THE

WORKS

OF THE

REVEREND and LEARNED

Henry Hammond, D. D.

The First Volume.

Containing a

COLLECTION

OF

DISCOURSES

Chiefly PRACTICAL.

With many ADDITIONS and Corrections
From the Authors own Hand.

The Second Edition.

Together with the LIFE of the AUTHOR.

LONDON,

Printed for *R. Royston*, Bookseller to the Kings most Sacred Majesty; and *R. Davis*, Bookseller in *Oxford*.
MDCLXXXIV.

THE WORKS OF Dr HAMMOND

IN

Four Volumes.

VOL. I.

A Collection of Diſcourſes chiefly Practical.

VOL. II.

A Collection of Diſcourſes in Defence of the Church of England,

I. Againſt the Romaniſts.

II. Againſt other Adverſaries.

VOL. III.

A Paraphraſe and Annotations upon all the Books of the New Teſtament.

VOL. IV.

A Paraphraſe and Annotations upon the Books of the Pſalms.

A Paraphraſe and Annotations upon [the ten firſt Chapters of] the Proverbs. MS.

XXXI. Sermons Preach'd upon ſeveral Occaſions.

WITH

An Appendix to Vol. II.

THE

WORKS

OF THE

REVEREND and LEARNED

Henry Hammond, D.D.

&c. &c. &c.

In Four VOLUMES.

COLLECTION

OF

DISCOURSES

Chiefly PRACTICAL.

With many ADDITIONS and Corrections

from the Author's own Hand

Together with the LIFE of the AUTHOR.

LONDON,

Printed for R. Royston, Bookseller to the Kings most Sacred Majesty: and R. Davis, Bookseller in Oxford.

MDCLXXIV.

TO THE

RIGHT REVEREND FATHER in GOD HUMFREY

BISHOP of LONDON,

Lord Almoner to His Majesty, and one of the Lords of His most Honourable PRIVY COUNCIL.

My Lord,

Although the Works of this Great Author can need no other Patronage, beside that of his own Name, yet this Edition of them is due to Yours; being an effect of that trust which he reposed in your Piety and Prudence for the managing of his Writings, and consequently, of his Reputation: Which, I hope, your Lordship will find nothing blemished by the Additions and Alterations herein made, having been so careful to follow the Authors own Copies, that this diligence is all I have to own in the Work, and to excuse this Address from

Your Lordships

Most Humble Servant

WILLIAM FULMAN.

TO THE

RIGHT REVEREND

FATHER in GOD

HUMFREY

BISHOP of LONDON,

Lord Almoner to His Majesty, and one of the Lords of His most Honorable PRIVY COUNCIL.

My Lord,

Though the Nobility of this Great Nation can need no other Patronage, besides that of their own Merit; yet this Edition of theirs is due to Yours; being an effect of that truly publick Re-spect in your Piety and Prudence for the managing of his Writings, and consequently of his Reputation: Which, I hope, Your Lordship will find notably Beautified by the Additions and Alterations herein made, having been so careful to follow the Authors own Copies, that this diligence is all I have to own in the Work, and to accept this Address from

Your Lordships

Most Humble Servant

WILLIAM [illegible]

THE PREFACE TO THE READER.

OF this Worthy Author and his ſeveral Works, ſo Large an accompt is already given by the accurate Writer of his *Life*, that there remaineth little for the gleaning of a ſecond hand: Only, to ſumme up thoſe particulars into this one general, That what before was excellent in each part, is now become more perfect and more uſeful in this Conjunction; which may ſerve for a *Body of Divinity*: The chief Heads whereof are briefly, plainly, and methodically laid down in the *Practical Catechiſm*; And then, thoſe points which daily uſe, or the iniquity of the Age, hath made more neceſſary to be inlarged on, are further purſued in the ſeveral Diſcourſes following: And where this alſo is not ſufficient to charm the Spirit of contradiction, they are more fully cleared and vindicated by large Defences in the next Volume.

Now, though this *Catechiſm* were at firſt the product of his diligence in the inſtruction of his own *Pariſh*, yet may it ſerve for an Index to the Learned, as well as an Introduction for the more ignorant: And being firſt publiſhed by the perſwaſion, and with the Preface of Doctor *Potter*, Provoſt of *Queens* College, which the modeſty of the Author left out in the later Editions; it may not be amiſs to let the Reader ſee the Judgment of that Worthy man, both of the deſign, and the performance: Which he gave in theſe words.

Be not forgetful to entertain ſtrangers, for thereby ſome have entertained Angels unawares, *ſaith the Apoſtle to the* Hebrews. *We have many ſhifts to ſave our Almes; This is a Counterfeit, that an ordinary vagabond, another a ſturdy Beggar; But he that relieves all, will undoubtedly meet with ſome object of his Charity, that may make amends for the reſt of his promiſcuous bounty.*

Thou, whoever thou art, that art ſo Charitable to the teeming Preſs, that nothing which it brings forth, eſcapes thy bounty; if, like the man in Lucian *thou buyeſt all, and unlike him in this, thou readeſt all too; thou wilt find upon a review of thy purchaces, incountring ſuch a prize as this, that thou haſt entertained an* Angel *indeed, that will make thee recompence for the reſt of thy unneceſſary profuſion: in truth a* pearl *of that rich value, that will amply pay thee for the barren* field *of writers thou boughteſt to compaſs it. Perhaps, my dear affection to the great piety and learning of the Author, may make me ſay that, which his exceeding humility and incomparable modeſty will not be pleaſed to hear; For none hath ever better written or practiſed a Catechiſm: none better taught, or better loved* Self-denyal *than himſelf: Yet my comfort is, when I have ſaid all I can ſay of it, my conſcience aſſures me, I do not prevaricate: I cannot tell how it*

may

may be valued by others, (for though we have but one Truth, we have many ſides) I know how it ought to be, I know how it is by me, whom not only with *King* Agrippa's ὀν ὀλίγῳ but with *S. Paul's* ὀν πολλῷ not almoſt, but altogether, *I hope, it hath perſwaded to become a Practical Chriſtian; perſwaded, did I ſay? 'tis too narrow an expreſſion,* ὑ γὰρ με εἰς πειθὼ, ἀλλ' εἰς ἔκ ſ ασιν ἄγει παῦτα τὰ ὑπερφυᾶ, *at the reading hereof methinks with S. Paul, I am caught and rapt up beyond the pitch and ſtature of theſe poor ſublunary things below, counting all, as indeed they are, but* σκύβαλα, *noyſome things, in reſpect of theſe high and precious truths taught by this Author. And I humbly beſeech God, that it may have the like energy in the breaſts of all that ſhall read it, that we may have leſs talking, leſs writing, leſs fighting for Religion, and more practice; that when our great Lord and Maſter comes, he may not find us ſo talking, ſo writing, ſo fighting; but ſo doing.* **Quod faxit Deus.**

Dr. *Potter* dyed *March* 3. 164½.

If ſuch an Elogy were then due to that firſt draught, from a perſon of that Piety and Learning, which his Life and Writings have witneſſed to the World; What might we have expected, if he had lived to ſee it thus poliſhed and perfected by his laſt hand, and thus attended by theſe accurate Diſcourſes?

Of which we need ſay no more in particular, but that, in the *Additions* (which are many, and in ſome places, large) and the *Corrections*, we have been ſo careful to follow the Authors Copies, that even where the ſenſe did plainly ſeem to require another reading, we have rather choſen to mention it in the margin, than to alter any thing in the Text without the Authority of his own hand.

Laſtly, To the ſeveral Titles of theſe Diſcourſes we have added the ſeveral *years* when they were firſt made publick: For that the full underſtanding of moſt Books depends upon the *Occaſion* of their writing; and that, upon the ſtate of Times and Things when they were written; by which the meaning of many paſſages, the ſeaſonableneſs of others, and even the truth of ſome, muſt be judged. The concerling whereof, by the fraud of thoſe that think to make their Merchandice more ſaleable by the ſeeming newneſs, is oftentimes no ſmall wrong both to the Author and the Reader, the one being miſunderſtood, and the other miſled, for want of ſome ſuch honeſt Advertiſement.

W. F.

A CATALOGUE OF THE DISCOURSES Contained in this VOLUME.

A Practical Catechiſm. Oxf. about 1644.
A Copy of ſome Papers paſt at Oxford *betwixt the Author of the Practical Catechiſm and Mr.* Ch. Oxf. 1647. *in* 4°
A Vindication of three Paſſages in the Practical Catechiſm. Lond. 1648. *in* 4°.

Of Conſcience. Oxf. 1644. *in* 4°.
Of Scandal. Oxf. 1644. *in* 4°
Of Will-worſhip. Oxf. 1644. *in* 4°.
Of Superſtition. Oxf. 1645. *in* 4°.
Of Idolatry. Oxf. 1646. *in* 4°.

Of Sins of Weakneſs and Wilfulneſs. Oxf. 1645. *in* 4°.
Of a late or Death-bed Repentance. Oxf. 1645. *in* 4°.
Of Fraternal Admonition or Correption. Lond. 1647. *in* 4°.

Of Reſiſting the Lawful Magiſtrate under colour of Religion. Oxf. 1644. *in* 4°.
Addreſs to the Lord Fairfax. Lond. 1649. *in* 4°.
A Vindication of the Addreſs. Lond. 1650. *in* 4°.

A View of the New Directory, and Vindication of the Antient Liturgy. Oxf. 1645. *in* 4°.
Conſiderations concerning the Change of Church-Government. Oxf. 1644. *in* 4°.
Of the Power of the Keys. Lond. 1647. *in* 4°.

* *Of the Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtian Religion.* Lond. 1650. *in* 12°.
Of Fundamentals. Lond. 1654. *in* 12°.
Of Schiſm. Lond. 1654. *in* 12°.
A Paræneſis, with a Diſcourſe of Hereſie. Lond. 1656. *in* 12°.

A Letter of Reſolution to ſix Quæres. Lond. 1653. *in* 12°.
A Pacifick Diſcourſe of God's Grace and Decrees. Lond. 1660. *in* 8°.
Of Hell Torments. Oxf. 1664. *in* 12°.
Two Prayers. Lond. 1660. *in* 8°.

* *Note, That the Diſcourſe* Of the Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtian Religion *is miſplaced next to the* Practical Catechiſm, *by the haſte of the Printer: By which means alſo, theſe Paſſages are omitted in their proper places, which ſhould be thus read.*

Chap. 1. §. 13. *(p.* 136. *lin.* 17.) -----had failed among the Jews. And they have an *antient* Saying, that *after the Age of the Prophets ſucceeded the Age of the Scribes,* i. e. of thoſe who although they were brought up in the *Scholes of the Prophets,* yet obtained not the *Spirit,* or *miſſion* of *Prophets.* Such as *Ezra, &c.* And under the ſecond Temple-----

* οὐχ ὑφήσουσι δικαίους ὑπὸ βεβλημένους ὑπὸ ὁσίων ἀνδρῶν. Epiſt. ad Cor. p. 58.

And Chap. 5. §. 13. *(p.* 150. *lin.* 16.) -----worth wondring at indeed. *Search the Scriptures,* ſaith *Clemens,* an *Apoſtolical* Writer, (the ſame who is mentioned by Saint *Paul Phil.* 4. 3.) *and* * *you ſhall never find the righteous caſt out of their dignities by pious men.* But for the Wicked-------

A

A PRACTICAL CATECHISM.

Theologia eſt Scientia Affectiva, non ſpeculativa. Gerſon.

Η τὸ πίλος ἐκλπῶσαι, ἢ διδάξαι. Clem. Alex. in Prædag.

A COPY of ſome PAPERS

Paſt at *OXFORD*, betwixt the Author of the *Practical Catechiſm*, and Mr *Ch.*

Χρὴ πρὸς τὰς διαβολὰς μὴ ἀποσιωπᾶν, ἵνα μὴ συγχωρήσωμεν ἐυωδωθῆναι τῷ ψεύδει, ἢ τὸ ἀπατηθῆναι μὴ ἐναφῶμεν τῇ βλάβῃ. S. Baſil. Epiſt. 63.

A BRIEF VINDICATION

Of three Paſſages in the

Practical Catechiſm,

From the Cenſures affixt on them by the MINISTERS of *LONDON*, in a Book Entituled, [*A Teſtimony to the truth of Jeſus Chriſt*, &c.]

THE CONTENTS
Of the Practical Catechism.

LIB. I.

OF Divinity Page 1
Of Practical Points Page 1
Sect. 1. Of the first Covenant 2
Of the second Covenant 2
Sect. 2. Of the Names of Christ 4
Of the Name of Jesus 4
Of the Name Christ, and his three Offices 5
Of Christ's Kingly Office 5
Of Christ's Priestly Office 7
Of Christ's Prophetick Office 10
Sect. 3. Of Faith 10
Of Hope 15
Of Charity 18
Of Repentance 19
Of Self-denial 24
Of taking up the Cross 25
Sect. 4. Of Justification 27
Of Sanctification 27
God's method in saving a Sinner 28

LIB. II.

Sect. 1. OF Christ's Sermon in the Mount 28
Of the Beatitudes 29
Of Poverty of Spirit 29
Of Mourning 29
Of Meekness 30
Of Hungring and Thirsting after Righteousness 32, 33.
Of Mercifulness 33
Of Purity of Heart 34
Of Peace-making 34
Of Persecution for Righteousness sake 35
Of the Order of these Beatitudes 36
Sect. 2. Of the exemplary lives of Christians 36
Sect. 3. Christianity is not destructive of the Laws to which Mankind hath been formerly obliged 37
Christ Perfected the Law 37
Sect. 4. The Style of the old Commandment 39
Sect. 5. Of killing 39
Of the Power of the Sword 39
Of Self-murder 40
Of Duels 40
Of Anger, causless or immoderate in the Breast 41
In the Tongue 42
Of Contumelious speaking 43
Of Reconciliation 43
Of the time of calling our selves to account for trespasses 44
Sect. 6. Of Adultery 44
Of Looking on a Woman to lust 44
Of the eye and hand offending 45
Sect. 7. Of Divorce 45
Sect. 8. Of Swearing 48
Of Sacrilege 48
Sect. 9. Of Revenge or retaliating evil 50
Of Wars 51
Of going to Law 53
Sect. 10. Of Loving enemies. 54
Sect. 11. Of the First Commandment 58
Sect. 12. Of the Duties of the First Table 60
Of the First Commandment 60
Of the Second Commandment 61
Of the Fourth Commandment 61
Of Festivities 62
Of Christmas 62

LIB. III.

Sect. 1. THree parts of Divine Worship 65
Of Almesgiving 65
Of vain-glory 69
Sect. 2. Of Prayer 73
Of vain repetitions 76
Of the Lord's Prayer 76
Sect. 3. Of Fasting 79
Of Sobriety 80
Of Feasting 81
Sect. 4. Of the desire and love of Wealth 83
Sect. 5. Of the Tenth Commandment 85
Of worldly care 85

LIB. IV.

Sect. 1. OF the Ninth Commandment 91
Of Judging others 91
Sect. 2. Of the Power of Prayer 93
Of doing as we would be done to 93
Of the Eighth Commandment 93
Of just dealing in buying and selling 94
Of Usury 98
Of Strictness 99
Of Wariness and Prudence 99
Marks of false Teachers 99
Sect. 3. Of Profession of Christianity without action 100

LIB. V.

Sect. 1. OF the Creed 101
Of Belief 101
Of believing in God 101
Sect. 2. Of believing in Jesus Christ 102
Of the Practical Doctrine from thence 103
Of Christ's Descent into Hell 104
Sect. 3. Of the Holy Ghost 107
Of the Holy Catholick Church 108
Of the Communion of Saints 108
Of Remission of Sins 109
Of the Resurrection of the Body 110
Of the Life everlasting, and endless punishment of sinners 110
The true ground thereof in the choice given us by God 111

LIB. VI.

Sect. 1. OF the Word Sacrament 114
Of the Sacraments in general 114
Sect. 2. Of Baptism 114
Sect. 3. Of the Vow of Baptism 118
Of Baptism of Infants 122
Sect. 4. Of the Lords Supper 123

TO

TO THE READER.

THE end of Christs Incarnation, Humiliation, and Death it self, being by St. *Paul* designed to be the *Redeeming us from all iniquity, and purifying to himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works*; and the end of his Resurrection being by St. *Peter* set down proportionable to that, *to bless us in turning every one of us from our iniquities*; and the design of Christ's own Sermons, when he was in the World, being to make our *Righteousness exceed the righteousness of the Pharisees*, and so in effect the reformation of lives, and heightning of Christian Practice to the most elevated pitch, being the one onely design of all our Christianity: It must needs be matter as of terrour, so of astonishment also, a most direful Prodigy, a most ominous fatal Prognostick in these last days, that Christians have so quite unlearnt their Master, made their lives such a continued contradiction and confutation of all his methods, such a frustration of all his aims; that the principles of Christian Purity and Meekness, and Mercifulness, and Peaceableness, should (not only of old among *Julian*'s Souldiers, but even now among Christian Professors, among those that make good all the formal outward part of Disciple-ship, that have had Christ's *eating and drinking daily among them*, and *teaching in their presence*) be perfectly abandoned and rejected, even with reproach and scorn, out of all their thoughts; yea, that the declination of Christian practice should be at last so great as to tear up the very root and foundation, I mean all natural, moral justice and honesty, and in place thereof to set up a new body of *Carneades* his Philosophy, in stead of those old *Heathen* dry principles of Integrity and Uprightness, that one Law of Interest, and Passion, and self-preservation. So that as *Machiavel* thought Religion would emasculate and infeeble Common-wealths, we have more reason to complain, that it hath debauched and corrupted lives: and, were it not that God hath been pleased to preserve a scattered remnant, a few in every Nation, to be the Records, as it were, from whom it may be seen what Christianity is able to do, if it may be hearkned to; were it not that there are a few ancient Primitive spirits, by whom, as by a standard, all others may and ought to be reformed; we have reason to think and say, that Christian-men are the impurest part of the World; that Satan's after Game hath proved more lucky and prosperous to him than his first designment did, that his Night-walk hath brought him more Proselytes, than his unlimited range of going up and down *to and fro over the face of the Earth*; that *as sin by the Law*, so Satan by the *Faith of Christ*, hath taken occasion, and so deceiv'd and ruined us most desperately, more universally, than by all the National Idolatrous customs of Heathenism he hath been able to do. What the one great error is, what the fundamental transcendent distemper that hath had all this inauspicious influence upon us, may perhaps be no great difficulty to discern. Is it not, that Christianity hath been taken, if not with the Atheist for an Art or Trick, yet with the Scholiastick for a Science, a matter of speculation; and so, that he that knows most, that believes most, is the only sanctified person? Is it not, that of the two sorts of things that belong

long to another Life, Viſion, which is peculiar to that ſtate, is by men deſired to be anticipated and acquired here, and the love and purity which alſo belong to it, are taken for impertinent things, that we are not concerned in? Is it not, that the factions and animoſities which are thus begotten in us againſt all that are not of our opinions in Religion, are thought to be our duty, and our piety? And all our zeal laid out upon this one head, of hating and condemning of all others; and ſo, *the love of many being grown cold*, by a natural conſequence all kind of *iniquity is increaſed*? If this be not the bottom of the matter, if one (or more of theſe in conjunction) have not had the priviledge to engroſs all our ſin and ruin, yet ſure it hath been a mighty and a moſt peſtilent ingredient in it: and I ſhall venture to gueſs but at one more, ſome *wreſting of Scripture to our own deſtructions*, either by undertaking without a guide to underſtand difficult Prophecies of *Daniel* and the *Revelation*, and accommodating them to the feeding of our own paſſions, making them to comply with our deſigns, whatſoever they are, (which next pretending to immediate Inſpirations and Enthuſiaſms, and ruling our ſelves not by the ſtanding Rule of *Scripture*, but by ſomewhat quite diſtant from that, whether we miſcal it *ſpirit* or *conſcience*, is the moſt infallibly pernicious) or elſe by miſtaking of ſome plainer places, and ſo ſwallowing and prepoſſeſſing our ſelves with ſome doctrines which directly incline to carnal or ſpiritual ſecurity, and then inſiſting more violently on them than on any other, making them marks of the moſt ſpiritual, ſanctified men, and ſo able to excuſe thoſe trifles of vicious life, that ſuch pious Profeſſors may poſſibly be guilty of. What theſe Doctrines are, I ſhall not in this place particularly define, but rather labour (by inſtilling thoſe diſtant principles which moſt naturally, and directly, and immediately tend to Chriſtian practice) to prevent or Cure thoſe Poiſons. This, and nothing but this, is entirely the deſign of this enſuing platform; which being again reviewed, hath received ſuch alterations and increaſes as ſeemed moſt conducible to the ends to which it was firſt deſigned, and having now attained the juſt growth, hath more reaſon to expect the benefit of the Reader's Prayers, the bleſſing influence of Heaven upon him and it. The Lord remove all prejudices and reſiſtances, which may foreſtal or obſtruct the deſired fruits and effects of it.

H. HAMMOND.

THE

THE LIFE OF THE Most Learned, Reverend and Pious Dr HENRY HAMMOND.

Written by JOHN FELL Dean of *Christ-Church*, and Lord Bishop of *OXFORD*.

DOctor *Henry Hammond*, whose Life is now attempted to be written, was born upon the 26 of *August* in the Year 1605. at *Chersey* in *Surrey*, a place formerly of remark for *J. Cæsar*'s supposed passing his Army there over the *Thames*, in the Enterprise upon this Island, as also for the entertainment of Devotion in its earliest reception by our *Saxon* Ancestors; and of later Years, for the Charity of having given burial to the equally pious and unfortunate Prince King *Hen.* VI.

He was the youngest Son of Dr. *John Hammond* Physician to *Prince Henry*, and from that great Favourer of meriting Servants and their Relations, had the honour at the Font to receive his Christian Name.

Nor had he an hereditary interest in Learning only from his Father; by his Mothers side he was allied both unto it and the Profession of Theology, being descended from Dr *Alexander Nowell*, the Reverend Dean of St *Paul*'s, that great and happy Instrument of the Reformation, and eminent Light of the *English* Church.

Being yet in his long Coats, (which heretofore were usually worn beyond the years of Infancy,) he was sent to *Eaton* School; where his pregnancy having been advantag'd by the more than paternal care and industry of his Father (who was an exact Critick in the learned Languages, especially the Greek) became the observation of those that knew him: for in that tenderness of Age he was not only a Proficient in Greek and Latine, but had also some knowledge in the Elements of Hebrew: in the later of which Tongues, it being then rarely heard of even out of Grammar Schools, he grew the Tutor of those who begun to write themselves men, but thought it no shame to learn of one whose knowledge seem'd rather infus'd than acquir'd; or in whom the learned Languages might be thought to be the Mother-Tongue. His skill in Greek was particularly advantag'd by the conversation and kindness of Mr *Allen*, one of the Fellows of the Colledge, excellently seen in that Language, and a great assistant of Sir *Henry Savile* in his magnificent Edition of St *Chrysostom*.

His sweetness of Carriage is very particularly remembred by his Contemporaries, who observ'd that he was never engag'd (upon any occasion) into fights or quarrels; as also that at times allowed for Play, he would steal from his fellows into places of privacy, there to say his Prayers: *Omens* of his future pacifick temper and eminent Devotion.

Which softness of temper his Schoolmaster Mr *Bust*, who upon his Fathers account had a tender kindness for him, lookt upon with some jealousie; for he building upon the general observation, that Gravity and Passiveness in Children is not from discretion but phlegme, suspected that his Scholars faculties would desert his Industry, and end only in a laborious well-read non-proficiency: but the Event gave a full and speedy defeat to those well-meant misgivings; for he so improv'd that at about thirteen years old he was thought, and (what is much more rare) was indeed ripe for the University, and accordingly

ingly ſent to *Magdalen* College in *Oxford*. * Not long after his being ſetled in the College he was choſen *Demie*; and though he ſtood low upon the Roll, by a very unuſual concurrence of providential Events, happen'd to be ſped and admitted in the year 1622. and though having then loſt his Father, he became deſtitute of the advantage which potent recommendation might have given, yet his merit voting for him, as ſoon as capable, he was choſen *Fellow*.

* His Entry upon the publick Matriculation Book, is not till *June* 26. 1621. but it has always been cuſtomary for young Students to neglect the Univerſity Regiſter, till they begin to look towards their Degree.

Being to proceed Maſter of Arts, he was made Reader of the natural Philoſophy Lecture in the College, and alſo was employed in making one of the two Funeral Orations ſpoken on the highly-meriting Preſident Dr *Langton*.

Having taken His Degree, he preſently bought a Syſteme of Divinity, with deſign to apply himſelf ſtraightway to that ſtudy: but upon ſecond thoughts he returned for a time to Humane Learning, and afterwards, when he reſum'd his purpoſe for Theology, took a quite different Courſe of reading from the other too much uſual, beginning that Science at the upper end, as conceiving it moſt reaſonable to ſearch for primitive Truth in the primitive Writers, and not to ſuffer his Underſtanding to be prepoſſeſt by the contrived and intereſſed Schemes of modern, and withal obnoxious Authors.

Anno 1629. being twenty four years of Age, the Statutes of his Houſe directing, and the Canons of the Church then regularly permitting it, he entred into Holy Orders, and not long after he took the degree of Batchellor in Divinity, giving as happy proof of his proficiency in Sacred, as before he had done in Secular knowledge. During the whole time of his abode in the Univerſity he generally ſpent thirteen hours of the day in Study; by which aſſiduity, beſides an exact diſpatch of the whole Courſe of Philoſophy, he read over in a manner all Claſſick Authors that are extant; and upon the more conſiderable wrote as he paſſed, *Scholia* and critical emendations, and drew up Indexes for his private uſe at the beginning and end of each Book: all which remain at this time, and teſtify his indefatigable pains to as many as have perus'd his Library.

In the year 1633. the Reverend Dr *Frewen*, the then Preſident of his College, now Lord Arch-biſhop of *York*, gave him the honour to ſupply one of his courſes at the Court; where the right Honourable the Earl of *Leiceſter* happening to be an Auditor, he was ſo deeply affected with the Sermon, and took ſo juſt a meaſure of the merit of the Preacher thence, that the Rectory of *Penſehurſt* being at that time void, and in his gift, he immediately offer'd him the Preſentation: which being accepted, he was inducted on the 22th of *Auguſt* in the ſame Year; and thenceforth from the Scholaſtick retirements of an Univerſity Life, applied himſelf to the more buſie Entertainments of a rural privacy, and what ſome have call'd the being buried in a Living: and being to leave the Houſe, he thought not fit to take that advantage of his place, which from Sacriledge or ſelling of the Founders Charity, was by cuſtom grown to be prudence and good Husbandry, but left the Colledge with the ſame integrity that he had lived in it.

In the diſcharge of his Miniſterial Function, he ſatisfied not himſelf in diligent and conſtant Preaching only; (a performance wherein ſome of late have phanſied all Religion to conſiſt) but much more conceived himſelf obliged to the offering up the ſolemn daily Sacrifice of Prayer for his people, adminiſtring the Sacraments, relieving the Poor, keeping Hoſpitality, reconciling of differences amongſt Neighbours, Viſiting the Sick, Catechiſing the Youth.

As to the firſt of theſe, his *Preaching*, 'twas not at the ordinary rate of the Times, an unpremeditated, undigeſted effuſion of ſhallow and crude conceptions; but a rational and juſt diſcourſe, that was to teach the Prieſt as well as the Lay-hearer. His method was (which likewiſe he recommended to his Friends) after every Sermon to reſolve upon the enſuing Subject; that being done, to purſue the courſe of ſtudy which he was then in hand with, reſerving the Cloſe of the Week for the proviſion for the next Lords-day. Whereby not only a conſtant progreſs was made in Science, but materials unawares were gain'd unto the immediate future Work: for, he ſaid, be the Subjects treated of never ſo diſtant, ſomewhat will infallibly fall in conducible unto the preſent purpoſe.

The offices of *Prayer* he had in his Church not only upon the Sundays and Feſtivals and their Eves, as alſo Wedneſdays and Fridays, according to the appointment of the *Rubrick*; (which ſtrict duty and miniſtration when 'tis examined to the bottom will prove the greateſt objection againſt the *Liturgy*; as that which, beſides its own trouble and auſterity, leaves no leiſure for factious and licentious meetings at Fairs and Markets) but every day in the Week, and twice on Saturdays and Holiday Eves: For his aſſiſtance wherein he kept a Curate, and allow'd him a comfortable Salary. And at thoſe Devotions he took order that his Family ſhould give diligent and exemplary attendance; which

was

was the eaſilier perform'd, it being guided by his Mother, a Woman of ancient Vertue, and one to whom he paid a more than filial Obedience.

As to the *Adminiſtration of the Sacrament*, he reduced it to an imitation, though a diſtant one, of Primitive frequency, to once a Month, and therewith its anciently inſeparable Appendant, the Offertory: wherein his inſtruction and happily-inſinuating Example ſo far prevail'd, that there was thenceforth little need of ever making any tax for the poor. Nay, (if the report of a ſober perſon born and bred up in that Pariſh, be to be believ'd) in ſhort time a ſtock was rais'd to be always ready for the apprentiſing of young Children, whoſe Parents condition made the proviſion for them an equal Charity to both the Child and Parent. And after this there yet remain'd a Superpluſage for the aſſiſtance of the Neighbour Pariſhes.

For the *Relief of the Poor*, beſides the foremention'd Expedient, wherein others were ſharers with him, unto his private Charity, the dedicating the tenth of all receipts, and the daily Almes given at the Door, he conſtantly ſet apart over and above every Week a certain rate in money: and however rarely his own Rent-days occurr'd, the indigent had two and fifty quarter-days returning in his Year. Yet farther, another art of Charity he had, the ſelling Corn to his poor Neighbours at a rate below the Market-price: which though, as he ſaid, he had reaſon to do, gaining thereby the charge of Portage; was a great benefit to them, who beſides the abatement of price, and poſſibly forbearance, ſaved thereby a Days-work.

He that was thus liberal to the neceſſitous Poor, was no leſs *hoſpitable* to thoſe of better quality: and as at other times he frequently invited his Neighbours to his Table, ſo more eſpecially on Sundays; which ſeldom paſt at any time without bringing ſome of them his Gueſts: but here beyond the Weekly treatments, the *Chriſtmas* Feſtival had a peculiar allowance to ſupport it. He knew well how much the application at the Table inforc'd the doctrines of the Pulpit, and how ſubſervient the endearing of his perſon was to the recommending his inſtructions, how far upon theſe motives our Saviour thought fit to eat with Publicans and Sinners, and how effectual the Loaves were to the procuring of Diſciples.

In accordance to which his generous freedom in Alms and Hoſpitality, he farther obliged his Pariſhioners in the ſetting of their Tithes and Dues belonging to him: for though he very well underſtood how prone men are to give complaints in payment, and how little obligation there is on him that lets a bargain to conſider the caſual loſs, who is ſure never to ſhare in a like ſurpluſage of gain; yet herein he frequently departed from his right, inſomuch that having ſet the Tithe of a large Meadow, and upon agreement received part of the money at the beginning of the Year; it happening that the profits were afterwards ſpoil'd and carried away by a flood, he, when the Tenant came to make the laſt payment, not only refus'd it, but returned the former ſum, ſaying to the poor man, *God forbid I ſhould take the Tenth where you have not the nine parts.*

As by publick admonition he moſt diligently inſtill'd that great Fundamental Doctrine of Peace and Love, ſo did he likewiſe in his *private addreſs and converſation*, being never at peace in himſelf, till he had procur'd it amongſt his Neighbours; wherein God ſo bleſt him, that he not only attain'd his purpoſe of uniting diſtant parties unto each other, but, contrary to the uſual fate of Reconcilers, gain'd them to himſelf: there having been no perſon of his Function any where better beloved than he when preſent, or lamented more when abſent, by his flock. Of which tender and very filial affection, inſtead of more, we may take two inſtances: the one, that he being driven away, and his Books plundred, one of his Neighbours bought them in his behalf, and preſerved them for him till the end of the War: the other, that during his abode at *Penſehurſt*, he never had any vexatious Law diſpute about his Dues, but had his Tithes fully paid, and not of the moſt refuſe parts, but generally the very beſt.

Though he judged the time of *Sickneſs* an improper ſeaſon for the great Work of Repentance; yet he eſteemed it a moſt uſeful preparative, the voice of God himſelf exhorting to it: and therefore not only when deſir'd made his *Viſits* to all ſuch as ſtood in need of thoſe his charities, but prevented their requeſts by early and by frequent coming to them. And this he was ſo careful of, that after his remove from *Penſehurſt*, being at *Oxford*, and hearing of the Sickneſs of one of his Pariſhioners, he from thence ſent to him thoſe inſtructions which he judg'd uſeful in that Exigent, and which he could not give at nearer diſtance.

For the inſtitution of Youth in the Rudiments of Piety, his Cuſtom was, during the warmer Seaſon of the Year, to ſpend an hour before Evening-Prayer in *Catechiſing*, whereat the Parents and older ſort were wont to be preſent, and from whence (as he with comfort was uſed to ſay) they reaped more benefit than from his Sermons. Where it may not be ſuperfluous to obſerve that he introduced no new form of *Catechiſm*, but adher'd

to that of the Church; rendring it fully intelligible to the meaneſt capacities by his explanations. It may be uſeful withal to advert, that if in thoſe times Catechetical inſtitution were very ſeaſonable, 'twill now be much more; when Principles have been exchang'd for dreams of words and notions; if not for a worſe ſeaſon of profane contempt of Chriſtian truth. His method of inſtitution chiefly aim'd at the enforcing exemplary Vertue, and holineſs of Life; having much the ſame materials with that moſt uſeful work which he afterwards publiſht, The Practical Catechiſm. But to return; Beſides all this, that there might be no imaginable aſſiſtance wanting, he took care for the providing an able Schoolmaſter in the Pariſh, which he continued during the whole time of his aboad.

And as he thus labour'd in the Spiritual building up of Souls, he was not negligent of the material Fabrick committed to his truſt: but repair'd with a very great Expence (the annual charge of a hundred pound) his Parſonage-Houſe; till from an incommodious ruine he had render'd it a fair and pleaſant dwelling, with the adherent conveniences of Gardens and Orchards.

While he was thus buſy on his Charge, though he ſo prodigally laid out himſelf upon the Intereſts of his Flock, as he might ſeem to have nothing left for other purpoſes; and his Humility recommended above all things Privacy and Retirement to him: yet when the uſes of the Publick call'd him forth, he readily obey'd the Summons, and frequently Preach'd both at S^t *Paul*'s Croſs, and the *Viſitations* of his Brethren the Clergy, (a *ſpecimen* whereof appears in print) as alſo at the Cathedral Church of *Chicheſter*, where by the unſought-for favour of the Reverend Father in God, *Brian*, then Lord Biſhop of that See, ſince of *Wincheſter*, he had an intereſt, and had the dignity of *Arch-deacon*: which at the beginning of the late Troubles falling to him, he managed with great Zeal and Prudence, not only by all the charms of Chriſtian Rhetorick, perſwading to Obedience and Union, but by the force of demonſtration, charging it as moſt indiſpenſable duty, and (what was then not ſo readily believed) the greateſt temporal intereſt of the inferiour Clergy: wherein the eminent importance of the Truths he would inforce, ſo far prevail'd over his otherwiſe-inſuperable Modeſty, that in a full Aſſembly of the Clergy, as he afterwards confeſt, he broke off from what he had premeditated, and out of the abundance of his heart ſpoke to his Auditory; and by the bleſſing of God, to which he attributed it, found a very ſignal reception.

In the Year 1639. he proceeded Doctor in Divinity, his Seniority in the Univerſity, and employment in the Church, and (what perchance was a more importunate motive) the deſire of Eleven of his Friends and Contemporaries in the ſame Houſe, whom not to accompany might be interpreted an affected pride and ſingularity, at leaſt an unkindneſs, jointly perſwading him to it.

His performance in the Act, where he anſwer'd the Doctors, was to the equal ſatisfaction and wonder of his Hearers; a Country-life uſually contracting at the leaſt an unreadineſs to the dextrous management of thoſe Exerciſes, which was an Effect undeſcernible in him.

About this time he became a Member of the Convocation, which ſate with the ſhort Parliament in 1640. as after in that which was call'd with the long one: nay he was named to be of the Aſſembly of Divines; his invincible Loyalty to his Prince, and Obedience to his Mother the Church, not being ſo valid arguments againſt his nomination, as the repute of his Learning and Vertue were on the other part, to have ſome title to him.

And now that Conformity became a Crime, and Tumults improving into Hoſtility and War, ſuch a Crime as had chaſtiſements ſevere enough; though the Committee of the Countrey ſummon'd him before them, and uſed thoſe their beſt arguments of perſwaſion, threatnings and reproaches, he ſtill went on in his regular practice, and continued it till the middle of *July* 1643. At which time there being in his Neighbourhood about *Tunbridge* an attempt in behalf of the King, and his Doctrine and Example having had that good influence, as it was ſuppoſed, to have made many more ready to the diſcharge of their duty; it being defeated, the good Doctor (the malice of one who deſign'd to ſucceed in his living being withal aſſiſtant) was forc'd to ſecure himſelf by retirement; which he did, withdrawing himſelf to his old Tutor D^r *Buckner*; to whom he came about the 25^th of *July* early in the Morning in ſuch an habit as that Exigence made neceſſary for him, and whither not many days before his old Friend and Fellow-Pupil D^r *Oliver* came upon the ſame Errand. Which accident, and the neceſſity to leave his Flock, as the Doctor afterwards frequently acknowledg'd, was that which did moſt affect him of any that he felt in his whole life: amidſt which, though he was no valuer of trifles, or any thing that look'd like ſuch, he had ſo extraordinary a Dream, that he could not then deſpiſe, nor ever afterwards forget it.

'Twas

'Twas thus; He thought himself and a multitude of others to have been abroad in a bright and chearful day, when on a sudden there seem'd a separation to be made, and he with a far less number to be placed at a distance from the rest; and then the Clouds gathering, a most tempestuous Storm arose, with thundring and lightnings, with spouts of impetuous rain, and violent gusts of Wind, and whatever else might add unto a scene of horrour; particularly Balls of Fire that shot themselves amongst the ranks of those that stood in the lesser party: When a gentle Whisper seem'd to interrupt those other louder noises, saying, *Be still, and ye shall receive no harm.* Amidst these terrors the Doctor falling to his Prayers, soon after the Tempest ceas'd, and that known Cathedral Anthem begun, *Come Lord Jesus, come away*; with which he awoke. The correspondent Event of all which he found verified signally in the preservation both of himself and his Friends, in doing of their duties; the which with much content he was us'd to mention. Beside, being himself taken to the Quires of Angels at the close of that Land-*Hurrican* of ours, whereof that dismal Apparition was only a faint Embleme; he gave thereby too literal a completion to his Dream, and the unhappy credit of bordering upon Prophecy.

In this retirement the two Doctors remained about three Weeks, till an Alarm was brought, that a strict enquiry was made for Doctor *Hammond*, and a hundred pound promised as a reward for him that should produce him. Which suggestion though they easily apprehended to have a possibility of being false, yet they concluded a necessary ground for their remove.

Upon this they resolve to be gone; and Doctor *Oliver* having an interest in *Wincheſter*, which was then in the Kings Quarters, they chose that as the next place of their retreat. But being on the way thither, Doctor *Oliver*, who had sent his Servant before to make provision for them, was met and saluted with the News that Doctor *Frewen*, President of *Magdalen* College, was made Bishop of *Lichfield*, and that the College had pitched upon him as Successor. This unlook'd-for accident (as justly it might) put Doctor *Oliver* to new counsels, and since Providence had found out so seasonable a relief, enclin'd him not to desert it, but fly rather to his Preferments and advantage, than merely to his refuge, and so to divert to *Oxford*. To this Doctor *Hammond* made much difficulty to assent, thinking that too publick a place, and, what he more consider'd, too far from his Living, whither (his desires strongly inclining him) he had hopes (when the present fury was allay'd) to return again; and to that purpose had wrote to such Friends of his as were in power, to use their Interest for the procuring his Security. But his Letters meeting a cold reception, and the Company of his Friend on one hand, and the appearance of deserting him on the other hand, charming him to it, he was at last perswaded; and encompassing *Hantshire* with some difficulty came to *Oxford*; Where procuring an apartment in his old College, he sought that peace in his Retirement and Study which was no where else to be met withal; taking no other diversion than what the giving Encouragement and instruction to ingenious young Students yielded him, (a thing wherein he peculiarly delighted) and the satisfaction which he received from the conversation of Learned men; who, besides the usual store, in great number at that time for their Security resorted thither.

Among the many Eminent persons with whom he here convers'd, he had particular intimacy with Doctor *Potter* Provost of Queens College, to whom among other fruits of his Studies he communicated his *Practical Catechism*, which for his private use he had drawn up out of those materials which he had made use of in the Catechetick institution of the youth of his Parish. The Provost much taken with the design, and no less with the performance, importun'd him to make it publick; alledging, in that lawless Age the great use of supplanting the empty form of Godliness which so prevail'd, by substituting of its real power and sober duties; of silencing Prophaneness, which then usurp'd the names of Wit and Gallantry, by enforcing the more eligible acts of the Christians reasonable service, which was not any other way so happily to be done, as by beginning at the foundation by sound, and yet not trivial, Catechetick institution.

It was not hard to convince D^r^ *Hammond* that 'twere well if some such thing were done; but that his Writing would do this in any measure, or that he should suffer his Name to become publick, it was impossible to perswade him. The utmost he could be brought to allow of was, that his Treatise was not likely to do harm, but had possibilities of doing (it might be) some good, and that it would not become him to deny that service to the World; especially if his Modesty might be secur'd from pressure by the concealing of him to be the Author. And this Doctor *Potter*, that he might leave no subterfuge, undertook, and withal the whole care of, and besides, the whole charge of the Edition. Upon these terms, only with this difference, that D^r^ *Hammond* would not suffer the Provost to be at the entire charge, but went an equal share with him, the *Practical Catechism* saw the light, and likewise the Author remained in his desir'd obscurity.

But

But in the mean time the Book finding the reception which it merited, the good Doctor was by the ſame arguments conſtrained to give way to the publiſhing of ſeveral other Tracts which he had written upon heads that were then moſt perverted by popular Error; as of *Conſtience*, of *Scandal*, of *Will-worſhip*, of *Reſiſting the lawful Magiſtrate*, and of the *Change of Church-Government*; his Name all this while concealed, and ſo preſerved, till Curioſity improving its gueſſes into confident aſſeverations, he was rumor'd for the Author, and as ſuch publiſh'd to the world by the *London* and *Cambridge* Stationers, who without his knowledge reprinted thoſe and other of his Works.

In the interim a Treaty being labour'd by his Majeſty, to compoſe (if it were poſſible) the unhappy differences in Church and State, and in order thereunto the Duke of *Richmond* and Earl of *Southampton* being ſent to *London*; Doctor *Hammond* went along as Chaplain to them; where with great zeal and prudence, he labour'd to undeceive thoſe ſeduced perſons whom he had opportunity to converſe with: and when the Treaty was ſolemnly appointed at *Uxbridge*, ſeveral Divines being ſent thither in behalf of the different Parties, he, among other excellent men that adher'd to the *King*, was made choice of to aſſiſt in that Employment. And there (not to mention the debates between the Commiſſioners, which were long ſince publiſh'd by an Honourable hand) Doctor *Steward* and Maſter *Henderſon* were at firſt only admitted to diſpute; though at the ſecond meeting the other Divines were call'd in: which thing was a ſurprize, and deſign'd for ſuch, to thoſe of the King's part, who came as Chaplains and private Attendants on the Lords; but was before projected and prepared for by thoſe of the Presbyterian way. And in this conflict it was the lot of Doctor *Hammond* to have Maſter *Vines* for his Antagoniſt; who in ſtead of tendring a Scholaſtick diſputation, read from a Paper a long Divinity-Lecture, wherein were interwoven ſeveral little Cavils and Exceptions, which were meant for Arguments. Doctor *Hammond* perceiving this, drew forth his Pen and Ink, and as the other was reading, took notes of what was ſaid, and then immediately return'd in order an anſwer to the ſeveral ſuggeſtions, which were about forty in number: which he did with that readineſs and ſufficiency, as at once gave teſtimony to his ability, and to the evidence of the Truth he aſſerted; which amidſt the diſadvantage of *Extempore* againſt Premeditation, diſpell'd with eaſe and perfect clearneſs all the Sophiſms that had been brought againſt him.

'Tis not the preſent work to give an account of that whole Diſpute, or character the merits of thoſe Worthy Perſons who were engag'd in it, either in that or the ſucceeding meetings: eſpecially ſince it was reſolv'd by both parties, that the tranſactions of neither ſide ſhould be made publick. But notwithſtanding this, ſince divers perſons addicted to the defence of a ſide, without any further conſideration of Truth or common Honeſty, have in this particular wounded the Doctors reputation; I ſhall take leave to ſay, that had the Victories in the field which were manag'd by the Sword been like this of the Chamber and the Tongue, a very eaſie Act of Oblivion muſt have atoned for them; ſince what never was, without much induſtry might be ſecur'd from being remembred. The impudent Falſity rais'd upon the *Doctor* was this, That Mr *Vines* utterly ſilenc'd him; inſomuch that he was fain to uſe this unheard of Stratagem to avoid his Adverſaries demonſtration, to ſwear by *God* and *the holy Angels*, that though at preſent a Solution did not occurr to him, he could anſwer it. Concerning this we have the Doctors own account in a Letter of his, bearing date *Jan.* 22. *Ann.* 1655. directed to a Friend who had advertis'd him of this Report.

I have formerly been told within theſe few years that there went about a Story much to my diſparagement, concerning the Diſpute at Uxbridge *(for there it was, not at* Holdenby*) with* Mr Vines; *but what it was I could never hear before: Now I do, I can, I think, truly affirm, that no one part of it hath any degree of truth, ſave only that* Mr Vines *did diſpute againſt, and I defend, Epiſcopacy. For as to the Argument mention'd, I did neither then, nor at any time of my life, (that I can remember) ever hear it urg'd by any. And for my pretended Anſwer, I am both ſure that I never call'd God and his holy Angels to witneſs any thing in my life, nor ever ſwore one voluntary Oath that I know of, (and ſure there was then none impos'd on me) and that I was not at that Meeting conſcious to my ſelf of wanting ability to expreſs my thoughts, or preſt with any conſiderable difficulty, or forc'd by any conſideration to wave the anſwer of any thing objected. A Story of that whole affair I am yet able to tell you; but I cannot think it neceſſary. Only this I may add, That after it I went to* Mr Marſhall *in my own and Brethrens names, to demand three things; 1. Whether any Argument propos'd by them remain'd unanſwer'd, to which we might yield farther anſwer: 2. Whether they intended to make any report of the paſt diſputation; offering if they would, to join with them in it, and to perfect a Conference by mutual Conſent, after the manner of that between* Dr Reynolds *and* Mr Hart: *both which being rejected, the 3. was, to promiſe each other that nothing ſhould be afterwards publiſh'd by either without the conſent or knowledge of the other party. And that laſt he promis'd for himſelf and his Brethren, and ſo we parted.*

But

But while theſe things were in doing, a *Canonry* in *Chriſt-Church* in *Oxford* became vacant, which the *King* immediately beſtowed on Doctor *Hammond*, though then abſent; whom likewiſe the Univerſity choſe their publick *Orator*: which Preferments though collated ſo freely, and in a time of Exigence, he was with much difficulty wrought upon by his Friends to accept, as minding nothing ſo much as a return to his old Charge at *Penſehurſt*. But the impoſſibility of a ſudden opportunity of going thither being evident unto him, he at laſt accepted; and in *March* 1645. after, made Chaplain in Ordinary to his Majeſty: probably the very laſt perſon aſſum'd to that Service.

But theſe new Employments no way diverted him from his former tasks; for, according to his wonted Method, he continued to addreſs remedies to the encreaſing Miſchiefs of the times, and publiſh'd the Tracts of *Superſtition*, *Idolatry*, *Sins of Weakneſs and Wilfulneſs*, *Death-bed Repentance*, *View of the Directory*; as alſo in anſwer to a *Romaniſt*, who taking advantage of the publick Ruine, hoped to erect thereon Trophees to the Capitol; his *Vindication of the Lord Falkland*, who was not long before ſlain in another kind of War.

But now the King's affairs declining every where, and *Oxford* being forc'd upon Articles to ſurrender to the Enemy, where after the expiration of ſix months all things were to be left to the luſt and fury of a ſervile, and therefore inſolent, Conquerour; though he foreſaw a ſecond and more fatal Siege approaching, a Leaguer of encamp'd inevitable miſchiefs; yet he remitted nothing of his wonted Induſtry, writing his Tracts of *Fraternal Correption*, and *Power of the Keyes*, and *Apologies by Letter* againſt the Pulpit-Calumnies of M^r *Cheynel*, and the Exceptions taken at his *Practical Catechiſm*.

When the Calamities of an improſperous War had prepared ſome for a reſort to Heaven, there appearing nothing like ſecurity on Earth; and others were under that violent temptation which has exercis'd the beſt men in all Ages, to repine at the unequal diſtributions of Providence, which brought Majeſty to the Duſt, and ſet Rebellion in the Throne; it ſeeming reaſonable to caſt off that Religion, which God Almighty had firſt himſelf deſerted; to march out of our opinions as we had done out of our Caſtles, and diſmantle our Cauſe as we had done our Garriſons: He with great Charity and skill adapted applications to both theſe equally preſſing, though moſt diſtant occaſions; for he not only by writing endeavour'd to eſtabliſh thoſe, whom the ill circumſtances of the times had inclined to vertue, and reduce them who were unhappily undermin'd or ſhaken; but alſo by converſation and familiar addreſs, he induſtriouſly purſued this bleſt deſign, and very effectually in ſeveral remarkable inſtances attain'd it.

I have been frequently told by a Noble Lord, who ſerved the late King in great employments through the War, with moſt remarkable Courage, Conduct, and Fidelity, and afterwards followed the fortune of our preſent Soveraign, during his exile with the ſame conſtancy and duty: that a little before he marcht out of *Oxford*, Doctor *Hammond* though a ſtranger applied himſelf unto him, and prefacing his Diſcourſe with the diſaſters which now had faln upon the Royal Cauſe, and the temptations which probably would come therefrom, particularly to thoſe who were in his Lordſhips condition, and would be driven into a Foreign Country, where they ſhould ſee a glittering Religion, recommended by proſperity and outward pomp, as alſo the inſinuations of artifice and falſehood, and bold obtruding dictates; methods never wanting to the Factors for the Roman Cauſe; He enforc'd upon him as the indiſpenſible obligation, upon all that own themſelves Chriſtians, of taking up the Croſs, and cheerfully receiving whatever ſufferings ſhall prove the price of duty; ſo alſo inſtructed him at large, in the grounds on which the Church of *England* ſtood bottom'd, both abſolutely in her ſelf, and relatively in oppoſition to Popery; which he back'd with ſuch conviction of reaſon, and obligingneſs of concern, that the ſame Honourable Perſon, who ſtill lives an imitable pattern of Piety and Vertue in this profligate Age, does to this day make liberal acknowledgments of the benefit he took, and yet reaps from thoſe documents ſo long ſince received.

In the mean time his Sacred *Majeſty*, ſold by his *Scotiſh* into the hands of his *Engliſh* Subjects, and brought a Priſoner to *Holdenby*, where ſtripp'd of all His Royal Attendants, and denied that common Charity which is afforded the worſt of Malefactors, the aſſiſtance of Divines, though he with importunity deſir'd it; He being taken from the Parliament Commiſſioners into the poſſeſſion of the Army, at laſt obtain'd that kindneſs from them (who were to be cruel at another rate) which was withheld by the two Houſes, and was permitted the ſervice of ſome few of his Chaplains, whom he by name had ſent for, and among them of Doctor *Hammond*.

Accordingly the good Doctor attended on his Maſter in the ſeveral removes of *Woburn*, *Caveſham* and *Hampton-Court*, as alſo thence into the Iſle of *Wight*, where he continued till *Chriſtmas* 1647. at which time His Majeſties Attendants were again put from Him, and he amongſt the reſt.

Sequeſtred

Sequeſtred from this his melancholick, but moſt deſir'd, Employment, he return'd again to *Oxford*: where being *Sub-dean*, an Office to which belongs much of the Scholaſtick Government of the College, and ſoon after prov'd to be the whole, (the Dean, for the guilt of aſſerting the Rights of His Majeſty and Univerſity in his ſtation of Vice-Chancellor, being made a Priſoner,) he undertook the entire Management of all affairs; and diſcharg'd it with great ſufficiency and admirable diligence, leaving his beloved ſtudies to intereſt himſelf not only in moderating at Divinity-Diſputations, which was then an immediate part of his Task, but in preſiding at the more youthful Exerciſes of Sophiſtry, Themes and Declamations; redeeming ſtill at night theſe Vacuities of the day, ſcarce ever going to Bed till after midnight, ſometimes not till three in the Morning, and yet certainly riſing to Prayers at five.

Nor did his inſpection content it ſelf in looking to the general performances of duty, but deſcended to an accurate ſurvey of every ones both practice and ability; ſo that this large Society of Scholars appear'd his private Family, he ſcarce leaving any ſingle perſon without ſome mark or other of both his Charity and Care, relieving the neceſſitous in their ſeveral wants of Money, and of Books, ſhaming the vicious to Sobriety, incouraging the ingenuous to Diligence, and finding ſtratagems to enſnare the idle to a love of Study. But above all he endeavoured to prepare his charge for the reception of the impending Perſecution; that they might adorn their Profeſſion, and not at the ſame time ſuffer for a Cauſe of Righteouſneſs, and as Evil-doers.

To this End he both admitted and ſolemnly invited all ſober perſons to his familiarity and converſe; and beſide that, receiv'd them to his Weekly private Office of Faſting and Humiliation.

But now the long-expected Ruine breaking in with its full weight and torrent, the *Viſitors* chaf'd with their former diſappointments and delays, coming with Hunters ſtomachs, and deſign to boot, for to ſeize firſt and then devour the prey, by a new method of judicature being to kill and then take poſſeſſion; the Excellent Doctor became involv'd in the general Calamity. And being conven'd before the pretended Viſitors, he was examined by them, whether he would ſubmit to the Viſitation, or own the Power of the Parliament therein? as alſo if he were not one of the Delegates of the Univerſity, and helpt to frame and paſs thoſe reaſons preſented in Convocation *June* 1. againſt the power of the Parliament to Viſit? Laſtly, whether he as Sub-dean of *Chriſt-Church* had publiſht the Orders ſent by the Committee of Lords and Commons, to remove ſeveral Delinquents of that Society, according to the ſaid Orders? To which though he returned no other reply, than *that he did not conceive himſelf obliged to anſwer thoſe queſtions thus propos'd to him.* (And ſurely there lay ſuch exceptions againſt the frame of thoſe Interrogatories, as could not well admit of any other reply; for inſtance, beſides thoſe Uſurpers having no juriſdiction over him to oblige him to make any anſwer, there was the manifeſt iniquity of requiring an unaccus'd perſon to accuſe himſelf, a thing by that party with all vehemence declamed againſt in the Oath *ex Officio*; and farther, there was no ſuch thing in the World as the matter of their ſecond queſtion, I mean, Reaſons preſented in Convocation *June* 1. againſt the Power of the Parliament to Viſit. The immortal, and never to be confuted reaſons which were that day paſt, were againſt the taking of the Covenant and negative Oath, and own'd that and no other Title.) But notwithſtanding his unoffenſive and cautious return to thoſe ill laid demands, immediately, it being the *Munday* before *Faſter*, an accuſation was ſent up to the Committee at *London*, and the ſame Week a Vote paſſed, and returned hither, that Doctor *Hammond* with ſome others, particularly Doctor *Sheldon* then Warden of *All Souls*, late Lord Arch-Biſhop of *Canterbury*, ſhould be removed from their places for their high contempt of the Authority of Parliament. And the fury of theſe godly men who call'd themſelves Viſitors was ſuch, that the Vigils of an *Eaſter*, and the Charity which that holy ſeaſon would invite to, could not put off the Execution of that Sentence, which they had with ſo much haſt and induſtry obtain'd. And therefore the next moment after the Order was come unto their hands, they ſolemnly marcht to *Chriſt-Church*-Hall attended with their Janizaries, a guard of Muſquetiers (a fit Equippage for thoſe Divines who had blown the Trumpet for War, and were the Preachers of an *Armed* Goſpel) and ſending their Mandatory with a Muſquetier to Doctor *Hammond*'s Lodging, commanded him to appear before them, where the whole buſineſs was, to hear himſelf declar'd no Orator of the Univerſity, nor Canon of *Chriſt-Church*; unleſs perhaps the malice of theſe good men had one farther ſtratagem, to rob him of the next days Sacrament, and diſcompoſe him from that ſerenity of mind, which was neceſſary for the due partaking of the Holy Euchariſt; which yet was a fond attempt, it being a much eaſier thing for his implacable Enemies, to ruine than provoke him; and plunder his Eſtate, than take away his conſtancy and patience. But whereas the then uſual Law of Expulſion was immediately to baniſh into the wide World by

beat

beat of Drum, injoining to quit the Town within twenty four hours upon pain of being taken and uſed as Spies, and not to allow the unhappy Exiles time for the diſpoſe either of their private affairs or ſtating the accounts of their reſpective Colleges or Pupils; the Reverend Doctor *Sheldon* late Lord Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, and Doctor *Hammond*, were ſubmitted to a contrary fate, and by an Order from a Committee of Parliament were reſtrained and voted to be Priſoners in that place, from which all elſe were ſo ſeverely driven. But ſuch was the authority and command of Exemplary Vertue, that the perſon deſign'd to ſucceed in the Canonry of *Chriſt-Church*, though he had accepted of the place at *London*, and done his Exerciſe for it at *Oxford*, acting as publick *Orator* in flattering there the then-pretending Chancellor, yet had not Courage to purſue his undertaking, but voluntarily relinquiſhed that infamous Robbery, and adhered to a leſs ſcandalous one in the Country. And then the Officer who was commanded to take Doctor *Sheldon* and *him* into Cuſtody upon their deſign'd removal, Colonel *Evelin*, then Governour of *Wallingford*-Caſtle, (though a man of as oppoſite Principles to Church and Church-men as any of the adverſe Party) wholly declin'd the employment, ſolemnly proteſting that if they came to him, they ſhould be entertained as Friends, and not as Priſoners.

But theſe remorſes prov'd but of little effect; the Prebend of *Chriſt-Church* being ſuddenly ſupply'd by a ſecond choice, and *Oxford* it ſelf being continued the place of their Confinement: Where accordingly the good Doctor remained, though he were demanded by his Majeſty to attend Him in the Iſle of *Wight* at the Treaty there, which then was again re-inforced. The pretence upon which both *he* and the Reverend Doctor *Sheldon* were refuſed, was that they were Priſoners; and probably the gaining that was the cauſe why they were ſo. But notwithſtanding the denial of a perſonal Attendance, the Excellent *Prince* requir'd that aſſiſtance which might conſiſt with abſence, and at this time ſent for a Copy of that *Sermon* which almoſt a year before He had heard preach'd in that place. The which Sermon his Majeſty, and thereby the publick, receiv'd with the acceſſion of ſeveral others delivered upon various Occaſions.

Doctor *Hammond* having continued about ten Weeks in his reſtraint in *Oxford*, where he begun to actuate his deſign of writing *Annotations* on the *New Teſtament* (nor was it diſproportionate that thoſe Sacred Volums, a great part of which was wrote in Bonds, ſhould be firſt commented upon by the very parallel ſuffering, and that the work it ſelf ſhould be ſo dedicated, and the Expoſitor fitted for his task by being made like the Authors) by the interpoſition of his Brother in Law, Sir *John Temple*, he had Licence granted to be removed to a more acceptable Confinement, to *Clapham* in *Bedfordſhire*, the Houſe in which his worthy Friend Sir *Philip Warwick* lived. Where ſoon after his arrival, that horrid mockery of Juſtice, the Rape and Violence of all that's Sacred, made more abominable by pretending to Right and Piety, the *Trial* of the *King*, drew on; and he being in no other capacity to interpoſe than by writing, drew up an *Addreſs* to the General and Council of Officers, and tranſmitted it to them. And when that unexampled VILLANY found this Excuſe, that it was ſuch as could be pleaded for, and men in cool Blood would dare to own and juſtifie, he affix'd his Reply to the ſuggeſtions of *Aſcham* and *Goodwin*. And now although he indulg'd to his juſt and almoſt-infinite Griefs, which were tranſported to the utmoſt bounds of ſober Paſſion, the affectionate perſonal reſpect he bore unto that glorious Victime, being added to the deteſtation due unto the guilt it ſelf, of which no man was more ſenſible than he who had ſtrange antipathies to all ſin, he gave not up himſelf to an unactive dull amazement; but with the redoubled uſe of Faſting, Tears and ſolemn Prayer, he reſum'd his wonted Studies; and beſides his fitting the *Annotations* for the Preſs, and his little Tract of the *Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtian Religion*, he now compoſed his Latine one againſt *Blondel* in the behalf of *Epiſcopacy*. As to the firſt of which, (his *Annotations*,) the manner of its birth and growth was thus.

Having written in Latine two large Volumes in *Quarto* of the way of interpreting the New Teſtament, with reference to the cuſtoms of the Jews and of the firſt Hereticks in the Chriſtian Church, and of the Heathens, eſpecially in the Grecian Games, and above all the importance of the *Helleniſtical* Dialect, into which he had made the exacteſt ſearch (by which means in a manner he happened to take in all the difficulties of that Sacred Book:) he began to conſider that it might be more uſeful to the Engliſh Reader, who was to be his immediate Care, to write in our vulgar Language, and ſet every Obſervation in its natural order, according to the guidance of the Text. And having ſome years before collated ſeveral Greek Copies of the New Teſtament, obſerv'd the variation of our Engliſh from the Original, and made an entire Tranſlation of the whole for his private uſe; being thus prepar'd, he caſt his work into that form in which it now appears. The reaſons of it need not to be here inſerted, being ſet down by his own Pen in his Preface to his *Annotations*.

The Tractate againſt *Blondel* grew to its laſt form and conſtitution by not unlike degrees, having a very different occaſion from the laſt performance. The immediate antecedent cauſe is own'd, and long ago preſented to the World in that writing; the more remote Original is as follows. The late moſt Learned *Primate* of *Armagh* having receiv'd from *Dav. Blondel* a Letter of Exception againſt his Edition of *Ignatius*, he communicated it to Doctor *Hammond*, deſiring his ſenſe of ſeveral paſſages therein contained, relating to the *Valentinian Hereſie*, *Epiſcopal* and *Chorepiſcopal* power, and ſome emergent difficulties concerning them, from the Canons of ſeveral ancient Eaſtern Councils. To all this the Doctor wrote a peculiar anſwer, promiſing a fuller account if it would be uſeful. Upon the receipt whereof the *Archbiſhop* being highly ſatisfied, return'd his thanks, and laid hold of the Promiſe: which being accordingly diſcharg'd, became the proviſion (and gave materials) to a great part of the Diſſertations. The *Primate*'s Letter ran in theſe words.

I Have read with great delight and content your accurate Anſwer to the Objections made againſt the credit of Ignatius *his Epiſtles, for which I do moſt heartily thank you, and am moved thereby farther to intreat you, to publiſh to the World in Latine what you have already written in Engliſh againſt this Objector, and that other, who for your pains hath rudely requited you with the baſe appellation of* Nebulo *for the aſſertion of Epiſcopacy: to the end it may no longer be credited abroad, that theſe two have beaten down this Calling, that the defence thereof is now deſerted by all men, as by* Lud. Cappellus *is intimated in his Theſis of* Church-government, *at* Sedan *lately publiſhed, which I leave unto your ſerious Conſideration, and all your Godly labours to the bleſſing of our good God, in whom I evermore reſt,*

Rygate *in* Surrey,
Jul. 21. 1649.

Your very loving Friend
and Brother,

Ja. Armachanus.

Now in this requeſt the *Archbiſhop* was ſo concern'd, that he re-inforc'd it by another Letter of *Aug.* 30. and congratulated the performance by a third of *Jan.* 14. Both which, though very worthy to ſee the publick light, are yet forborn, as ſeveral of the like kind from the Reverend Fathers the *Biſhops* of this and our Siſter Churches, as alſo from the moſt eminent for Piety and Learning of our own and the Neighbouring Nations: which courſe is taken not only in accordance to the deſires and ſentiments of the Excellent Doctor, who hated every thing that look'd like Oſtentation; but likewiſe to avoid the very unpleaſing choice, either to take the trouble of recounting all the *Doctors* Correſpondencies, or bear the envy of omitting ſome.

But to return to the preſent task, and that of the good *Doctor*, which now was to perfect his Commentaries on the New Teſtament, and finiſh the Diſſertations: amidſt which cares he met with another of a more importunate nature, the loſs of his Dear *Mother*, which had this unhappy acceſſion, that in her Sickneſs he could not be permitted, by reaſon of his being concern'd in the *Proclamation* that baniſh'd thoſe that adher'd to the *King* twenty miles from *London*, to viſit her; nor while ſhe pay'd her lateſt debt to Nature, to pay his earlier one of filial homage and attendance.

A few months after, the rigour of that reſtraint with the declining of the Year (a ſeaſon judg'd leſs commodious for Enterpriſe) being taken off, he removed into *Worceſterſhire*, to *Weſtwood*, the Houſe of the eminently-Loyal Sir *John Packington*: where being ſetled, and proceeding in the Edition of thoſe his Labours which he had begun at *Clapham*, his *Majeſty* coming to *Worceſter*, by his Neighbourhood to that place, the good *Doctor*, as he had the ſatisfaction perſonally to attend his *Sovereign*, and the honour to receive a Letter from his own hand of great importance, for the ſatisfaction of his Loyal Subjects concerning his adherence to the eſtabliſhed Religion of the Church of *England*, wherein his Royal Father liv'd a Saint, and died a Martyr: ſo likewiſe had he on the other part the moſt immediate agonies for his defeat; to which was added the Calamity which fell upon the Family where he dwelt, from the Perſecution and danger of the generous Maſter of it. But it pleaſed God to give an iſſue out of both thoſe difficulties, eſpecially in the miraculous deliverance of his Sacred Majeſty; a diſpenſation of ſo ſignal an importance, that he allow'd it a ſolemn recognition in his conſtant offices during his whole life, receiving that unuſual interpoſition of Providence as a pledge from Heaven of an arrier of mercies, to uſe his own words, *That God, who had thus powerfully reſcued him from*

from Egypt, *would not ſuffer him to periſh in the Wilderneſs; but though his paſſage be through the Red Sea, he would at laſt bring him into* Canaan; *that he ſhould come out of his tribulations as Gold out of the fire, purified, but not conſumed.*

But notwithſtanding theſe reflections, bottom'd upon Piety and reliance upon Heaven, the preſent ſtate of things had a quite different proſpect in common Eyes; and the generality of men thinking their Religion as troubleſome a burthen as their Loyalty, with the ſame prudence by which they chang'd their mild and gracious *Soveraign* for a bloody *TYRANT*, began to ſeek a pompous and imperious Church abroad, inſtead of a pious and afflicted one at home. To which Event the *Roman* Miſſionaries gave their liberal contribution, affording their prepoſterous Charity to make them Proſelytes who had no mind to be Confeſſors or Martyrs. Hereupon the *Doctor* thought it highly ſeaſonable to write his Tract of *Schiſm*, and oppoſe it to that moſt popular topick whereby they amus'd and charm'd their fond Diſciples. And whereas the love of Novelty prevail'd in ſeveral other inſtances, as in controuling the *uſe and authority of the Scripture*, defending *inceſtuous Marriages*, *Polygamy*, *Divorce*, the *anabaptizing of Infants*, the *ſchiſmatical Ordination of Miniſters by mere Presbyters*, and *diſuſe of the Feſtivals of the Church*; he apply'd his Antidotes to each: by which means he made himſelf the common mark of oppoſition to all parties. For (beſides the aſſaults from a whole Claſſis of Antagoniſts which the *Diſſertations* had engag'd againſt him, and to which he was preparing his defence) upon the *Romaniſts* part he was charg'd by the *Catholick Gentleman* and his Armour-Bearer *S. W.* on the Presbyterian Account by M^r *Cawdry* and M^r *Jeanes*; and in the behalf of the Independents and Anabaptiſts by M^r *Owen* and M^r *Tombs*: not to mention ſeveral others that ſought themſelves a name by being his Gainſayers, but fail'd of their purpoſe, by bringing only ſpight and paſſion into the quarrel, and ſo were to be anſwered only by pity and ſilence.

Nor did he only ſtand and keep at Bay this multiply'd conteſt; but (as if this had not been task enough) beſides the intercurrent offices of life, his reception of Viſits, anſwering of Letters, his conſtant Preaching and Catechiſing, he found leiſure to write his Tract of *Fundamentals*, his *Paræneſis*, his *Review of the Annotations*; and amidſt all, to be in debt to his importunate Antagoniſts for nothing but their Railing, leaving that the only thing unanſwered. Nay more than ſo, brought ſeveral of them even under their own hands to recognize their ſenſe of their undue procedure us'd by them unto him: which their acknowledgments yet remain, and are producible upon occaſion.

And would to God he had met no other oppoſition; for in the entrance on theſe conflicts that ſtrength of Body which before had faithfully attended his indefatigable Mind began to fail him, and thoſe four torments of diſeaſe, which ſingle have been judg'd a competent tryal of humane ſufferance, ſome years before his death, the *Stone*, and near his end, the *Gout*, the *Colick*, and the *Cramp*, (the laſt of which was to him as tyrannous as any of the former) became in a manner the conſtant exerciſe of his Chriſtian Fortitude and Patience; affording him from this time to the laſt period of his life very rare and ſhort intervals of vigorous Health.

But among all his Labours, although Polemick Diſcourſes were otherwiſe moſt uneaſy, as engaging to converſe with men in Paſſion, a thing he naturally abhorr'd, his *Paræneſis*, a perſwaſive and practical Tract (which now he wrote, and which upon that account was exceeding agreeable to his deſires) coſt him moſt throes and pangs of Birth, as having been penn'd firſt in Tears, and then in Ink. For however with great ſerenity he entertain'd all other accidents, having habituated himſelf to his beloved doctrine of *ſubmitting not to the Will of God alone, but to his Wiſdome, both which* he was us'd to ſay *were perfectly one thing in that bleſt Agent* (and accordingly in the moſt diſmal appearance of Event made this conſtant Motto גם זו לטובה *Even this for good*;) yet in this inſtance the tenderneſs of his Soul ſeem'd to have melted his reſolution: the occaſion of that Treatiſe being the Interdict of *Jan.* 1655. which diſabled the Loyal ſuffering Clergy from doing any Miniſterial act, which he reſented with the higheſt paſſion, not only upon the general account of God's more immediate diſpleaſure to the Nation legible therein, but (what he had much leſs reaſon to do) in reference to his own particular, he looking on this diſpenſation of Providence as God's pronouncing him unworthy to do him Service, *the reproaching* (to uſe his own words) *his former unprofitableneſs by caſting him out as ſtraw to the dunghill.* Nor ſhould any conſideration that terminated on himſelf have perſwaded him at all to regard that tyrannous injunction, had not Charity to the Family where he was, made him content to admit of an Expedient that ſecured all real duties, whilſt he for ſome ſhort time forbore that attendance on the Altar which was the very joy of his life.

And now, though his Phyſicians had earneſtly forbidden his accuſtomed Faſtings, and his own weakneſſes gave forcible ſuffrages to their advice; yet he reſumed his rigours,

eſteeming this calamity ſuch a one as admitted no exception, which ſhould not be outliv'd, but that it became men to be Martyrs too, and deprecate even in death.

While he thus earneſtly implored the aids of Heaven, and exhorted unto preſent Duty, he omitted not a third Expedient, the ſecuring a Succeſſion to the Church, thereby to preſerve its future being. And this he did not only in reference to the *ſuperiour* order of *Epiſcopacy*, which it has pleaſed God now to ſecure by another more gracious method of his favour, and even miraculous goodneſs; but alſo in the *inferiour attendance on the Altar:* the later of which as it was an Enterpriſe ſuiting well with his heroick Mind, ſo was it no way anſwering his narrow Fortunes. The thing in his deſign was this; Whereas the ancient ſtock of Clergy-men were by this Edict in a manner rendered uſeleſs, and the Church was at beſt like the *Roman* State in its firſt beginning, *res unius ætatis populus Virorum*, a Nation of ancient perſons haſting to their Graves, who muſt in a few years be waſted; he projected by Penſions unto hopeful perſons in either Univerſity, to maintain a Seminary of Youth inſtituted in Piety and Learning upon the ſober Principles and old eſtabliſhment of the *Anglicane* Church. In which work though the aſſiſtances he preſum'd on fail'd in a great meaſure, yet ſomewhat not inconſiderable in this kind by himſelf and Friends he did atchieve, and kept on foot until his death. In his inſtructions to them whom he employ'd in this affair, he gave in charge *carefully to ſeek out ſuch as were piouſly inclin'd, and to prefer that qualification before unſanctified good parts*; adding this as a certain Maxime, *that Exemplary Vertue muſt reſtore the Church.*

And whereas that black Defeat at *Worceſter*, raiſing the inſolent *Tyrant* here unto that Greatneſs which almoſt outwent the impudence of his hopes, made him to be feared by Foreign Nations almoſt as much as hated by his own, the Loyal Sufferers abroad became ſubjected to the worſt effect of Baniſhment, and even there expell'd and driven from their Flights: ſo paralleling in their Exigencies the moſt immediate objects of that Monſter's Fury. The Excellent Doctor, to whoſe diffuſive Vertue the limits of the Nation were too ſtreight a Circle, thought this a ſeaſon to exert his Charity: accordingly, though this greateſt duty were ſolemnly declared Treaſon, he then continued to ſend over ſeveral Sums for their relief.

Which practice of his, by the ſurpriſe of the perſon intruſted, being diſcovered to the *Tyrant*, he was alarm'd with the expectation of that uſage which was then a certain conſequent of ſuch meritorious acts. But this adventure brought nothing of amazement or diſturbance to the Doctor, his moſt importunate reflection being only this, that he ſeem'd to have gain'd an opportunity of ſaying ſomething very home to that fierce Monſter concerning his foul deeds, and to diſcourſe the appropriate ways remaining to alleviate at leaſt, if not to expiate for them; which he purpoſed within himſelf to preſs to the higheſt advantage: and indeed this was the only iſſue of that ſo threatning accident, God's reſtraining power interpoſing here, and exemplifying upon him what in others he was wont to obſerve, *that they who leaſt conſidered hazard in the doing of their duties fared ſtill beſt.*

And this ſucceſs as it was indeed, and accordingly he frequently acknowledg'd it for, an eminent act of the Divine Providence; ſo we may likewiſe take it as a ſignal teſtimony of the commanding worth the *Doctor* had, which extorted a reverence to his perſon from that worſt of men, and render'd him a Sanctuary, perhaps the only one this Architect of Miſchief ſtood in aw of, and even his Sacrilege preſerv'd inviolate.

Nor did this danger being over, as with others in all likelihood it would have done, perſuade to caution for the future; but with the wonted diligence that formerly he us'd, he immediately proceeded, and chearfully went on in the purſuit of his heroick Charity.

Amidſt theſe diverſions grew up the Labours of this *Heroe*, the iſſues of his Brain, being not only Midwiv'd into the World like natural Births with torment and diſeaſe, but wrote like *Cæſar*'s Commentaries, in Dangers and in War. And now beſides the Replies which the importunities of M^r *Owen*, M^r *Jeanes*, and M^r *Tombs* drew from him, *W. S.* continuing his loud clamors and impudent triumph at his own folly, the good *Doctor* ſuffer'd himſelf to be engag'd on that long Anſwer, which prov'd the laſt of that kind he made, excepting that *ſingle ſheet* put out a few Months before his death, as a *ſpecimen* to what deſperate ſhifts the Patrons of the *Roman* Cauſe were driven: for though ſome of his Friends advis'd him to remit that Divinity Buffoon to be anſwered in his own way by a ſlighter Pen; he by no means would admit of the propoſal, reſolving *it unfit that another ſhould do in his behalf what was indecent for himſelf to do; and though there was no reſpect to be had of* W. S. *yet was the Sacred Cauſe to be manag'd with reverence and awful regard.* While this was in hand, the ſecond *Review of the Annotations* came to light, as alſo the *Expoſition on the Book of Pſalms*, and ſoon after the pacifick diſcourſe of *Gods Grace and Decrees*, ventilated between him and his dear Friend the Reverend and moſt Learned

Doctor

Doctor *Sanderſon*, afterward Lord Biſhop of *Lincoln*, occaſion'd by ſome Letters which had paſſed on that Subject between the ſaid Doctor and the Reverend Doctor *Pierce*. To this immediately ſucceeded the Latine Tract of *Confirmation*, in Anſwer to the Exceptions of M^r *Daillée*, which was then prepar'd for the Preſs, though detain'd much longer upon prudential or rather charitative conſiderations, a reſpect to which was ſtrictly had in all the *Doctor*'s Writings; it being his care not only to publiſh ſober and convincing, but withal ſeaſonable, uſeful Truths.

He was likewiſe enterpriſing a farther *Commentary on the Old Teſtament*, and begun on the Book of *Proverbs*, and finiſhed a third part of it: But the Completion of this and all other the great intendments of the equally Learned, Pious, and indefatigable Author receiv'd here a full period; it pleaſing the Divine Providence to take to himſelf this high Example of all moral and Chriſtian Excellencies, in a ſeaſon when the Church and Nation would leaſt have been depriv'd of his Aids toward the cementing of thoſe breaches which then began to offer at a cloſure.

'Tis eaſily to be preſum'd the Reader will not be diſoblig'd, if we a while divert from this remaining ſadder part of the undertaken Narrative, and entertain him with a Survey of the Perſonal accompliſhments of the Excellent *Doctor*. The particulars whereof would not readily have faln into the thred of Hiſtory, or at leaſt had been disjointed there, and under diſadvantage; but will be made to ſtand in a much fairer light, when repreſented to the view by way of Character and Picture.

And therefore to this proſpect we chearfully invite all eyes in whoſe eſteem Vertue it ſelf is lovely.

Section the Second.

THE Frame of his Body was ſuch as ſuited with the noble uſe to which it was deſign'd, the entertaining a moſt pure and active Soul, but equally to the advantages of Strength and Comelineſs. His *Stature* was of juſt height and all proportionate dimenſions, avoiding the extreams of groſs and meager, advantag'd by a graceful Carriage, at once moſt grave, and yet as much obliging. His *Face* carried dignity and attractives in it, ſcarce ever Clouded with a frown, or ſo much as darkned by reſervedneſs. His *Eye* was quick and ſprightful, his *Complexion* clear and florid, ſo that (eſpecially in his youth) he had the eſteem of a very beauteous perſon; which was leſſen'd only by the colour of his Hair: though if the ſentence of other Ages and Climates be of value, that reaſonably might be vouch'd as an acceſſion to it.

To this outward Structure was join'd that ſtrength of *Conſtitution*, patient of ſevereſt toil and hardſhip; inſomuch that for the moſt part of his life, in the fierceſt extremity of cold, he took no other advantage of a fire, than at the greateſt diſtance that he could to look upon it. As to Diſeaſes (till immoderate Study had wrought a change) he was in a manner only lyable to Feavers, which too a conſtant temperance did in a great meaſure prevent, and ſtill aſſiſted to relieve and cure.

Next to his frame of Body, if we ſurvey his inward Faculties, we ſhall find them juſt unto the promiſes of his outward ſhape. His *Sight* was quick to an unuſual degree; inſomuch that if by chance he ſaw a knot of Men, a Flock of Sheep or Herd of Cattel, being ingag'd in Diſcourſe, and not at all thinking of it, he would involuntarily caſt up their number, which others after long delays could hardly reckon. His *Ear* was accurate and tun'd to his harmonious Soul, ſo that having never learned to ſing by Book or Study, he would exactly perform his part of many things to a *Harpſicon* or *Theorbo*; and frequently did ſo in his more vigorous years after the toil and labour of the day, and before the remaining Studies of the night. His *Elocution* was free and graceful, prepared at once to charm and to command his Audience: and when with Preaching at his Country charge he had in ſome degree loſt the due manage of his Voice, His late *Sacred Majeſty*, by taking notice of the change, became his Maſter of Muſick, and reduc'd him to his ancient decent modulation; a kindneſs which the *Doctor* very gratefully acknowledg'd to his dying day, and reported not only as an inſtance of the meek and tender condeſcenſions of that gracious Prince, but improv'd to perſuade others by ſo great an Example to that moſt Friendly Office of telling perſons of their Faults, without which very commonly (as here it happen'd) men muſt be ſo far from amending their Errours, that 'tis morally impoſſible they ſhould ever know them.

As to his more inferiour Faculties, we muſt allow the firſt place to his *Invention*, his richeſt, altogether unexhauſted treaſure, whoſe flowings were with that full torrent, that for ſeveral years, after his choice of Subject, which generally he had in proſpect beforehand,

beforehand, a little meditation on the *Saturday* Night made up his Sermon: but in the laſt twelve of his Life, finding the recollection of his thoughts diſturb his ſleep, he remitted the particular care of the Compoſition and Method of his future Diſcourſe to the *Sunday* Morning, wherein an hours conſideration fitted him to the office of the day. With the like ſwiftneſs he diſpatch'd his Writings, uſually compoſing faſter than his *Amanuenſis*, though a very dextrous perſon, could eaſily tranſcribe after him. His *Conſiderations of preſent neceſſity concerning Epiſcopacy* were drawn up after ten a Clock at Night in a Friends Chamber, who profeſſes, that ſitting by all the while, he remembers not that he took off Pen from Paper till he had done; and the very next Morning, it being fully approved by the Biſhop of *Salisbury*, he ſent it to the Preſs: to which work he could have no premeditation or ſecond thoughts, he being that very Night after Supper employ'd by the before-mentioned Lord Biſhop of *Salisbury*, after of *Wincheſter*, on that task. So likewiſe he began his Tract of *Scandal* at eleven at Night, and finiſhed it before he went to Bed. Nor was this a peculiar or extraordinary thing with him, but moſt cuſtomary; five ſheets having amidſt his other diverſions been ſundry times his one days work; adding to it ſo much of the Night as he frequently borrowed from ſleep and Supper. And indeed ſuch were his diverſions, ſo many and ſo importunate, that notwithſtanding this incredible eaſe of writing, 'tis hardly imaginable how he could compaſs the tith of what he did. For he that ſhall conſider his laborious way, immerſt in almoſt infinite quotations, to which the turning over Books and conſulting ſeveral Editions was abſolutely needful; his obligation to read not only Claſſick Authors, but the more recent abortions of the Preſs, wherein he proved frequently concerned; his peruſal of the Writings of his Friends and Strangers intended to be publick; his review of his own Works, and correcting them with his own hand ſheet by ſheet as they came forth, which he did to all his later Tracts; his reception of Viſits, whether of Civility, or for reſolution of Conſcience, or information in points of difficulty, which were numerous, and great devourers of his time; his agency for men of quality, providing them School-Maſters for their Children, and Chaplains in their Houſes, in which affair he had ſet up a kind of Office of Addreſs; his general correſpondencies by Letter, whereof ſome coſt him ten, others twenty, thirty, forty, nay ſixty ſheets of Paper, and ever took up two days of the Week entirely to themſelves; the time exhauſted by his ſickneſſes, which in the later years of his life gave him but ſhort and ſeldom truce, and always made it neceſſary for him not to ſtir from his Chair, or ſo much as read a Letter for two hours after every Meal, failance wherein being certainly reveng'd by a fit of the Gout; his not only conſtant preaching and inſtructing the Family where he was, and his viſiting the ſick both there and in the Neighbourhood, but amidſt all, his ſure returns of Prayer, ſo frequent and ſo conſtant as certainly to challenge to themſelves a great portion of the day: he, I ſay, that ſhall compute and ſum up this, the particulars whereof are nakedly ſet down without any ſtraining of the truth or flouriſh of expreſſion, muſt be to ſeek what a point of vacant time remain'd yet undiſpoſed; I do not ſay to write Books, but even to breathe and reſt a little in.

After a ſerious reflexion on the premiſſes, and full debate thereon, the account given by that excellent perſon who had the happineſs of being the neareſt and moſt conſtant witneſs of the before-recited ſeverals, ſeems the beſt and chiefly ſatisfactory that poſſibly can be made; that he gain'd time for his writing Books by the time he ſpent in Prayer, whileſt (a more than ordinary aſſiſtance attending his Devotions) his Cloſet prov'd his Library, and he ſtudied moſt upon his Knees.

As to his *Memory*, 'twas ſerviceable, but not officious; faithful to things and buſineſs, but unwillingly retaining the contexture and punctualities of words: which defect he frequently lamented, it being harder with him to get one Sermon by heart than to Pen twenty.

His way of *Speech* and faculty of communicating notions was ſufficiently happy, having only this beſt kind of defect, exuberance and ſurpluſage of plenty, the tide and torrent of his matter being not eaſily confined by periods; whereby his ſtile, though round and comprehenſive, was incumbred ſometimes by *Parentheſes*, and became difficult to vulgar underſtandings: but by the uſe of writing, and his deſire to accommodate himſelf to all Capacities, he in his later years had maſter'd that defect, which was ſo ſlight, that notwithſtanding it, he deſerved from (the moſt accurate Judge and greateſt Maſter of Engliſh Rhetorick which this Age hath given) His late Sacred *Majeſty* this Character and Teſtimony, *That he was the moſt natural Orator he ever heard.*

His *Judgment*, as in it ſelf the higheſt Faculty, ſo was it the moſt eminent among his natural endowments: for though the finding out the ſimilitudes of different things, wherein the Phancy is converſant, is uſually a Bar to the diſcerning the diſparities of ſimilar appearances, which is the buſineſs of Diſcretion, and that ſtore of notions which

is

is laid up in Memory assists rather Confusion than Choice, upon which grounds the greatest Clerks are frequently not the wisest men; He had to his sufficient *Memory* and incomparable *Invention*, a clear discerning *Judgment*; and that not only in Scholastical affairs and points of Learning, which the arguings, and besides them the designment of his Writings manifest beyond dispute, but in the concerns of publick nature both of Church and State, wherein his gues was usually as near to Prophecy as any mans; as also in the little mysteries of private manage, by which upon occasion he has unravell'd the studied cheats of great Artificers in that liberal Science, wherein particularly he vindicated a person of Honour for whom he was intrusted, and assisted frequently his Friends in their domestick intercurrent difficulties.

As to acquir'd habits and abilities in *Learning*, his Writings having given the World sufficient account of them, there remains only to observe, that the range and compass of his knowledge fill'd the whole Circle of the Arts, and reach'd those severals which single do exact an entire man unto themselves, and full Age. To be accurate in the *Grammar* and Idioms of the Tongues, and then as a *Rhetorician* to make all their graces serve his Eloquence; to have traverst *ancient*, and yet be no stranger in *modern* Writers; to be studied in *Philosophy*, and familiarly vers'd in all the politer *Classick Authors*; to be learn'd in *School-divinity*, and a Master in *Church-Antiquity*, perfect and ready in the sence of *Fathers*, *Councils*, *Ecclesiastical Historians* and *Liturgicks*; to have devour'd so much and yet digested it, is a rarity in nature and in diligence which has but few Examples.

But after all we must take leave to say, and do it upon sober recollection, that the *Doctor*'s Learning was the least thing in him; the *Scholar* was here less eminent than the *Christian*: His Speculative knowledge, that gave light to the most dark and difficult Proposals, became Eclipsed by the more dazeling lustre of his Practick. In the Catalogue of his Vertues, his *Chastity* and *Temperance* may claim the earliest place, as being the Sacrists to the rest, and in him were therefore only not the greatest of his Excellencies, because every thing else was so.

And first, his *chast* thoughts, words and carriage so disciplin'd his lower faculties, as not only restrain'd through all the heats of Youth, made more than usually importunate by the full vigour of a high and sanguine Constitution, (which his escape he gratefully referr'd unto the only mercy of Almighty God) but gave a detestation of all those verbal follies, that have not only the allowance of being harmless mirth, but the repute of Wit and gaiety of humour: so that the scurrilous jest could sooner obtain his Tears in penance for it, than the approbation of a smile; and all approaches to this sin he look'd upon not only with an utter disallowance in his Will, but a kind of natural abhorrence and antipathy in his lower outward faculties.

In his first remove to *Pensehurst* he was perswaded by his Friends that the Matrimonial state was needful to the bearing off those Houshold cares and other intercurrent troubles which his condition then brought with it; and on this ground he gave some Ear to their advices: which he did then more readily, for that there was a person represented to him, of whose Vertue as well as other more-usually-desired accomplishments he had been long before well satisfied. But being hindred several times by little unexpected accidents, he finally laid down all his pretensions upon a ground of perfect self-denial; being inform'd that one of a fairer Fortune and higher quality than his was, or else was like to be, and consequently one who in common account would prove the better match, had kindness for her. Having thus resolv'd, the Charity of his Mother, who undertook the manage of his Family, became a seasonable assistant and expedient in this single state; till after several years her Age making those cares too great a burthen for her shoulders, he again was induc'd to resume his thoughts of Marriage. But the National disturbances (that afterwards brake out in War and Ruine) appearing then in ferment, he was again diverted by recollecting the Apostles advice, 1 *Cor.* 7. 26. enforc'd upon his thoughts by the reading of Saint *Jerom*'s Epistle to *Agereuchia*, where after glorious Elogies of Marriage, the Father concluded in an earnest dehortation from it, upon a representation of a like face of things, the *Goths* then breaking into *Italy*, as they before had done into the other near parts of the *Roman* Empire, and filling all with Slaughter, Cruelty and Ruine. Upon which prospect the good *Doctor* casting a serious Eye, and with prophetick sorrows and misgivings fearing a parallel in this our Nation, the second time deposited his conjugal intendments, and thenceforth courted and espoused (what he preserv'd inviolate) unto his death the more eminent perfection of spotless Virgin Chastity.

His *Appetite* was good, but the restraint of it was very eminent and extraordinary; for his Diet was of the plainest meats, and commonly not only his Dishes, but the parts of them were such as most others would refuse. Sauces he scarce ever tasted of, but often

often expreſs'd it his wonder *how rational Creatures ſhould eat for any thing but health, ſince he that did eat or drink that which might cauſe a fit of the Stone or Gout, though a year after, therein unman'd himſelf, and acted as a beaſt.* So that his ſelf-denials were quite contrary to the uſual ones; for conſidering the time loſt in Eating, and the vacancy ſucceeding it, his meals were the greateſt preſſure, and his Faſting-day the moſt ſenſual part of his Week.

In the time of his full and more vigorous health he ſeldom did eat or drink more than once in twenty four hours, and ſome Fruit towards night; and two dayes in every Week, and in *Lent* and *Ember-week* three dayes, he eat but once in thirty ſix. Nor did he ever with ſo much regret ſubmit unto any preſcript, as when his Phyſicians, after his great Feaver that he had in *Oxford*, requir'd him to eat Suppers. Which ſeverity of injunction he ſoon ſhook off, and returned to his beloved abſtinence, until renew'd infirmities brought him back unto the penance of more indulgence to himſelf.

As he had the greateſt indifference to what he eat, ſo had he the greateſt obſervation too, eſpecially when it came to be made point of diet and preſcription; for in this caſe he was moſt exact, never taſting of any prohibited meats, though ſome of them had before the advantage of being cuſtomary towards their ſeeming neceſſary. And herein his Palate was ſo tractable and ſubdued to the dictates of an higher choice, that he really thought no meat pleaſant, but in proportion to its wholeſomeneſs: even his beloved Apples he would oft ſay he would totally abandon, aſſoon as they ſhould appear to be no more than barely innocent, and not of uſe. And if by chance or inadvertency he had at any time taſted of an interdicted Diſh, as ſoon as he perceived it, he diſcovered a diſlike both with himſelf and what he had been ſurpriz'd with.

The *Carving* at the Table he always made his Province, which he ſaid he did as a diverſion to keep him from eating over-much: but certainly that practice had another more immediate cauſe, a natural diſtributiveneſs of humour, and a deſire to be employed in the relief of every kind of want of every perſon. The report, and much more the ſight, of a luxurious feeder, would turn his Stomach, ſo that he was in more danger to be ſick with other's Surfeits than his own; Charity ſeeming a part of his Complexion, while he perform'd a natural ſpontaneous penance for his Neighbours Vice, as well as a deliberate one in ſorrowing for it.

His *temperance in Sleep* reſembled that of his Meats, Midnight being the uſual time of his going to reſt, and four or five, and very rarely ſix, the hour of riſing. There was ſcarce any thing he reſented ſo much in his infirmities and multiplied Diſeaſes as their having abridg'd him of his Night-ſtudies, profeſſing thereby he loſt *not only his greateſt pleaſure, but higheſt advantage in reference to buſineſs.* And in his later time of weakneſs, when to take benefit of a gentle breathing ſweat, which uſually came in the Morning, he had been engag'd by his Phyſician to continue in Bed till it was over; and upon complaint of coſtiveneſs he was on the other ſide directed to riſe ſomewhat early in the Morning; this later injunction he look'd upon as a mere reſcue and deliverance, often mentioning it with thanks, as if it had been an eminent favour done him.

His diſpoſal of himſelf in the other parts of time was to perpetual *induſtry and diligence:* he not only avoided, but bore a perfect hate, and ſeem'd to have a forcible antipathy to Idleneſs, and ſcarcely recommended any thing in his advices with that concern and vigour, as *to be furniſh'd always with ſomewhat to do.* This he propos'd as the beſt expedient both for innocence and pleaſure, aſſuring that *no burthen is more heavy or temptation more dangerous, than to have time lye on ones hand; the idle man's brain being not only* (as he worded it) *the Devils ſhop, but his kingdom too, a model of and an appendage unto hell, a place given up to torment and to miſchief.* Beſides thoſe Portions of time which the neceſſities of nature and of civil life extorted from him, there was not a minute of the day which he left vacant. When he walked abroad, which he did not ſo much to recreate himſelf, as to obey the Preſcripts of his Phyſician, he never fail'd to take a Book with him, and read all the while: And in his Chamber alſo he had one lay conſtantly open, out of which he read while he was dreſſing and undreſſing; by which one piece of Huſbandry in ſhort ſpace he diſpatch'd ſeveral conſiderable Volumes.

His way was ſtill to caſt into Paper all his Obſervations, and direct them to his preſent purpoſes; wherein he had an incredible dexterity, ſcarce ever reading any thing which he did not make ſubſervient in one kind or other. He was us'd to ſay, *he could not abide to talk with himſelf*, and therefore was ſo diligently provided of that which he call'd *better Company.* In his Sickneſſes, if they were not ſo violent to make the recollection of thoughts impoſſible, he never intermitted ſtudy, but rather re-inforc'd it then as the moſt appropriate revulſive and diverſion of pain. The *Gout* by its moſt frequent and importunate returns exceeded his other maladies; in which although the firſt moſt furious aſſaults were ſure to beat him from his ſtudy, and for a time confine him to his Bed,

Bed, yet as ſoon as he had recovered his Chair, he reſum'd his Pen too, and ply'd it as hard as though he had ail'd nothing.

Next to downright Idleneſs he diſlik'd *ſlow and dilatory undertakings*, thinking it a great folly to ſpend that time in gazing upon buſineſs which ſhould have ſerved for the doing of it. In his own practice he never conſider'd longer than till he could diſcern whether the thing propoſed was fit or not: when that was ſeen, he immediately ſet to work. When he had perfected one buſineſs, he could not endure to have his thoughts lye fallow, but was preſently conſulting what next to ſet about.

But when we reckon up and audit the expences of the *Doctor*'s Time, we cannot paſs his conſtant tribute of it paid by him to Heaven in the offices of *Prayer*; which took up ſo liberal proportions of each day unto it's ſelf for the ten laſt years of his life, and probably the preceeding. Beſides occaſional and ſupernumerary addreſſes, his certain perpetual returns exceeded *David*'s ſeven times a day. Aſſoon as he was ready (which was uſually early) he prayed in his Chamber with his Servant, in a peculiar form compoſed for that purpoſe. After this he retired to his own more ſecret Devotions in his Cloſet. Betwixt ten and eleven in the Morning he had a ſolemn interceſſion in reference to the National Calamities: to this after a little diſtance ſucceeded the Morning Office of the Church, which he particularly deſired to perform in his own perſon, and would by no means accept the eaſe of having it read by any other. In the Afternoon he had another hour of private Prayer which on Sundays he enlarg'd, and ſo religiouſly obſerved, that if any neceſſary buſineſs or Charity had diverted him at the uſual time, he repair'd his Soul at the coſt of his Body, and, notwithſtanding the injunctions of his Phyſicians, which in other caſes he was careful to obey, ſpent the Supper-time therein. About five of the Clock the ſolemn private Prayers for the Nation and the Evening Service of the Church return'd. At Bed-time his private Prayers cloſed the Day: and after all even the Night was not without its Office, the LI *Pſalm* being his deſign'd midnight entertainment.

In his Prayers, as his Attention was fixt and ſteddy, ſo was it inflam'd with paſſionate fervours, inſomuch that very frequently his tranſport threw him proſtrate on the Earth; his tears alſo would interrupt his words: the latter happening not only upon the pungent exigencies of preſent or impending Judgments, but in the common Service of the Church; which, notwithſtanding his concealments, being taken notice of by a perſon of good ſufficiency, once a Member of his Houſe in *Oxford*, that became of late Years a Proſelyte to the new extemporary way, he, among his other Topicks whereby he thought to diſparage ſet Forms, us'd in Diſcourſe to urge the heartleſs coldneſs of them, and to adorn his triumph, would make it his ſolemn wonder how a perſon of ſo good parts as Doctor *Hammond* was certainly Maſter of, could find motive for his tears in the confeſſion in the beginning of the Liturgy. So much does Paſſion and miſguided Zeal tranſport the moſt ſenſible, that this man, otherwiſe ſagacious enough, never conſider'd how ill an inſtance he had made; which ſhew'd 'twas the coldneſs of the Votary, and not the Prayer, that was in fault, when ever fervour was deficient at the publick Office of the Church.

The *Charity* and *extent of his Prayers* was as exuberant as the zeal and fervour: he thought it very unreaſonable that our Interceſſions ſhould not be as univerſal as our Saviours Redemption was; and would complain of that thrift and narrowneſs of mind to which we are ſo prone, confining our Care either to our ſelves and relatives, or at moſt to thoſe little angles of the World that moſt immediately concern'd us, and which on due account bear very low proportions to the whole. There was no emergent diſtreſs, however remote, but it inlarg'd his Litany; every Years Harveſt and new birth of miſchiefs, which for ſeveral ones paſt conſtantly fell on the Orthodox and Loyal Party in the Nation, remov'd it ſelf from the ſanguinary Edicts of the Tyrant, to be tranſcrib'd and expiated by his pathetical Office of Devotion. In which Calender and Rubrick the *thirtieth* of *January* was ſure to have a very ſolemn place, and a peculiar Service prepar'd for it.

Nor did he only take to heart general National concernments, but even the more private Exigencies of the ſick and weak had a ſtaple intereſt in his Prayers. Among all which none had ſo liberal a part as they that merited them leaſt, yet wanted them moſt; his and (what was uſually the ſame thing) the Churches and God's Enemies. He never thought he had aſſur'd his forgiveneſs of injuries, unleſs he returned good for them; and though other opportunities of this beſt kind of retaliation might fail him, that of his interceſſions never did.

Three perſons there were who above all men by unworthy malice and impotent virulence had highly diſobliged him; but he in recompence of their guilt had a peculiar daily Prayer purpoſely in their behalf: and though in the openneſs of his Converſation

with his moſt intimate acquaintance he confeſt thus much, yet he never nam'd the perſons, though probably that was the only thing which he conceal'd; it being his method to withhold nothing, eſpecially of confidence or privacy, from one he own'd as Friend.

And having mentioned the name of *Friend*, however incidentally, we muſt not leave it without homage; Friendſhip being the next ſacred thing unto Religion in the apprehenſions of our Excellent *Doctor*, a Vertue of which he was a paſſionate Lover, and with which he ever ſeem'd to have contracted Friendſhip. The union of Minds thereby produced he judg'd the utmoſt point of humane Happineſs, the very beſt production that Nature has in ſtore, or grows from Earth. So that with compaſſion he reflected on their ignorance who were ſtrangers to it, ſaying that *ſuch muſt needs lead a pitiful inſipid herb-John-like life.*

Upon this ground he us'd with all induſtrious art to recommend and propagate *Friendſhip* unto others; and where he ſaw ſeveral perſons that he judg'd capable of being made acquainted to mutual advantage, he would contrive that League; and where himſelf had kindneſs unto any ſo allied, he would ſtill enjoin them to be kinder to each other than to him; beſides, he ſtill labour'd to make all his Friends endeared to each of them; reſolving it to be an Errour bottomed on the common narrowneſs of Soul, which repreſented Amity like ſenſual love, to admit no Rivals, confin'd unto two perſons.

When he ever happen'd to ſee or be in Company with ſuch as had an intimate and hearty kindneſs for each other, he would be much tranſported in the contemplation of it, and where it was ſeaſonable, would openly acknowledge that his ſatisfaction.

In the liſt and number of his Friends there chanced to be three perſons, who having in their youth contracted a ſtrict intimacy, had undertaken the ſame profeſſion; and accordingly had the ſame common ſtudies and deſignments, and with theſe the opportunity through the late Troubles to live in view of each other: whom for that reaſon he was us'd with an obliging envy to pronounce *the moſt happy men the Nation had.*

Accordingly he *profeſt that* for his particular *he had no ſuch way of enjoying any thing as by reflection from the perſon whom he loved: ſo that his friends being happy was the readieſt way to make him ſo.* Therefore when one eminently near to him in that relation was careleſs of health, his moſt preſſing argument was his complaint of unkindneſs to him. And this way of meaſuring felicities was ſo natural to him, that it would occur even in the moſt trivial inſtances: when there has been any thing at the Table peculiarly wholſome in relation to his infirmities, if his Friend, who was in a like weak condition, forbare to eat of it in civility to him, he would with vehemence of grief reſent it as his ſingular unhappineſs after ſo many profeſſions not to be believed, *that he had a thouſand times rather that his* Friend *ſhould have that which was conducible to health, than to have it himſelf*; and then aſſum'd, *that if this were believ'd, it were impoſſible any one ſhould attempt to expreſs kindneſs by robbing him of his greateſt pleaſure.*

The principal thing he contracted for in Friendſhip was a free uſe of *mutual Admonition*; which he confin'd not to the groſſer guilts which Enemies and common fame were likely to obſerve and mind men of, but extended it unto prudential failings, indecencies, and even ſuſpicious and barely doubtful actions: nay beyond that, unto thoſe vertuous ones which might have been improv'd and render'd better. He was us'd to ſay, *it was a poor deſign of Friendſhip to keep the perſon he admitted to his breaſt only from being ſcandalous, as if the Phyſician ſhould endeavour only to ſecure his patient from the Plague.* And what he thus articled for, he punctually himſelf perform'd, and exacted back again to be returned unto himſelf.

And if for any while he obſerv'd that no remembrance had been offer'd to him, he grew afraid and almoſt jealous of the omiſſion, ſuſpecting that the Courtier had ſupplanted the Friend, and therefore earneſtly inforc'd the obligation of being faithful in this point: and when with much ado ſomewhat of advertiſement was pick'd up, he receiv'd it always as a huge kindneſs; and though the whole ground of it happen'd to be miſtake, yet he ſtill return'd moſt affectionate thanks.

His good will when plac'd on any was ſo fix'd and rooted, that even ſupervening Vice, to which he had the greateſt deteſtation imaginable, could not eaſily remove it, the abhorrency of their Guilts leaving not only a charity but tenderneſs to their perſons; and, as he has profeſt, his concernment rather encreas'd than leſſened by this means, compaſſion being in that inſtance added unto love. There were but *two things* which (he would ſay) were apt to give check to his affections, *Pride* and *Falſeneſs*, where he ſaw theſe predominant, he thought he could never be a Friend to any purpoſe, becauſe he could never hope to do any good; yet even there he would intend his Prayers, ſo much the more, by how much the leſs he could do beſides. But where he ſaw a malleable honeſt temper, a *Jacob*'s plain ſimplicity, nothing could there diſcourage him; and how-

ever

ever inadvertency or paſſion, or haply ſome worſe ingredient, might fruſtrate his deſign, he would attend the *mollia tempora*, as he call'd them, thoſe gentle and more treatable opportunities which might at laſt be offer'd. He ſo much abhorr'd artifice and cunning, that he had prejudice to all concealments and pretenſions. He us'd to ſay he hated a *Non-cauſa*, and he had a ſtrange ſagacity in diſcovering it. When any with much circumlocution and contrivance had endeavour'd to ſhadow their main drift and purpoſe, he would immediately look through all thoſe miſts, and where 'twas in any degree ſeaſonable, would make it appear he did ſo: His charity of fraternal correption having only this caution or reſtraint, the hearer's intereſt, of which he judg'd, that when advice did not do good, 'twas hardly ſeparable from doing harm; and on this ground ſometimes he did deſiſt. But whereſoe're he gave an admonition, he prefac'd it always with ſuch demonſtrations of tenderneſs and good will, as could not fail to convince of the affectionate kindneſs with which 'twas ſent, though it could not of the convenience or neceſſity to embrace it. And this he gave as a general rule, and enforc'd by his Example, *never to reprove in anger*, or the leaſt appearance of it. If the paſſion were real, that then was evidently a fault, and the guilty perſon moſt unfit to be a Judge: if it were reſemblance only, yet even that would be ſo like to guilt, as probably to divert the Offender from the conſideration of his failance, to faſten on his Monitor; and make him think he was chid not becauſe he was in fault, but becauſe the other was angry.

Indeed the perſon who would not be ſome way mov'd with his advices muſt be ſtrangely inſenſate and ill-natur'd. Though his Exhortations had as much evidence and weight as words could give them, he had over and above a great advantage in his manner of ſpeaking: His little phraſe, *Don't be ſimple*, had more power to charm a paſſion than long harangues from others; and very many who lov'd not Piety in it ſelf, nor to be troubled with the news of it, would be well pleas'd to be invited and adviſ'd by him, and venerated the ſame matter in his language which they have derided in anothers.

He would ſay, *he delighted to be lov'd, not reverenc'd*; thinking that where there was much of the latter, there could not be enough of the former; ſomewhat of reſtraint and diſtance attending on the one, which was not well conſiſtent with the perfect freedom requiſite to the other. But as he was thus no Friend to ceremonious reſpect, he was an open *Enemy to Flattery*, eſpecially from a Friend, from whom he ſtarted to meet the ſlighteſt appearance of that ſervile kindneſs. Having upon occaſion communicated a purpoſe againſt which there happen'd to lie ſome objections, they being by a Friend of his repreſented to him, he immediately was convinced, and aſſumed other Counſels. But in proceſs of diſcourſe it happen'd ſomething fell in that brought to mind a paſſage of a late Sermon of the *Doctor*'s, which that perſon having been affected with, innocently mentioned ſuch apprehenſions of it, and ſo paſt on to talk of other matters. The next day the *Doctor* having recollected that probably the approbation given to the paſſage of the Sermon might be an after-deſign to allay the plain-dealing which preceded it, expoſtulated his ſurmiſe, proteſting *that nothing in the world could more avert his love, and deeply diſoblige him, than ſuch unfaithfulneſs*. But being aſſur'd that there was no ſuch art or contrivance meant, he gladly found and readily yielded himſelf to have been miſtaken. In other caſes he was no way inclinable to entertain doubts of his Friends kindneſs: but if any irregularity chanc'd to intervene, and cauſe miſapprehenſions, he gave them not leave to root and faſten by concealment, but immediately produc'd his ground of jealouſy; and exacted the like meaſure back again, if his own proceedings fell at any time under a doubtful or unkind appearance. This he thought a juſtice eſſential to Friendſhip, without which it could not poſſibly ſubſiſt: For we think not fit to condemn the moſt notorious Malefactor before he hath had licence to propoſe his Plea; and ſure 'tis more ſtrangely barbarous to treat a Friend, or rather Friendſhip it ſelf, with leſs regard.

To the performances of Friendſhip he *hated* all *mercenary returns*, whereof he was ſo jealous, as hardly to leave place for gratitude. *Love*, he ſaid, *was built upon the union and ſimilitude of minds, and not the bribery of gifts and benefits*. So generous was he herein, that he has oft profeſt, he *admitted retributions of good turns, yet not ſo much on any ſcore, as that his Friend might have the pleaſure of being kind*.

There was a perſon of quality, a great and long ſufferer in the late times of tryal, to whom the *Doctor* had frequently ſent ſupplies, and continued ſo to do, till there happened at laſt a change in the condition of the correſpondent, ſuch a one as, if it did not ſuperſede the need of farther aſſiſtance, yet gave promiſe of an approaching affluence; whereupon the *Doctor* fear'd the adding a new obligation in this conjuncture of affairs might ſeem a piece of deſign rather than kindneſs or charity: and though this ſuggeſtion was not of force to divert his purpoſe, it prov'd ſufficient to ſuſpend it, till by inquiry he found his deſign'd preſent would be a relief, and then he thought it an impertinence to conſider what it could be call'd beſides.

But doing good to relatives, or being kind unto acquaintance were low expreſſions of this Vertue we exhibit. Miſery and Want, where-ere he met with them, ſufficiently endear'd the Object. His *Alms* was as exuberant as his Love; and in Calamities to the Exigence he never was a ſtranger, whatever he might be to the man that ſuffer'd. So that ſeveral were ſurpriz'd, and ſome amaz'd at his bounty; and I have been aſſur'd by a learned and ſober perſon employ'd in this affair, that his beneficiaries frequently made it their wonder how the Doctor ſhould either know of them, or their diſtreſs; and lookt on his Errand, who was employed to bring relief, as a Viſion rather than a real bounty.

And here, to ſecure his Charities, the firſt preparative was to leave himſelf no motive to reſiſt or ſlight the opportunities of giving; which he compaſs'd by being a Steward to himſelf as well as unto God, and parting ſtill with the propriety of a ſet portion of his Eſtate, that when at any time he relieved the wants of any, he might become no whit the poorer by his gift, have only the content of giving, and the eaſe of being rid of keeping anothers money. The rate and ſumme of what he thus devoted was the tenth of all his income; wherein he was ſo ſtrictly punctual, that commonly the firſt thing he did was to compute and ſeparate the poor mans ſhare. To this he added every Week five ſhillings, which had been his loweſt proportion in the heat of the War in *Oxford*, when he liv'd upon his *Penſehurſt* ſtock, and had no viſible means or almoſt poſſibility of ſupply. Over and above this he compleated the devotions of his Weekly Faſt by joining Alms thereto, and adding twenty ſhillings to the poor man's heap.

Theſe were his debts to Charity, the eſtabliſh'd fixt revenue of the indigent; in the diſpenſation of which he was ſo religiouſly careful, that if at any time he happen'd to be in doubt whether he had ſet apart his charitable proportions, he always paſt ſentence againſt himſelf, reſolving it much better to run the hazard of having pay'd the ſame Debt twice, than to incur the poſſibility of not having done it once. But beyond theſe he had his Free-will Offerings, and thoſe proportion'd more by the occaſion of giving, than the ſurpluſage he had to give. His poor man's bag had ſo many mouths, and thoſe ſo often open'd, that it frequently became quite empty: but its being ſo never diverted him from relieving any that appear'd in need; for in ſuch ſeaſons he choſe to give in more liberal proportions than at others.

In the time of the War at *Oxford*, to paſs by other leſſer Reliefs, and many great ones, which his induſtrious concealment has preſerv'd from all notice of the moſt diligent enquiry, though he were then at a very low ebb, he furniſh'd an indigent Friend with ſixty pound, which never was repay'd him: as alſo upon another ſcore he parted with twenty pound, and another conſiderable ſumme beſides that: and to one in diſtreſs about the ſame time and on the ſame occaſion an hundred pound.

Inſtead of hiding his face from the poor, 'twas his practice ſtill to ſeek for theirs. Thoſe perſons whom he truſted with (his greateſt ſecret and greateſt buſineſs) his Charity, ſeldom had recourſe to him, but he would make enquiry for new Penſioners: and though he had in ſeveral parts of the Nation thoſe whom he employ'd to find out indigent perſons, and diſpoſe his largeſs to them, and though the Tyranny that then prevail'd made every day ſtore of ſuch; his covetous bounty ſtill graſp'd for more. Beſides his ordinary proviſion for the neigbouring poor, and thoſe that came to look him out in his retirement, (which were not few; for that the Liberal man dwells always in the Road) his Catalogue had an eſpecial place for ſequeſtred Divines, their Wives and Orphans, for young Students in the Univerſities, and alſo thoſe Divines that were abroad in baniſhment: Where over and above his frequent occaſional reliefs to the laſt of theſe, the exil'd Clergy, beſides what he procur'd from others, he ſent conſtantly over Year by Year a very conſiderable Summe, ſuch a one as men of far greater revenues do not uſe upon any occaſion to put into the *Corban*, and give away, much leſs as a troubleſome excreſcence every Year prune off, and caſt from their Eſtates.

Now if we enquire into the ſtock and fountain that was to feed all theſe diſburſements, 'twas at his flight from *Penſehurſt* barely three hundred pounds; which, at the ſale of a Leaſe left him for his Portion from his Father, and the aſſiſtance of his Prebend in *Chriſt-Church*, after all his laviſh Charities during thoſe Years, was near upon a thouſand. The taking of Uſe though he judg'd lawful, yet he never approv'd by practice, but lent ſtill *gratis* both to Friends and Strangers. The only other way he had of income was the buying of Leaſes for Years, and the Printing of his Books; from the latter of which when there is defaulk'd the many whole Editions he had nothing for, the charge he was at in the ſending of his Copies before he printed them unto his Friends for their animadverſions and advices, his ſending them ſheet by ſheet when printed, and ſurveying the reviſes, and the great numbers he gave away to his acquaintance, it will appear that the remainder was but a ſlight matter. As for private contributions or aſſiſt-

ance

ance of that kind, he had never any: for though there were many who would gladly have made thoſe oblations, yet he induſtriouſly prevented them by publick avowing that he needed not. In which refuſal he was ſo peremptory, that when being in *Oxford* made Priſoner at the Sign of the *Bear*, thence to be ſent immediately to *Wallingford*-Caſtle, a Gentleman perfectly a ſtranger to him, and coming by chance to the Inn, and hearing of his condition, having fifty pieces by him, would needs have preſented them to him; though the *Doctor* had before him the barbarous uſage of his Brethren, clap'd on Shipboard under Hatches, the like to which he might probably enough meet with; and though this extraordinary occurrence ſeem'd to carry with it ſomewhat of providential deſignment; yet he wholly refus'd the offer, as afterwards he did a far greater Summe from a perſon of honour that courted him with it. Only one twenty pound he was ſurpriz'd by, and thought fit to accept, which after ſome diſpute with himſelf he did upon theſe two grounds: Firſt, that he might not gratifie the pride from whence he was us'd to ſay mens reluctancies to receive benefits proceeded; and ſecondly, that he might not give the Gentleman the diſcomfiture of ſeeing he had made an unſeaſonable Offer.

But with all this diſproportioned Expence unto Revenue (a thing which after a very deliberate and ſtrict enquiry remains riddle ſtill, and an event next door to miracle) the *Doctor* daily improv'd in his Eſtate, and grew in ſpight of all his liberality rich, being worth at the time of his death about 1500 *l.* which yet we are not to marvel ſhould be ſtrange to us, ſince it was ſo to the *Doctor* himſelf, who often profeſt *to wonder at it*, and thereupon would apply this Axiome, *that half is more than the whole*, his mean Revenue by being ſcattered in the worſt of times growing upon him, when others that had great ones, by griping made them leſs, and grew ſtark Beggars.

As the *Doctor* was thus charitable, ſo was he gentile and liberal; his openneſs of hand in Secular occaſions was proportionable to that in Sacred. When any one had ſent him a ſlight preſent of Apples or the like, his reward would uſually much exceed the value; and he would be ſo well pleaſed to have ſuch an occaſion of giving to a ſervant, ſaying, *Alas, poor Soul, I warrant he is glad of this little matter*, that this ſeem'd a part of the ſender's Courteſie. Thus if there happen'd any other occaſion of giving, or of gratifying, or advancing publick works, (for inſtance the great Bible, upon which he was out 50 *l.* and re-imburſt himſelf only by ſelling two Copies) he would be ſure to do it at a free and highly-ingenuous rate. So that he was ſparing only to himſelf, and that upon no other principle, but thereby to be liberal to thoſe he lov'd better than himſelf, the neceſſitous and poor. A pregnant inſtance whereof may be, that the *Doctor* upon occaſion calculating his Expences on himſelf, found them to be not above five pound in the Year.

Beſides this, he had a further impediment to Riches, an eaſineſs which alone has waſted other mens Eſtates; he commonly making thoſe he dealt with their own Arbitrators, and if they ſeriouſly profeſs'd they could go no nigher, he deſcended to their terms, ſaying commonly, that *this traſh was not worth much ado.* And beyond this he was ſo careleſs after Bargains, that he never receiv'd ſcript of Paper of any to whom he lent, nor Bond of any for performance of Covenants, till very lately from two perſons, when he found it neceſſary to uſe that method with them. He was us'd to ſay, *that if he thought men Knaves, he would not deal with them; and if indeed they were ſo, it was not all his Circumſpection that could prevent a Cheat: On the other ſide, if they were honeſt, there needed no ſuch caution.* And poſſibly if we conſider the whole matter, there was not ſuch imprudence in the manage as at firſt appears: for Bonds would have ſignified little to him, who in the beſt times would ſcarce have put them in ſuit; but would certainly have ſtarv'd before he would have made an application to thoſe Judicatories which of late prevail'd, and uſurp'd the protection as well as the poſſeſſion of mens rights, and were injurious not only in their Oppreſſions but Reliefs.

In thoſe black days, being charg'd with the debt of about fifty or ſixty pound formerly by him paid, being offer'd a Releaſe if he would take his Oath of Payment, he thought the condition too unequal, and was reſolv'd to double his payment rather than perform it: but a farther enquiry having clear'd the Account, he incurr'd not that penalty.

To a Friend of his who by the falſeneſs of a correſpondent whom he truſted was reduc'd to ſome extremity, and enquir'd what courſe he took to eſcape ſuch uſage, the *Doctor* wrote as follows;

To your doubt concerning my ſelf, I thank God I am able to anſwer you, that I never ſuffer'd in my life for want of hand or ſeal, but think I have far'd much better than they that have always been careful to ſecure themſelves by theſe cautions. I remember I was wont to reproach an honeſt Fellow-Prebend of mine, that whenſoever a Siege was near, always ſent away what he moſt valued

to

to ſome other Garriſon or Friend, and ſeldom ever met with any again, the ſollicitude was ſtill their ruine: Whereas I venturing my ſelf and my Cabinet in the ſame bottom, never loſt any thing of this kind. And the like I have practis'd in this other Inſtance. Whom I truſted to be my friend, all I had was in his power, and by God's bleſſing I was never deceived in my truſt.

And here amidſt all theſe unlikelihoods and ſeeming impoſſibilities, Riches thruſt themſelves upon him, and would take no refuſal: it pleaſing God, ſince he had exemplified the advices of his *Practical Catechiſm* to the duties of Alms and charitable diſtributions, in him alſo to make good and ſignally exemplify the aſſurance he there and elſewhere made in the behalf of Almighty God upon ſuch performance, the giving affluence of temporal wealth. Nor was he the ſingle inſtance of this truth; as he had Proſelytes to the ſpeculative verity, he had Partiſans alſo of the effect and real iſſue of it. About four years ſince a perſon of good Eſtate, and without charge of Children, coming to viſit the *Doctor*, among other diſcourſe happen'd to ſpeak of the late Dean of *Worceſter*, Doctor *Potter* (whoſe memory, for his remarkable Charity and all other excellencies befitting his Profeſſion and Dignity in the Church, is precious.) This Gentleman there related, that formerly enquiring of the Dean how it was poſſible for one that had ſo great a charge of Children, was ſo hoſpitable in his Entertainment, and profuſe in Liberality, not only to ſubſiſt, but to grow rich; he anſwered, that ſeveral Years before he happen'd to be preſent at a Sermon at St. *Paul*'s Croſs, where the Preacher recommending the Duty of Alms and plentiful giving, aſſured his Auditory that that was the certaineſt way to compaſs Riches. He mov'd therewith, thenceforward reſolv'd diligently to follow the counſel and expect the iſſue; which was ſuch as now created ſo much wonder. It fortun'd that at that time when this was telling, the *Doctor*'s Δευτεραι φροντιδες were newly come out, and therewith this Sermon of the *Poor man's tithing*. He therefore willing to improve the opportunity, confeſt that he himſelf was that Preacher which Doctor *Potter* referr'd to, and that there was the very Sermon: which immediately giving to this Viſitant, he deſir'd Almighty God it might have the like effect on him; and ſo after a ſhort civility diſmiſt him.

As to the *way* and very *manner of his Charity*, even that was a part of his donation and largeſs. One great care of his was to diſpoſe of his reliefs ſo as to be moſt ſeaſonable; to which purpoſe he had his Spies and Agents ſtill imployed to give him punctual notice of the occurrents in their ſeveral ſtations. His next endeavour was to diſpenſe them ſo as to be moſt endearing. To perſons that had been of quality he conſulted to relieve their modeſty as well as needs, taking order they ſhould rather find than receive Alms; and knowing well they were provided for, ſhould not yet be able to gueſs by what means they were ſo. To thoſe who were aſſiſted immediately from his hand, he over and above beſtow'd the Charities of his familiar and hearty kindneſs: in the expreſſiveneſs of which he was us'd to ſay that *'twas a moſt unreaſonable and unchriſtian thing to deſpiſe any one for his poverty*; but much more by the pleaſure and tranſport which the very act of giving transfus'd into him: which whoſoever noted, ſtood in need of no other proof of the truth of his uſual affirmation, *that 'Twas one of the greateſt ſenſualities in the World to give.* Upon which conſideration he often took occaſion to magnify *the exceeding indulgence of God, that had annex'd future rewards to that which was ſo amply its own recompence.* Another circumſtance in the *Doctor*'s Liberality not to be paſs'd over was his *choice of what he gave*; his care that it ſhould not be of things vile and refuſe, but of the very beſt he had. It happen'd that a Servant in the Family being troubled with the Gout, the *Doctor* gave order that he ſhould have ſome of the Plaiſter which he us'd in the like extremity: but the ſtore of that being almoſt ſpent, the perſon intruſted in this office gave of another ſort, which was of ſomewhat leſs reputation. Which practice the *Doctor* within a while coming to know, was extremely troubled at it, and complain'd of that unſeaſonable kindneſs unto him, which diſregarded the preſſing intereſts and wants of another perſon, and thereby gave him a diſquiet parallel to that which a fit of the Gout would have done.

But beſides this of *giving*, the *Alms of lending* had an eminent place in the practice as well as judgment of the *Doctor*. When he ſaw a man honeſt and induſtrious, he would truſt him with a Summe, and let him pay it again at ſuch times and in ſuch proportions as he found himſelf able: withal when he did ſo, he would add his Counſel too, examine the perſons condition, and contrive with him how the preſent Summe might be moſt advantageouſly diſpos'd; ſtill cloſing the diſcourſe with Prayer for God's bleſſing, and after that diſmiſſing him with infinite affability and kindneſs. In which performance as he was exuberant to all, ſo moſt eſpecially to ſuch as were of an inferiour degree; giving this for a Rule to thoſe of his Friends that were of Eſtate and Quality, to *treat their poor Neighbours with ſuch a chearfulneſs, that they may be glad to have met with them.*

And

And as upon the grounds of his moſt gentile and obliging humanity he never ſuffer'd any body to wait that came to ſpeak with him, though upon a mere viſit, but broke off his beloved Studies, upon which his intention was ſo great, that he extremely grudg'd to be interrupted by any bodily concernment of his own, and ſo would often intermit his preſcribed Walks and Suppers in purſuance of it: ſo with a more exceeding alacrity he came down when it was told him that a poor Body would ſpeak with him. Such of all others he lov'd not to delay; and ſo much he deſired that others ſhould do the ſame, that when the Lady of the Houſe, diverted either by the attractives of his Diſcourſe, or ſome other occaſion, delay'd the Clients of her Charity in Alms, or that other moſt commendable one in Surgery, he in his Friendly way would chide her out of the room.

As Poverty thus recommended to the *Doctor*'s care and kindneſs, in an eſpecial manner it did ſo when *Piety* was added to it: upon which ſcore a mean perſon in the Neighbourhood, a Weaver by Trade, but by weakneſs diſabled much to follow that or any other employment, was extremely his Favourite. Him he us'd with a moſt affectionate freedom, gave him ſeveral of his Books, and examined his Progreſs in them; invited him, nay importun'd him, ſtill to come to him for whatever he needed, and at his Death left him ten pounds as a Legacy. A little before which fatal time, *He* and the *Lady P.* being walking, his Client happen'd to come by, to whom after the *Doctor* had talked a while in his uſual friendly manner, he let him paſs, yet ſoon after call'd him with theſe words, If it ſhould pleaſe God that I ſhould be taken from this place, let me make a bargain between my Lady and you, that you be ſure to come to her with the ſame freedome you would to me for any thing you want: and ſo with a moſt tender kindneſs gave his Benediction. Then turning to the Lady, ſaid, Will you not think it ſtrange I ſhould be more affected for parting from this poor man than from you? His treating him when he came to viſit him in his Sickneſs was parallel hereto in all reſpects.

Such another Acquaintance he had at *Penſehurſt*, whom he likewiſe remembred in his Will, and to whom he was us'd to ſend his more practical Books, and to write extreme kind Letters, particularly enquiring of his condition and Childrens: and when he heard he had a Boy fit to put out to School, allow'd him a penſion to that purpoſe: and alſo with great contentment receiv'd from him his kind, though ſcarce legible, returns. In this place I cannot omit to add a very unexpected account of both theſe Perſons beforemention'd; as a great inſtance how unſecure our vertue is in this World, howe're eſtabliſh'd it may ſeem, and removed out of the way and hazards of temptation. Both the one and the other of theſe two, whether out of Pride that their Exemplary Piety had recommended them to the Doctor, and thereby put them into eſteem with others; or that his awe ceaſing to be upon them, they gave way to thoſe vicious inclinations which before they ſuppreſt or concealed, or ſome other more unaccountable and hidden cauſe, upon a ſudden after the Doctor died, which now immediately happen'd, to the amazement of all that formerly knew them, turned open debauchees; and one of them after ſeveral diſorders in the Country, went up to *London*, where he join'd himſelf to the worſt Company of that place, and turn'd Hector, with the addition of the liberal Art of Coining; but divine vengeance remarkably purſued theſe two unhappy men, who after they had paſt a great part of their Life under the beſt advantages of inſtitution, and ſeeming practice of ſtrict Duty, made ſuch a change of their way of living, and Shipwrack of their Souls: the one being taken up drown'd in a ſmall Brook near his Houſe, not without violent ſuſpicions that he had thrown himſelf wilfully into the Water, to make himſelf away; the other, if my intelligence fail not, coming to a more ſhameful end, being Hang'd at *Tyburn*. The pretences of theſe perſons to Religion were ſo remarkable, and their Apoſtaſie from it, with the vengeance that followed, ſo extraordinary, the inſtruction naturally flowing from the whole, ſo very uſeful; that I preſume this digreſſion will not be thought an impertinence.

To return to our former ſubject of Diſcourſe, this exuberant kindneſs and condeſcenſion in the Doctor will not ſeem ſtrange to any who ſhall conſider how low a rate he put upon thoſe uſual diſtinctives, Birth or Riches; and withal how high a value on the Souls of men: for them he had ſo unmanageable a paſſion, that it often broke out into words of this effect, which had with them ſtill in the delivery an extraordinary vehemence, *O what a glorious thing, how rich a prize for the expence of a man's whole life were it to be the inſtrument of reſcuing any one Soul?* Accordingly in the purſuit of this deſign he not only waſted himſelf in perpetual toil of ſtudy, but moſt diligently attended the Offices of his Calling, reading daily the Prayers of the Church, Preaching conſtantly every Sunday, and that many times when he was in ſo ill a condition of health, that all beſides himſelf thought it impoſſible, at leaſt very unfit, for him to do it. His Subjects

were

were ſuch as had greateſt influence on Practice, which he preſt with moſt affectionate tenderneſs, making tears part of his Oratory. And if he obſerv'd his documents to have fail'd of the deſired effect, it was matter of great ſadneſs to him; where inſtead of accuſing the parties concern'd, he charg'd himſelf that his Performances were incompetent to the deſigned End, and would ſolicitouſly enquire what he might do to ſpeak more plainly or more movingly; whether his extemporary wording might not be a defect, and the like. Beſides this, he liberally diſpens'd all other ſpiritual aids: from the time that the Children of the Family became capable of it till his Death, he made it a part of his daily buſineſs to inſtruct them, allotting the interval betwixt Prayers and Dinner to that work, obſerving diligently the little deviations of their manners, and applying remedies unto them. In like ſort, that he might enſnare the Servants alſo to their benefit, on Sundays in the Afternoon he Catechis'd the Children in his Chamber, giving liberty, nay invitation, to as many as would to come and hear, hoping they haply might admit the truths obliquely level'd, which baſhfulneſs perſuaded not to enquire for, leſt they thereby ſhould own the fault of former inadvertence. Beſides he publickly declar'd himſelf ready and deſirous to aſſiſt any perſon ſingle, and to that purpoſe having particularly invited ſuch to come at their leiſurable hours, when any did ſo, he us'd all arts of encouragement and obliging condeſcenſion; inſomuch that having once got the Scullion in his Chamber upon that Errand, he would not give him the uneaſineſs of ſtanding, but made him ſit down by his ſide: though in other caſes amidſt his infinite Humility, he knew well how to aſſert the dignity of his place and Function from the approaches of Contempt. Upon this ground of ardent love to Souls, a very diſconſolate and almoſt deſponding perſon happening ſome years ſince to come to him, there to unload the burthen of his mind, he kept him privately in his Chamber for ſeveral dayes with a paternal kindneſs, anſwering every ſcruple which that unhappy temper of Mind too readily ſuggeſted, and with unwearied patience attending for thoſe little Arguments which in him were much more eaſily ſilenc'd than ſatisfied. This practice continued, till he at laſt diſcovered his impreſſions had in good proportion advanc'd to the deſir'd effect; which proceeded carefully in this Method, that Duty ſtill preceded Promiſe, and ſtrict Endeavour only founded Comfort.

On the ſame motive of this higheſt Charity, when ſome years ſince a young man, (who by the encouragement of an Uncle, formerly the Head of an Houſe in *Oxford*, had been deſign'd to Learning, but by his Ejectment at the Viſitation was diverted from that courſe to a Country-life, and being ſo, to engage him therein was alſo married and had Children;) amidſt his toilſome avocations continued to employ his vacant hours in ſtudy, and happening on ſome of the *Doctor*'s Writings, was ſo affected with them, as to leave his Wife and Family and Employment, to ſeek out the *Doctor* himſelf, whom being accordingly addreſt unto, the Excellent *Doctor* met this unknown Romantick Undertaker with his accuſtom'd kindneſs, and moſt readily received this Votary and Proſelyte to Learning into his care and pupillage for ſeveral years, affording him all kind of aſſiſtance both in ſtudies and temporal ſupport, till he at laſt arrived at good proficiency in knowledge, and became an uſeful perſon in the Church.

Nor could this zeal to the eternal intereſts of Souls be ſuperſeded by any ſight of danger however imminent. The laſt year of the *Doctor*'s Life, one in the Neighbourhood mortally ſick of the Small Pox, deſiring that he would come to him, as ſoon as he heard of it, though the Diſeaſe did then prove more than uſually fatal, and the *Doctor*'s Age and Complexion threatned it particularly ſo to him, and though one might diſcern in his Countenance vigorous apprehenſions of the danger, he preſently ſuppreſs'd his fears, ſtaying only ſo long as to be ſatisfied whether the party was ſo ſenſible that a Viſit might poſſibly be of uſe, and being inform'd thereof, chearfully went; telling the perſon that happen'd to be preſent, whoſe dreads in his behalf were not ſo eaſily depoſited, that *he ſhould be as much in God's hands in the ſick man's chamber as in his own:* and not contented with going once, appointed the next day to have return'd again; which he had done, had not the Patients Death abſolv'd him of his promiſe.

So likewiſe when at another time a Gentleman of no very laudable life had in his Sickneſs deſir'd to ſpeak with the *Doctor*, which Meſſage through the negligence of the perſon employ'd was not deliver'd till he that ſent it was in the laſt agonies of Death; the *Doctor* was very much affected at it, paſſionately complaining of the *brutiſhneſs of thoſe that had ſo little ſenſe of a Soul in that ſad ſtate:* and pouring out his moſt fervent Prayers in his behalf, requeſted farther *that by this example others, and in particular the Companions of that unhappy perſons Vice, might learn how improper a ſeaſon the time of Sickneſs, and how unfit a place the Death-Bed is for that one great important Work of Penitence, which was intended by Almighty God the one commenſurate work of the whole Life.*

But though to advance the Spiritual concerns of all that could in any kind become receptive

ceptive of the good he meant them was his unlimited designment and endeavour, yet to nourish and advance the early Vertue of young persons was his more chosen study: When he saw such a one, he would contrive and seek out ways to insinuate and endear himself, lay hold of every opportunity to represent the beauty, pleasure and advantage of a pious life; and on the other side to express the toil, the danger and the mischief of brutal sensuality. Withal he would be still performing Courtesies, thereby to oblige of very gratitude to him, obedience and duty unto God.

Where to pass by the many instances that he gave of this his Charity, it will not be amiss to insist on one as a *specimen* of the rest, which was thus. It happen'd during the *Doctor*'s abode in *Oxford* in the War, that a young man of excellent faculties and very promising hopes in that place, by his love to Musick was engag'd in the Company of such who had that one good quality alone to recommend their other ill ones. The *Doctor* finding this, though otherwise a stranger to the person, gave him in exchange his own; and taking him as it were into his own bosom, directed him to Books, and read them with him, particularly a great part of *Homer*, at a Night dispatching usually a Book, and if it prov'd Holiday, then two; where his Comical expression was when one *Iliad* was done, to say, *Come, because 'tis Holiday let us be jovial and take the other Iliad*, reflecting on the mode of the former Debauches, whose word it was, 'Tis Holiday, let's take the other Pint.

And as the *Doctor* labour'd in the rescue of single persons, he had an Eye therein to multitudes; for whereever he had planted the Seeds of Piety, he presently cast about to extend and propagate them thereby to others: engaging all his Converts *not to be asham'd of being reputed innocent, or to be thought to have a kindness for* Religion; *but own the seducing men to God with as much confidence at least as others use when they are Factors for the Devil: And in stead of lying on the guard and the defensive part*, he gave in charge *to chuse the other of the assailant*. And this method he commended *not only as the greatest service unto God and to our Neighbour, but as the greatest security to our selves; it being like the not expecting of a threatned War at home, but carrying it abroad into the Enemies Country. And nothing in the Christian's Warfare* he judg'd *so dangerous as a truce, and the cessation of hostility. Withal, parly and holding intelligence with guilt in the most trivial things*, he pronounc'd *as treason to our selves, as well as unto God: for while*, saith he, *we fight with Sin, in the fiercest shock of opposition we shall be safe; for no attempts can hurt us till we treat with the assailants: Temptations of all sorts having that good quality of the Devil in them, to fly when they are resisted.* Besides, whereas young people are us'd to varnish o're their non-performance and forbearance of good actions by a pretence unto humility and bashful modesty, saying they are asham'd for to do this or that, as being not able for to do it well, he assur'd them *this was arrant pride and nothing else.*

Upon these grounds his Motto of instruction to young persons was, *Principiis obsta*, and *Hoc age*, to withstand the overtures of ill, and be intent and serious in good; to which he join'd a third advice, *to be furnish'd with a Friend.* Accordingly at a solemn leave-taking of one of his disciples, he thus discours'd: *I have heard say of a man who upon his Death-Bed being to take his farewel of his Son, and considering what course of life to recommend that might secure his innocence, at last enjoin'd him to spend his time in making of Verses and in dressing a Garden; the old man thinking no temptation could creep into either of these Employments. But I instead of these expedients will recommend these other, the doing all the good you can to every person, and the having of a Friend; whereby your life shall not only be rendred innocent, but withal extremely happy.*

Now after all these Excellencies, it would be reason to expect that the *Doctor*, conscious of his Merit, should have look'd if not on others with contempt, yet on himself with some complacency and fair regard: but it was far otherwise; there was no Enemy of his, however drunk with Passion, that had so mean an Esteem either of him or of his Parts as he had both of the one and other. As at his first appearing in publick he was clearly over-reach'd and cheated in the owning of his Books; so when he found it duty to go on in that his toilsome trade of Writing, he was wont seriously to profess *himself astonish'd at their reception into the World, especially, as he withal was pleas'd to add, since others fail'd herein, whose performances were infinitely beyond any thing which he was able to do.*

From this opinion of his mediocrity at best, and the resolution of not making any thing in Religion publick before it had undergone all Tests, in point not only of truth but prudence, proceeded his constant practice of subjecting all his Writings to the censure and correction of his Friends, *engaging them at that time to lay aside all their kindness, or rather to evidence their love by being rigidly censorious.* There is scarce any Book he wrote that had not first travail'd on this Errand, of being severely dealt with, to several parts of the Nation before it saw the light; nay so scrupulous was the *Doctor* herein, that he

has frequently, upon ſuggeſtion of ſomething to be changed, return'd his Papers the ſecond time unto his Cenſor, to ſee if the alteration was exactly to his mind, and generally was never ſo well pleas'd as when his Packets return'd with large acceſſions of objectings and advertiſements. And in this point he was ſo ſtrangely adviſeable, that he would advert unto the judgment of the meaneſt perſon, uſually ſaying, *that there was no one that was honeſt to him by whom he could not profit*; withal, *that he was to expect Readers of ſeveral ſorts, and if one illiterate man was ſtumbled, 'twas likely others of his form would be ſo too, whoſe intereſt, when he writ to all, was not to be paſs'd over. Beſides, thoſe leſs-diſcerning Obſervators, if they could do nothing elſe, he ſaid could ſerve to draw teeth*; that is, admoniſh if ought were ſaid with paſſion or ſharpneſs, a thing the *Doctor* was infinitely jealous of in his Writings. Many years ſince he having ſent one of his Tracts unto an eminent perſon in this Church, to whom he bore a very high and merited regard, to be look'd over by him. He ſending it back without any amendment, but with a profuſe Complement of liking every thing; the good *Doctor* was much affected with the diſappointment, only comforted himſelf herein, that *he had reap'd this benefit, to have learn'd never to ſend his Papers to that hand again*: which reſolution to his dying day he kept.

Nor was this caution before the publiſhing of his Books ſufficient, but was continued after it, the *Doctor* importuning ſtill his Friends to ſend him their Objections, if in any point they were not ſatisfied; which he with great indifference conſider'd in his reviews and ſubſequent Editions: however took more kindly the moſt impertinent exception than thoſe advertiſements of a different kind which brought *Encomiums* and laviſh praiſes, which he heard with as great diſtaſt as others do the moſt virulent Reproaches.

A farther proof of this low eſteem the *Doctor* had of himſelf (if ſuch were poſſible) would be *meekneſs* to thoſe that ſlighted him and diſparag'd his abilities: this being the ſureſt indication that our Humility is in earneſt, when we are content to hear ill Language not only from our ſelves but from our Enemies: which with how much indifference this inimitable perſon did, 'tis neither eaſie fully to deſcribe, nor to perſwade to juſt belief. The ſhort is, as he was never angry with his pertinacious Diſſenters for not being of his mind in points of ſpeculation; no more was he in the leaſt with his ſcornful Oppoſites for their being of it in their little value of his Perſon. And though he had, as well as other men, ſeeds of incitation in his natural temper, and more than others temptation to it in his daily and almoſt intolerable injuries; yet ſuch was the habitual maſtery he had gain'd over himſelf, that the ſtricteſt conſiderers of his actions have not in ten years perpetual converſation ſeen his Paſſion betray him to an indecent Speech.

Nor was his *ſufferance* of other kinds leſs exemplary than that he evidenc'd in the reception of Calumny and foul Reproach: for though *Pain were that to which* he was us'd to ſay *he was of all things moſt a Coward*, yet being under it he ſhew'd an eminent Conſtancy and perfect Reſignation.

At the approach of Sickneſs his firſt conſideration was, *what Failing had provok'd the preſent Chaſtiſement*, and to that purpoſe made his earneſt Prayer to God (and enjoin'd his Friends to do the like) *to convince him of it*; *nor only ſo, but tear and rend away, though by the greateſt violence and ſharpeſt diſcipline, whatever was diſpleaſing in his Eyes, and grant not only patience, but fruitfulneſs under the rod.* Then by repeated acts of ſubmiſſion would he deliver himſelf up into God's hands to do with him as ſeem'd him good; amidſt the ſharpeſt pains meekly invoking him, and ſaying, *God's holy Will be done.* And even then when on the rack of torture, would he be obſerving every circumſtance of allay: *When 'twas the Gout, he would give thanks 'twas not the Stone or Cramp; when 'twas the Stone, he then would ſay 'twas not ſo ſharp as others felt, accuſing his impatience that it appear'd ſo bad to him as it did.* And then when ſome degree of health was given, he exerted all his ſtrength in a return of grateful recognition to the Author of it, which he perform'd with a vivacious ſenſe and chearful piety, frequently reflecting on the Pſalmiſt's Phraſe, *that it was a joyful thing to be thankful.* Which his tranſport whoever ſhould attentively obſerve, would eaſily apprehend how poſſible it was for the infinite fruitions of another World to be made up by the perpetual act of grateful recognition, in giving lauds and ſinging praiſes unto God.

Upon this ſcore he was a moſt diligent Obſerver of every Bleſſing he receiv'd, and had them ſtill in readineſs to confront unto thoſe preſſures he at any time lay under. In the intermiſſions of his importunate maladies he would with full acknowledgment mention the great indulgence, That he *who had in his Conſtitution the Cauſe of ſo much pain ſtill dwelling with him, ſhould yet by God's immediate interpoſing be reſcued from the Effect.*

To facilitate yet more this his ſerenity and calm of Mind, he lay'd this Rule before him, which prov'd of great uſe, *Never to trouble himſelf with the fore-ſight of future Events*, being reſolv'd of our Saviour's Maxime, that *Sufficient to the day is the evil thereof*: and

that

that it were the greateſt folly in the World to perplex ones ſelf with that which perchance will never come to paſs; but if it ſhould, then God who ſent it will diſpoſe it to the beſt; moſt certainly to his Glory, which ſhould ſatisfie us in our reſpects to Him; and, unleſs it be our fault, as certainly to our Good, which, if we be not ſtrangely unreaſonable, muſt ſatisfie in reference unto our ſelves and private intereſts. Beſides all this, in the very diſpenſation God will not fail to give ſuch allays which (like the cool gales under the Line) will make the greateſt heats of ſufferance very ſupportable. In ſuch occaſions he uſually ſubjoin'd *Epictetus* his *Dilemma, Either the thing before us is in our power, or it is not: if it be, let us apply the Remedy, and there will be no motive for complaint; if it be not, the Grief is utterly impertinent, ſince it can do no good.* As alſo from the ſame Author he annex'd this conſideration, *that every thing has two handles; if the one prove hot, and not to be touch'd, we may take the other that's more temperate:* And in every occurrent he would be ſure to find ſome cool handle that he might lay hold of.

And to enforce all this, he made a conſtant recourſe to the Experience of God's dealing with him in preceeding accidents, which however dreadful at a diſtance, at a nearer view loſt much of their terrour. And for others that he ſaw perplex'd about the manage of their difficult affairs, he was wont to ask them, *when they would begin to truſt God,* or *permit him to govern the World.* Beſides, unto himſelf and Friends he was wont ſolemnly to give this mandate, *Quod ſis eſſe velis, nihilq; malis,* in his Engliſh, *to rather nothing*; not only to be content or acquieſce, but be reſolv'd the preſent ſtate to be the very beſt that could be wiſh'd or phanſied.

And thus all private concernments he paſs'd over with a perfect indifference; the World and its appendages hanging ſo looſe about him, that he never took notice when any part dropt off, or ſate uneaſily. Herein indeed he was concern'd and render'd thoughtful, if ſomewhat interven'd that had a poſſibility of duty appendant to it; in which caſe he would be ſolicitous to diſcern where the obligation lay: but preſently reſcued himſelf from that diſquiet by his addreſſes unto God in Prayer and Faſting, which was his certain refuge in this as well other Exigents; and if the thing in queſtion were of moment, he call'd in the devotions of his Friends. Beſides this Caſe he own'd to have ſome kind of little diſcompoſure in the choice of things perfectly indifferent; for where there was nothing to determine him, the balance by hanging even became tremulous and by a propenſity to either ſide enclin'd to neither, making uſeleſs offers, but promoving nothing: which condition of mind he was wont to call *the deliberation of* Buridan's *Aſs.*

Upon which grounds of all other things he moſt diſlik'd the being left to make a choice; and hugely applauded the ſtate of ſubjection to a Superiour, where an obſequious diligence was the main ingredient of Duty: as alſo he did the ſtate of ſubjection unto preſſure, as a privilege and bleſſing. And though he pray'd as much and withal as heartily as any perſon for the return of the Nation from Captivity, he always firſt premis'd the being made receptive of ſuch Mercy by the intervention of Repentance. He would often both publickly and privately aſſert ſolemnly, *That proſperous iniquity would not be deliverance, but the moſt formidable judgment: That the Nation during its preſſures was under the Diſcipline of God, given up to Satan by a kind of Eccleſiaſtick Cenſure; and ſhould the Almighty diſmiſs us from his hands, and put us into our own, give us up to our ſelves, with a Why ſhould you be ſmitten any more? this were of all inflictions the moſt dreadful.* Though with admirable equanimity he could run over the black Annals of this unhappy Nation while its Calamities were reckon'd up, he could ſcarce hear the ſlighteſt mention of its incorrigible guilt without diſſolving into tears; eſpecially when he happened to advert unto the impudence of that Hypocriſie which reconcil'd Godlineſs and Villany, and made it poſſible for men to be Saints and Devils both together: whereby Religion grew ruinous to it ſelf, and beſides the ſcandal of ſuch Enormities committed in the face of the Sun, with ſuch pretence to Zeal and Holineſs, our Faith became inſtructed to confute and baffle Duty, the Creed and the Commandments, Belief and Practice being brought into the Liſts, and repreſented as incompatible; while the flames intended for the Sacred Lamps, the eſtabliſhment of Doctrinals and Speculative Divinity, burnt up the Altar and the Temple, conſumed not only Charity, but good nature too, and untaught the common documents of honeſt Heatheniſm.

And while this publick Soul in the contemplation of the Miſchief which our ſins both were themſelves and in their Iſſues; great in their provocation and fatal in their plagues, indulg'd unto his pious and generous Griefs: yet even then conſidering Judgment not to be more juſt than uſeful to the ſufferers, he found out means from that unlikely Topick to ſpeak comforts to himſelf and others.

In that laſt *Criſis* of our gaſping hopes, the defeat of the *Cheſhire* Forces, which promis'd all the Miſery conſequent to the ſway of a Senate gorg'd in blood, and yet ſtill

thirſting more, and of a veterane Army compos'd of deſperate Fanaticks engag'd in equal guilts among themſelves, and equal hate againſt the other Party, and therewithal the Religion, Liberty and Being of the Nation; he thus addreſſes himſelf to the deſponding ſorrows of a Friend.

Sept. 2.

SIR,

I Have received your laſt, and acknowledge the great fitneſs of it to the preſent opportunities under which God hath pleas'd to place us. If we look about us, there was never any louder call to lamentation and bitter mourning; and the ſharpeſt accents of theſe are viſibly due to thoſe continued Provocations which appear to have wrought all our woe: yet is there not wanting ſome gleam of light, if we ſhall yet by God's grace be qualified to make uſe of it. It is the ſupream Privilege of Chriſtianity to convert the ſaddeſt evils into the moſt medicinal advantages, the Valley of Achor *into the door of hope, the blackeſt Tempeſt into the moſt perfect διὰ· and it is certain you have an excellent opportunity now before you to improve and receive benefit by; and you will not deſpiſe that affection which attempts to tell you ſomewhat of it. It is plainly this; That all kind of Proſperity (even that which we moſt think we can juſtifie the moſt importunate purſuance of, the flouriſhing of a Church and Monarchy) is treacherous and dangerous, and might very probably tend to our great ills, and nothing is ſo entirely ſafe and wholeſome as to be continued under God's diſciplines. Thoſe that are not better'd by ſuch methods, would certainly be intoxicated and deſtroyed by the pleaſanter draughts; and thoſe that would ever ſerve God ſincerely in affluence, have infinitely greater advantages and opportunities for it in the adverſe fortune. Therefore let us all now adore and bleſs God's wiſeſt choices, and ſet vigorouſly to the task that lies before us, improving the preſent advantages, and ſupplying in the abundance of the inward beauty what is wanting to the outward luſtre of a Church; and we ſhall not fail to find that the Grots and Caves lie as open to the Celeſtial influences as the faireſt and moſt beautified Temples. We are ordinarily very willing to be rich, and flatter our ſelves that our aims are no other than to be enabled by much wealth to do much good; and ſome live to ſee themſelves confuted, want hearts when Wealth comes in greateſt abundance: ſo thoſe that never come to make the experiment, have yet reaſon to judge that God ſaw it fit not to lead them into temptation, leſt if they had been prov'd they ſhould have been found faithleſs. And the ſame judgment are we now oblig'd to paſs for our ſelves, and by what God appears to have choſen for us, to reſolve what he ſees to be abſolutely beſt for us; and it muſt be our greateſt blame and wretchedneſs, if what hath now befaln us be not effectually better for us, than whatever elſe even Piety could have ſuggeſted to us to wiſh or pray for. And then, I pray, judge candidly whether any thing be in any degree ſober or tolerable in any of us, beſide the one great neceſſary Wiſdom as well as Duty of Reſignation, and making God's choices ours alſo. I have been theſe three Weeks under reſtraint by the Gout and other pains, and am not yet on my legs, yet bleſſed be God have all cauſes of thanksgiving, none of repining. And I ſhall with confidence pray and hope that the great multitudes of perſons and families that are now under far ſharper exerciſes, will find as much greater allays and ſweetneſſes, and the black Cloud (as oft it hath done) vaniſh undiſcernibly.*

And when this moſt unlikely Prophecy became fulfill'd, when that black Cloud he ſpoke of, contrary to all humane expectation, broke not in Tempeſt, but the faireſt Sunſhine that ever ſmil'd on this our Land, when our deſpairs and reſolute deſpondencies became unravel'd by a Miracle of Mercy, which after-ages will be as far from giving credit to in its endearing moſt improbable circumſtances, as this of ours (pardon the harſhneſs of a true compariſon) is from eſteeming at its merited rate; our excellent Patriot, and beſt of men, ſeeing the dawnings of this welcome day, paid down at once his greateſt thanks and heartieſt deprecations as a tribute to it, paſſionately fearing what he had more paſſionately wiſht for, ſuſpecting his own hopes and weeping over his fruitions.

As to his Sacred *Majeſty*, he look'd on His Return with pity and compaſſion, as *bringing Him to that uneaſie, if not inſuperable, Task of ruling and reforming a licentious people; to that moſt irkſome ſufferance of being worried with the importunities of covetous and ambitious men, the reſtleſs care of meeting the deſigns of mutinous and diſcontented ſpirits: reſolving, His moſt wiſht Return could only be a bleſſing to his People, but unto him could not be ſo, but only on the ſcore, by having opportunities through glorious ſelf-denials to do good.* And for all other perſons he ſaid, *that having ſeriouſly conſidered what ſort of men would be better for the Change, he could not think of any. As for the Church,* 'twas certain, *Perſecution was generally the happieſt means of propagating that; ſhe then grew faſteſt when prun'd moſt: then of the beſt complexion and moſt healthy when fainting through loſs of blood. As to the Laity, in all their ſeveral ſtations and eſtates they had ſo much perverted the healthful diſpenſations of Judgment, that it was moſt improbable they ſhould make any tolerable uſe of Mercy. And laſtly, in reference to himſelf,*

himself, he resolv'd (though sure on weaker grounds) *Affliction most conducible.* During the current of that Tyranny, which for so many years we all groan'd under, he kept a constant equable serenity and unthoughtfulness in outward accidents: but the approaching Change gave him somewhat of pensive recollection, insomuch that discoursing of occurrents, he broke forth into these words, *I must confess I never saw that time in all my life wherein I could so chearfully say my* Nunc dimittis *as now. Indeed I do dread Prosperity, I do really dread it. For the little good I am now able to do, I can do it with deliberation and advice: but if it please God I should live and be call'd to any higher Office in the Church, I must then do many things in a hurry, and shall not have time to consult with others, and I sufficiently apprehend the danger of relying on my own Judgment.* Which words he spake with the greatest concernment of earnest melting passion as is imaginable. Accordingly it pleas'd Almighty God to deal; and having granted to his Servant the satisfaction of a full return and gracious answer to his Prayer in the then every-day-expected Reception of His Sacred *Majesty*, not to deny his other great request of not sharing a temporary advantage from it: but as his merits were far beyond those transitory ensnaring retributions, to remove him from them to those solid and unmixt Rewards, which could be nothing else than such, and would be such for ever.

But this sad part of our relation requiring to it self a fresh unwearied sorrow, and the Saint-like manner of this Excellent person's passage from the World being as exemplary and conducing to the uses of Survivers as the notice of his Life; we shall allow it a distinct appartment, and once again break off the thred of our Discourse, for to resume it in its proper unentangled Clue.

Section the Third.

AT the opening of the Year 1660, when every thing visibly tended to the reduction of His Sacred *Majesty*, and all persons in their several stations began to make way and prepare for it, the good *Doctor* was by the Fathers of the Church desir'd to repair to *London*, there to assist in the great Work of the composure of Breaches in the Church: Which Summons as he resolv'd unfit either to dispute or disobey, so could he not without much violence to his inclinations submit unto. But finding it his Duty, he diverted all the uneasiness of antipathy and aversation into a deliberate preparation of himself for this new Theater of affairs on which he was to enter. Where his first care was to fortifie his mind against the usual temptations of Business, Place, and Power. And to this purpose, besides his earnest Prayers to God for his assistance, and disposal of him entirely to his Glory, and a diligent survey of all his inclinations, and therein those which were his more open and less defensible parts, he farther call'd in and solemnly adjur'd that Friend of his with whom he had then the neareſt opportunity of Commerce, to study and examine the last ten Years of his Life, and with the justice due to a Christian Friendship to observe his failances of all kinds, and shew them to him: which being accordingly attempted, the product, after a diligent inquest, only proving the representation of such defects which might have past for Vertue in another person; his next prospect was abroad, what several ways he might do good unto the publick: and knowing that the Diocese of *Worcester* was by the favour of His *Majesty* design'd his Charge, he thought of several opportunities of Charity unto that place, and among others particularly cast in his mind for the repair of the Cathedral Church, and had lay'd the foundation of a considerable advance unto that work. Which early care is here mention'd as an instance of his inflamed desire of doing good, and singular zeal to the House of *God*, and the restoring of a decent Worship in a like decent place: For otherwise it was far from his Custom to look forward into future events, but still to attend and follow after Providence, and let every day bear its own Evil. And now considering that the Nation was under its great *Crisis* and most hopeful method of its Cure, which yet if palliate and imperfect would only make way to more fatal Sickness, he fell to his Devotions on that behalf, and made those two excellent Prayers which were publish'd immediately after his Death, as they had been made immediately before his Sickness, and were almost the very last thing he wrote.

Being in this state of mind fully prepar'd for that new course of life, which had nothing to recommend it to his taste but its unpleasantness, (the best allective unto him) he expected hourly the peremptory mandate which was to call him forth of his belov'd Retirements.

But in the instant a more importunate, though infinitely more welcome, Summons ingag'd him on his last Journey: For on the fourth of *April* he was seiz'd by a sharp fit

of

of the *Stone*, with thoſe ſymptoms that are uſual in ſuch caſes; which yet upon the voidance of a Stone ceaſed for that time. However on the eighth of the ſame month it return'd again with greater violence; and though after two days the pain decreas'd, the ſuppreſſion of Urine yet continued, with frequent Vomitings, and a diſtenſion of the whole Body, and likewiſe ſhortneſs of breath, upon any little motion. When, as if he had by ſome inſtinct a certain knowledge of the iſſue of his Sickneſs, he almoſt at its firſt approach conceiv'd himſelf in hazard: and whereas at other times, when he ſaw his Friends about him fearful, he was us'd to reply chearfully, *that he was not dying yet*; now in the whole current of his Diſeaſe, he never ſaid any thing to avert ſuſpicion, but addreſt unto its Cure, telling his Friends with whom he was, *that he ſhould leave them in God's hands, who could ſupply abundantly all the aſſiſtance they could either expect or deſire from him, and who would ſo provide, that they ſhould not find his removal any loſs.* And when he obſerved one of them with ſome earneſtneſs pray for his health and continuance, he with tender paſſion replied, *I obſerve your zeal ſpends it ſelf all in that one petition for my recovery; in the interim you have no care of me in my greateſt Intereſt, which is, that I may be perfectly fitted for my Change when God ſhall call me: I pray let ſome of your fervour be employ'd that way.* And being preſt to make it his own requeſt to God to be continued longer in the World, to the ſervice of the Church, he immediately began a ſolemn Prayer, which contain'd firſt a very humble and melting acknowledgment of ſin, and a moſt earneſt interceſſion for Mercy and Forgiveneſs through the Merits of his Saviour: next reſigning himſelf intirely into his Maker's hands, he begg'd *that if the Divine Wiſdom intended him for Death, he might have a due preparation for it; but if his Life might be in any degree uſeful to the Church, even to one ſingle Soul, he then beſought Almighty God to continue him, and by his grace enable him to employ that Life he ſo vouchſafed induſtriouſly and ſucceſsfully.* After this he did with great affection intercede for this Church and Nation, and with particular vigour and enforcement pray'd for *ſincere performance of Chriſtian duty now ſo much decayed, to the equal ſupplanting and ſcandal of that holy Calling; that thoſe who profeſs'd that Faith might live according to the Rules of it, and to the form of Godlineſs ſuperadd the Power.* This with ſome repetitions and more tears he purſued, and at laſt clos'd all in a Prayer for the ſeveral concerns of the Family where he was. With this he frequently bleſt God for ſo far indulging to his infirmity, as to make his Diſeaſe ſo painleſs to him; withal to ſend it to him before he took his Journey, whereas it might have taken him in the way, or at his Inn, with far greater diſadvantages.

Nor did he in this Exigence deſiſt from the exerciſe of his accuſtomed Candor and ſweetneſs, whereby he was us'd to entertain the addreſſes of the greateſt Strangers. For two Scholars coming at this time to ſee him, when they having ſent up their names, it appear'd they were ſuch as he had no acquaintance with, though they that were about the *Doctor*, conſidering his illneſs, propoſed that a civil excuſe might be made, and the Viſitants be ſo diſmiſs'd; he reſiſted the advice with greateſt earneſtneſs, ſaying, I will by no means have them ſent away, for I know not how much they may be concern'd in the Errand they come about, and gave order they ſhould be brought up: and when upon tryal it appear'd that a Complement was the whole affair, yet the good *Doctor* ſeem'd much ſatisfied that he had not diſappointed that unſeaſonable kindneſs.

Likewiſe his own neceſſities however preſſing, diverted not his concernments for thoſe of others. It ſo happen'd that a Neighbour-*Lady* languiſhing under a long weakneſs, he took care that the Church-Office for the ſick ſhould be daily ſaid in her behalf: and though at the beginning of the *Doctor*'s illneſs the Chaplain made no other variation, than to change the ſingular into the plural, yet when his danger encreas'd, he then thought fit to pray peculiarly for him; which the good *Doctor* would by no means admit, but ſaid, *O no, poor Soul, let not me be the cauſe of excluding her*; and accordingly had thoſe Prayers continued in the more comprehenſive latitude. And indeed thoſe Offices which had a publick character upon them he peculiarly valued. For as to the forms of Devotion appropriate to his Extremity, he took care they ſhould not exclude the publick ones, but ſtill gave theſe a conſtant place: and when in his ſharp agonies his Friends betook themſelves to their extemporary ejaculations, he compos'd thoſe irregularities by ſaying, *Let us call on God in the voice of his Church.*

And in ſeaſons of this kind whereas the making of a Will is generally an uneaſie task, as being at once a double parting with the World; to him it was in all reſpects agreeable and welcome. For having bequeath'd ſeveral Legacies to his Relatives and Friends, and left the remainder of his Eſtate to the diſpoſal of his intimate and approved Friend Doctor *Henchman*, now Lord Biſhop of *London*, as if recovered from the worſt part of his Diſeaſe, the neceſſity of reflecting upon Secular affairs, he became ſtrangely chearful, and overlook'd the encroaching importunate tyranny of Sickneſs.

On the twentieth of *April*, being *Good-friday*, he ſolemnly receiv'd the Sacrament; and

and again on the two and twentieth of *April*, which then was *Easter-day*. At which time when the number of Communicants was too great to have place in his Bed-Chamber, and the whole Office was over-long for him to go through with, it was ordered that the Service being perform'd in the usual appartment, a competent number should afterwards come up and communicate with him: Which though he allow'd as most fitting, yet he did so with grief and trouble, breaking out into this passionate complaint, *Alas! must I be excommunicated?* To be absent from any part of publick Worship he thus deeply resented: So far was he from their opinion (and they would be thought Godly too) who in their most healthful leisurable days make this not their penance, but election and choice.

Amidst his weakness and indisposition of all parts, in the act of Celebration his Devotion only was not faint or sick, but most intent and vigorous: yet equall'd by his infinite Humility, which discovered it self as in his deportment, so particularly in that his pathetical ejaculation, which brake forth at the hearing of those words of the Apostle, *Jesus Christ came into the world to save sinners*; unto which he rejoin'd, in an accent that neither intended a complement to God nor men, to either of which he was not under a temptation, *Of whom I am the chief.*

The Exuberance of this Humility appear'd in all other occasions of instance: particularly about this time a Letter being sent unto him, in which, among many expressions of great value, there was added an intimation, That *there was now hope the dayes were come when his desert should be considered, and himself imployed in the Government as well as the instruction of the Church*; at this he was hugely discomposed, and expressed a grief and anguish beyond that his Sickness in any period, however sharp, had extorted from him.

But now through the long suppression of Urine the blood grown thin and serous, withal made eager and tumultuous by the mixture of heterogeneous parts, the Excellent *Doctor* fell into a violent bleeding at the Nose; at which the by-standers being in astonishment, he chearfully admonish'd *to lay aside impatience in his behalf, and to wait God's leisure, whose seasons were still the best*: withal thankfully acknowledged God's mercy in the dispensation, alledging, *that to bleed to death was one of the most desirable passages out of this World.*

And truly he very justly made this observation; for it pleas'd the Divine Providence strangely to balance the symptoms of the *Doctor*'s Disease to his advantage: for the sharp pains of the Stone were allay'd by that heaviness of sense which the recuilment of serous moisture into the habit of the body and insertions of the Nerves occasion'd; and when that oppression endanger'd a Lethargick or Apoplectick torpor, he was retain'd from that by the flux of blood. Which several accidents interchangeably succeeded one the other, insomuch that in this whole time of Sickness he neither had long violence of torment, nor diminution of his intellectual faculties. And here this violent hemorrhage of which we now speak, being of it self even miraculously stopt, when all applications were ineffectual, a drowsiness succeeding, which happened at the time of Prayers, though he perfectly attended, and returned to every response amidst his importunate infirmity, he very sadly resented it saying, *Alas! this is all the return I shall make to this mercy, to sleep at Prayers.*

When he was in pain he often prayed for Patience, and while he did so, evidenc'd that his Prayer was heard; for he exercised not only that, but Thankfulness too, in his greatest extremity crying out *Blessed be God, blessed be God.* Among the providential alleviations of the Doctors Sickness, I shall not omit; because he valued it at a considerable rate, that he had the advantages of all the Offices of the Church, and Sacerdotal assistances; being attended not only by the domestick Chaplain, but Mr. *Dolben*, now the Lord Bishop of *Rochester*, during all his illness; who coming casually to visit him at the time of his first being amiss, departed not from him till after his Interment.

Nor did this excellent person according to the usual method, inflict his Sickness upon those about him, by peevishness disquieting his attendants; but was pleas'd with every thing that was done, and liked every thing that was brought, condescending to all Proposals, and obeying with all readiness every advice of his Physicians. Nor was it wonder he should so return unto the endeavours of his Friends, who had tender kindness for his Enemies, even the most inveterate and bloody. When the Defeat of *Lambert* and his Party, the last effort of gasping Treason in this Nation before its blest return unto Obedience, was told him, his only triumph was that of his Charity, saying with tears in his Eyes, *Poor Souls! I beseech God forgive them.* So habitual was Pity and Compassion to his Soul, that all representations concentred there: Vertue had still his Prayers, because he lov'd it; and Vice enjoyed them too, because it wanted them.

In his own greatest desolations he administer'd reliefs to those about him, mixing Advices

vices with his Prayers, and twiſting the tenderneſs of a Friend to that of the Chriſtian, he then diſpens'd his beſt of Legacies, his Bleſſings; moſt paſſionately exhorting the young growing hopes of the Family, whoſe firſt innocence and baſhful ſhame of doing ill he above all things labour'd to have preſerv'd, *to be juſt to the advantage of their education, and maintain inviolate their firſt baptiſmal Vows:* then more generally commended unto all the great advantage of *mutual friendly Admonitions.* On which occaſion when the good *Lady* ask'd him what more ſpecial thing he would recommend unto her for her whole life, he briefly replyed, *Uniform Obedience:* Whereby (if we may take a Comment from himſelf at other times) he meant not only a ſincere reception of Duty as ſuch, becauſe commanded, and not becauſe 'tis this or that, pleaſant or honourable, or perchance cheap or eaſie duty; but withal the very condition of Obeying, the lot of not being to chuſe for ones ſelf, the being determin'd in all propoſals by humane or Divine Command, and where thoſe left at large, by the guidance of God's Providence, or the aſſiſtance of a Friend.

But amidſt theſe moſt Chriſtian divertiſements, theſe happieſt *anodynes* of Sickneſs, the 25 of *April* fatally drew on, wherein his flux of Blood breaking forth again with greater violence than it had done before, was not to be ſtopp'd by outward applications, nor the revulſives of any kind, not of its own, the opening of a Vein, firſt in the Arm, and after in the Foot; till at laſt the Fountain being exhauſted, the torrent ceas'd its courſe, and indeed that Vital one which its regular motion kept on foot: for the good *Doctor* leaving off to bleed about three of the Clock in the Afternoon, became very weak and dif-ſpirited, and cold in the extreme parts, yet at this time Doctor *Willis*, and another Friend of the Doctors coming in, who alarm'd with the news of his danger, had in part of that day come from *Oxford*; he obſerving them ſtand by his Bed-ſide, found ſtrength enough to ſay, with great tenderneſs of paſſion, *This is very kindly done*; which I mention, as the laſt teſtimony which he gave of the reſentments which he had of Friendſhip, of which no man ever was a greater Votary; and which he thought of weight enough to interrupt his dying Prayers, and laſt addreſſes to his Maker: Having ſaid this, he preſently returned to his Devotions, and in them perſevered unto the laſt period of his life, about a quarter or half hour before his Death breathing out thoſe words which beſt became his Chriſtian Life, *Lord make haſt*, which he repeated three or four times.

And ſo upon that very day, or, if he did not expire till after Midnight, (for in that concern, the Company that happen'd to be preſent had not leiſure to conſult Clocks or Watches) the Morrow after that, on which the *Parliament* conven'd, which lay'd the foundation of our Releaſe and Liberty, and brought at once this Nations return from its Captivity, and its Gracious Sovereign Prince, this great Champion of Religion and Pattern of all Vertue, as if reſerv'd for Maſteries and Combats of exigence and hazard, for Perſecution and Sufferings, was taken hence, and by his loſs repreſt the overflowing and extravagance of thoſe joyes that waited the reception of His *Sacred Majeſty.*

'Twill be below the greatneſs of the Perſon as well as of this Loſs, to celebrate his Death in Womaniſh Complaints, or indeed by any verbal applications; his Worth is not to be deſcrib'd by any Words beſides his own, nor can any thing beſeem his Memory but what is Sacred and Eternal as thoſe Writings are. May his juſt Fame from them and from his Vertue be precious to ſucceeding times, grow up and flouriſh ſtill: and when that Characters engrav'd in Braſs ſhall diſappear, as if they had been writ in Water, when Elogies committed to the truſt of Marble ſhall be illegible as whiſper'd accents, when *Pyramids* diſſolv'd in duſt ſhall want themſelves a Monument to evidence that they were once ſo much as ruine; let that remain a known and claſſick Hiſtory deſcribing him in his full Pourtraicture among the beſt of Subjects, of Friends, of Scholars, and of Men.

The *dead body* being opened (which here is mentioned, for that the Reader cannot want the curioſity to deſire to know every thing that concern'd this great Perſon) the principal and Vital parts appear'd ſound; only the right Kidney, or rather its remainder, which exceeded not the bigneſs of an Egg, was hard and knotty, and in its cavity, beſides ſeveral little ones, a large Stone of the figure of an Almond, though much bigger, whoſe leſſer end was faln into the Ureter, and as a ſtopple clos'd it up; ſo that 'tis probable that Kidney had for divers Years been in a manner uſeleſs. The other Kidney was ſwoln beyond the natural proportion, otherwiſe not much decayed; but within the Ureter four Fingers breadth a round white Stone was lodged, which was ſo faſtned in the part, that the Phyſician with his Probe could not ſtir it, and was fain at laſt to cut it out: and ſo exactly it ſtop'd the paſſage, that upon the Diſſection the water before enclos'd guſh'd forth in great abundance: from whence it appeared perfectly impoſſible for Art to have ennobled it ſelf in the preſervation of this great Perſon; as it was alſo

manifeſt

manifeſt that nothing but the conſequences of his indefatigable Study took him from us, in the perfection and maturity, the 55*th* Year of his Life.

On the 26*th* day of the ſame Month, in the Evening, he was, according to his deſire, without Oſtentation or Pomp, though with all becoming Decency, buried at the Neighbouring-Church of *Hampton*, with the whole Office and uſual Rites of the Church of *England*, ſeveral of the Gentry and Clergy of the County, and affectionate multitudes of perſons of leſs quality attending on his Obſequies, the Clergy with ambition offering themſelves to bear him on their Shoulders; which accordingly they did, and laid that Sacred burthen in the Burial-place of the generous Family which with ſuch Friendſhip had entertain'd him when alive: where now he reſts in Peace, and full aſſurance of a glorious Reſurrection.

Having thus given a faithful, though imperfect, draught of this *excellent Perſon*, whoſe Vertues are ſo far from imitation by practice, that they exerciſe and ſtrain the comprehenſion of words; and having ſhewed how much he has merited of this Nation in its moſt preſſing Exigents, both by his Writings and by his Example, and perchance above both theſe by his unwearied interceſſion in Devotion; it may poſſibly be neither uſeleſs nor unacceptable to offer a requeſt unto the *Reader* in his behalf, and ſhew him an expedient whereby he may pay his debt of gratitude, and eminently oblige this *holy Saint* though now with God.

'Tis this, to add unto his account in the day of Retribution by taking benefit by his Performances: and as he being dead yet ſpeaks, ſo let him perſwade likewiſe.

That the *Covetous Reader* would now at his requeſt put off his ſordid Vice, and take courage to be Liberal, aſſured by his Example, that if in the worſt of times Profuſeneſs could make Rich, Charity ſhall never bring to Beggery.

That the *Proud* opinionated perſon on the ſame terms would in civility to him deſcend from his fond heights, inſtructed here that lowly Meekneſs ſhall compaſs great reſpects, and inſtead of Hate or Flattery be waited on with Love and Veneration.

That the *Debauch'd* or *Idle* would leave upon this ſcore his lewd unwarrantable joyes, convinc'd that ſtrict and rugged Vertue made an Age of Sun-ſhine, a life of conſtant Smiles, amidſt the dreadfulleſt Tempeſts; taught the Gout, the Stone, the Cramp, the Colick, to be treatable Companions, and made it eligible to live in bad times and dye in flouriſhing.

That the *Angry* man, who calls Paſſion at leaſt Juſtice, poſſibly Zeal and Duty, would for his ſake aſſume a different temper, believe that Arguments may be anſwer'd by ſaying Reaſon, Calumnies by ſaying No, and Railings by ſaying nothing.

The *Coward* and *Diſloyal*, that durſt not own in words, much leſs by ſervice and relief, his Prince; that complemented his Apoſtaſy and Treaſon by the ſoft terms of changing an Intereſt, will from hence learn that the ſureſt way to ſafety is to have but one Intereſt, and that eſpous'd ſo firmly as never to be chang'd; ſince ſuch a Conſtancy was that which a *Cromwel* durſt not perſecute.

That the *employ'd in Buſineſs* would from hence diſmiſs their fears of regular Piety, their Suſpicion that Devotion would hinder all diſpatch and manage of affairs; ſince it appear'd, his conſtant Office (like the Prayer of *Joſuah*, which made the Sun ſtand ſtill) ſeem'd to have render'd unto him each day as long as two.

That the *Ambitious* perſon, eſpecially the Eccleſiaſtick, would think employment and high place a Stewardſhip, that renders Debtors both to God and man; a reſidence at once of conſtant labour and attendance too; a Precipice that equally expoſes both to Envy and to Ruine: and conſequently to be that which ſhould become our greateſt fear and terror, but at no hand our Choice: ſince it was that which this heroick conſtancy was not aſhamed to own a dread of, and whoſe appearance did render Death it ſelf relief and reſcue.

Laſtly, that the *narrow Self-deſigning* perſon, who underſtands no kindneſs but advantage; the *Senſual*, that knows no love but luſt; the *Intemperate*, that owns no Companion but Drink; may all at once from him reform their bruitiſh Errours: ſince he has made it evident that a Friend does fully ſatisfie theſe diſtant and importunate deſires, being as the moſt innocent and certainly ingenuous entertainment, ſo beſides that the higheſt mirth, the greateſt intereſt and ſureſt pleaſure in the World.

They that had the happineſs of a perſonal acquaintance with this beſt of men, this Saint, who ſeems in our decays of ancient Vertue lent us by ſpecial Providence even for this end and purpoſe, that we might not disbelieve the Faith of Hiſtory delivering the Excellency of primitive Chriſtians; know with what thirſt and eagerneſs of Soul he ſought the ſpiritual advantage of any ſingle man how mean ſoever, with what enjoyment he beheld the recovery of any ſuch from an ill courſe and habit. And whatever

apprehenſions other men may have, they will be eaſily induc'd to think, that if bleſſed Spirits have Commerce with Earth, (as ſurely we have reaſon to believe it ſomewhat more than poſſible) they, I ſay, will reſolve it a connatural and highly agreeable acceſſion unto his fruitions, that when there is joy in the preſence of the Angels of God for a Sinner that repents, he may be an immediate acceſſory to that bleſſed triumph, and be concern'd beyond the rate of a bare Spectator.

Perſwaſions to Piety now-adays are uſually in ſcorn call'd Preaching: but 'tis to be hoped that this, how contemptible an Office ſoever it be grown, will be no indecency in this inſtance; that 'twill not be abſurd if his Hiſtory, who deſervedly was reckoned among the beſt of Preachers, whoſe Life was the beſt of Sermons, ſhould bear a correſpondence to its Subject, and profeſtly cloſe with an application: That it adjures all perſons to be what they promiſed God Almighty they would be in their Baptiſmal Vows, what they ſee the Glorious Saints and Martyrs and Confeſſors, and in particular this holy man has been before them; be what is moſt honourable, moſt eaſie and advantageous to be at preſent; and, in a word, to render themſelves ſuch as they deſire to be upon their Death-Beds, before they leave the World and then would be for ever.

Which bleſt atchievement as it was the great deſign of the Excellent *Doctor*'s both Words and Writings, his Thoughts and Actions, is alſo (beſides the payment of a Debt to Friendſhip and to Vertue) the only aim of this imperfect, but yet affectionate and well-meant, account: And may Almighty *God* by the aſſiſtance of his Grace give all of theſe this their moſt earneſtly-deſired effect and iſſue.

By

By the generous Piety of the Right Reverend Father in God *Humphrey* Lord Biſhop of *Sarum*, there is now Erected to the Sacred Memory of this Great Perſon in the Pariſh Church of *Hampton*, the place of his Interment, a fair Monument of White Marble bearing this Inſcription.

HENRICUS HAMMONDUS,

Ad cujus Nomen aſſurgit
Quicquid eſt gentis literatæ,
(Dignum Nomen
Quod Auro, non Atramento,
Nec in Marmore perituro, ſed Adamante potiùs
Exaretur)
Muſagetes celeberrimus, vir planè ſummus,
Theologus omnium conſummatiſſimus,
Eruditæ pietatis Decus ſimul & Exemplar;
Sacri Codicis Interpres
Facilè omnium oculatiſſimus,
Errorum Malleus
Poſt homines natos feliciſſimus,
Veritatis Hyperaſpiſtes
Supra-quam-dici-poteſt Nervoſus;
In cujus Scriptis
Eluceſcunt
Ingenii Gravitas & Acumen,
Judicii Sublimitas & Ἀκρίβεια,
Sententiarum Ὄγκος & Δεινότης,
Docendi Methodus utiliſſima,
Nuſquam dormitans Diligentia.

Hammondus *(inquam)* ὁ πεῖρος,
In ipſa Mortis Vicinia poſitus,
Immortalitati quaſi contiguus,
Exuvias Mortis venerandas
(Præter quas nihil Mortale habuit)
Sub obſcuro hoc Marmore
Latere voluit,
VII. *Cal. Maias,*
Ann. Ætat. LV.
MDCLX.

The Marble Tablet would receive no more in charge; but ours indulging greater Liberty, I ſhall ſet down the whole Elogy, as it grew upon the affectionate Pen of the Reverend Doctor *T. Pierce*, who was employ'd to draw it up.

Sed latere qui voluit, Ipſas Latebras illuſtrat;
Et Pagum aliàs obſcurum
Invitus cogit inclareſcere.
Nullibi Μνημόσυνον *Illi poteſt deeſſe,*
Qui, niſi ἀξιομνημόνευτον,
Nihil aut dixit aut fecit unquam.
Ἀνδρὶ γὰρ γυναικὶ πᾶσα γῆ τάφος.
Animi dotibus ita Annos anteverterat,
Ut in ipſâ linguæ infantiâ τελειωτὴς,
Eâque ætate Magiſter Artium,

Quâ

Quâ vix alii Tyrones, eſſet.
Tam ſagaci fuit Induſtriâ,
Ut horas etiam ſubciſivas utiliùs perderet
Quam pleriq; mortalium ſerias ſuas collocârunt.
Nemo rectiùs de ſe meruit,
Nemo ſenſit demiſſiùs;
Nihil eo aut excelſius erat, aut humilius.
Scriptis ſuis factiſque
Sibi Uni non placuit,
Qui tam Calamo quàm Vitâ
Humano generi complacuerat.
Ita Labores pro Dei ſponſa, ipſoque Deo exantlavit.
Ut Cœlum ipſum Ipſius Humeris incubuiſſe videretur.
Παεαλληλίαν omnem ſupergreſſus
Romanenſes vicit, profligavit Genevates,
De utriſque triumphârunt
Et VERITAS & HAMMONDUS:
Utriſque meritò triumphaturis,
Ab Hammondo *victis, &* Veritate.
Qualis Ille inter Amicos cenſendus erit,
Qui demereri ſibi adverſos vel Hoſtes potuit?
Omnes hæreſes incendiarias
Atramento ſuo deleri maluit,
Quàm ipſorum aut ſanguine extingui,
Aut diſpendio animæ expiari.
Cœli Indigena
Eò Divitias præmittebat,
Ut ubi Cor jam erat,
Ibi etiam theſaurus eſſet:
In hoc uno avarus,
Quòd prolixè Benevolus prodigâ manu erogavit,
Æternitatem in Fœnore lucraturus.
Quicquid habuit, voluit habere;
Etiam invalidæ Valetudinis.
Ita habuit in deliciis non magis facere *quàm* ſufferre
Totam Dei Voluntatem, ut frui etiam videretur
Vel morbi Tædio.
Summam animi γαλωλω teſtatam fecit
Hilaris frons & exporrecta:
Nuſquam aliàs in Filiis Hominum
Gratior ex pulchro veniebat Corpore Virtus.
Omne jam tulerat punctum,
Omnium plauſus:
Cùm Mors, quaſi ſuum adjiciens Calculum,
Funeſtâ Lithiaſi *terris abſtulit*
Cœli avidum,
Maturum Cœlo.
Abi, Viator,
Pauca ſufficiat delibâſſe:
Reliqua ſeræ poſteritati narranda reſtant,
Quibus pro merito enarrandis
Una ætas non ſufficit.

A PRACTICAL CATECHISM.

LIB. I.

SCHOLAR.

I Have, by the grace of God, and your help and care, attained in some measure to the understanding of the Principles of Religion, proposed to those of my age by our Church Catechism; and should in modesty content my self with those Rudiments, but that I find my self, as a Christian, not only invited, but obliged to grow in Grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Of Divinity.

Shall I therefore beseech you to continue my guide, and to direct me first, what kind of questions it will be most useful for me to ask, and you to instruct me in; that I may not please my self, or trouble you with less profitable speculations?

Catechist. I will most readily serve you in this demand, and make no scruple to tell you, that that kind of *knowledge* is most useful, and proper to be superadded to your former grounds, which tendeth most immediately to the directing of your Practice; for you will easily remember, that it was the form of the young man's question, Mark 10. 17. *Good Master, what shall I do that I may inherit eternal life?* and our books tell us, that the *Oracle*, (that is, the *Devil* himself) was inforced to proclaim *Socrates* to be the wisest man in the world, because he applied his studies and knowledge to the *moral* part, the squaring and ordering of mens lives: and *Gerson*, a very learned and pious man, hath defined * *Divinity*, of all others, to be an *affective*, not onely *speculative*, knowledge; which you will best understand the meaning of, by a very ancient Writer's words, which are in English these, that * *The end of Christian Philosophy is to make men better, not more learned; to edifie, not to instruct.* Of Practical Points.

* *Theologia est Scientia affectiva, non speculativa.*

* Ἵνα τὸ τέλος βελτίους ἡμᾶς, ἢ διδάξαι; Cl. Al. in pæd.

S. I shall most willingly intrust my self to your Directions: and though the vanity of my heart, and the unruliness of my youthful affections, may perhaps make me an improper Auditor of such Doctrines; yet I hope the Doctrines themselves, and the assistance of Gods grace, obtainable by our Prayers, may be a means to fit me to receive profit by them. I beseech you therefore to tell me your opinion, what kind of Doctrines, and what parts of Scripture, will be likely to have the most present influence on my heart, or contribute most to a Christian Practice.

C. I conceive, especially these five: first, the Doctrine of the *first* and *second Covenant*, together with the difference of them: secondly, the *Names*, and (in one of them intimated) the *Offices of Christ*: thirdly, the *Nature* of the *Three Theological Graces*, *Faith*, *Hope*, and *Charity*, together with *Self-denial*, and *Repentance*, or *Regeneration*: fourthly, the difference and dependence betwixt *Justification* and *Sanctification*: and lastly the thorough understanding of our Saviours *Sermon on the Mount*, set down in the fifth, sixth and seventh Chapters of Saint *Matthew*'s Gospel. And when those are done, I may perhaps give you a second view of some particulars which you have already learned, but not so distinctly in order to *Practice*: Such are the *Creed* it self, the *Sacraments*, and the *vow of Baptism*, a most *practical* point. But you will be frighted with the length of this task, and discouraged from setting out on so tedious a journey. The principal sorts of them.

S. I shall think it unreasonable for me to be tired with receiving the largest favours that you have the patience and the charity to bestow upon me: and to shew you that I have an appetite to the journey, I shall not give you the least excuse of delay, but put you in mind where it was that you promised to set out, or begin your first stage, and beseech you to go before me my guide and instructer, first in the Doctrine of the two Covenants: *To which purpose my Ignorance makes it necessary for me to request your first help, to tell me what a* Covenant *is.*

C. A *Covenant* is a mutual compact, (as we now consider it) betwixt God and man, consisting of *mercies* on God's part made over to man, and of *conditions* on mans part required by *God*.

S. It will be necessary for me to demand, first, what you mean by the first Covenant? Sect. I. *Of the first Covenant.*

C. I mean that which is supposed to be made with *Adam*, as soon as he was created, before his first sin, and with all mankind in him.

S. What then was the mercy on God's part made over to him in that Covenant?

C. It consisted of two parts, one sort of things supposed before the Covenant, and absolutely given to him by God in his *creation*: another promised, and not given but upon *condition*. The mercies given in it.

S. What is that which is absolutely given?

C. 1. A *Law* written in his heart, teaching him the whole duty of man. 2. A *positive Law*, of not eating the fruit of one tree in the garden, all others but that one being freely allowed him by God. 3. A *perfect Strength* and ability bestowed on him to perform all that was required of him, and by that a possibility to have lived for ever without ever sinning. Absolutely.

S. What is that which was promised on condition?

On condition. *C.* 1. *Continuance* of that light and that ſtrength, the one to direct, the other to aſſiſt him in a perſevering performance of that perfect obedience. 2. A crown of ſuch performance, aſſumption to eternal felicity.

S. What was the condition upon which the former of theſe was promiſed?

C. Walking in that *Light*, making uſe of that *ſtrength*; and therefore upon defailance in thoſe two, (on commiſſion of the firſt ſin) that *light* was dimmed, and that ſtrength (like *Sampſon*'s when his locks were loſt) extreamly weakned.

S. What was the condition upon which the Eternal felicity was promiſed?

C. Exact, unſinning, perfect Obedience, proportioned to the meaſure of that ſtrength; and conſequently upon the commiſſion of the firſt ſin, this *crown* was forfeited, *Adam* caſt out of Paradiſe, and condemned to death, and ſo deprived both of *Eternity* and *felicity*: and from that hour to this there hath been no man living (*Chriſt* only excepted, who was God as well as man) juſtifiable by that *firſt Covenant*, *all* having *ſinned, and ſo coming ſhort of the Glory of God* promiſed in that *Covenant*.

S. You have now given me a view of the firſt Covenant, and I ſhall not give my curioſity leave to importune you with more queſtions about it. Only, if you pleaſe, tell me, what condition Adam, *and conſequently mankind, were concluded under, upon the defailance or breach of the condition required in that firſt Covenant: for I perceive* Adam *ſinned, and ſo brake that condition.*

The ſtate of man after the breach of the firſt Covenant. *C.* I have intimated that to you already, and yet ſhall further enlarge on it. Upon the fall of *Adam*, he and all mankind forfeited that perfect light and perfect ſtrength, and became very defective and weak both in Knowledge and ability of performing their duty to their Creator; and conſequently were made utterly uncapable of ever receiving benefit by that *firſt Covenant*. It being juſt with God to withdraw that high degree of ſtrength and grace, when he ſaw ſo ill uſe made of it.

S. But why ſhould God inflict that puniſhment upon all mankind, for (or upon occaſion of) the ſin of that one man? Though he uſed his talent ſo very ill, others of his poſterity might have uſed it better, and why ſhould they all be ſo prejudged upon one mans miſcarriage?

God's wiſdom therein. *C.* Many reaſons may be rendred for this act of God's, and if they could not, yet ought not his *wiſdom* to be arraigned at our *tribunal*, or judged by us. Now this is an act of his *wiſdom*, more than of diſtributive *juſtice, it being free for him to do what he will with his own*, and ſuch is his *Grace* and his *Crown*. But the moſt full ſatisfactory reaſon may be this, Becauſe *God* intending to take the forfeiture of that *firſt Covenant*, intended withall to make a *ſecond Covenant*, which ſhould tend as much (or more) to the main end, the eternal felicity of mankind, as (or than) the firſt could have done. And that you will acknowledge when you hear what this *ſecond Covenant* is.

S. I beſeech you then, What is the ſecond Covenant? and firſt, With whom was it made?

Of the ſecond Covenant. *C.* It was made with the ſame *Adam* now after his fall, in theſe words, *The ſeed of the woman ſhall break the Serpents head*, Gen. 3. 15. and afterwards repeated more plainly to *Abraham*, Gen. 22. 18.

S. But who is that Seed of the Woman?

C. It is our Saviour *Jeſus Chriſt*, which ſprang from the Progeny of that Woman.

S. What then is the firſt thing promiſed in that ſecond Covenant?

The promiſes thereof. *C.* The giving of *Chriſt*, to take our nature upon him, and ſo to become a kind of ſecond *Adam*, in that nature of ours to perform *perfect, unſinning* Obedience, and ſo to be juſt according to the condition of the *firſt Covenant*, and yet being faultleſs to undergo a ſhameful death voluntarily upon the *Croſs*, to ſatiſfie for the ſin of *Adam*, and for all the ſins of *all mankind*, to *taſte death for every man*, Heb. 2. 9. to die for all thoſe which were *dead in Adam*, 2 Cor. 5. 15. And this being the firſt thing, all other parts of this *Covenant* are conſequent and dependent on this, and ſo the ſecond *Covenant* was made in *Chriſt*, ſealed in his blood, (as it was the cuſtom of the *Eaſtern Nations* to ſeal all *Covenants* with *blood*) and ſo confirmed by him, which is the meaning of thoſe words, 2 *Cor.* 1. 20. *All the Promiſes of God in him are Yea, and in him Amen*, that is, are *verified* (which is the importance of *Yea*) and *confirmed* (which is meant by *Amen*) into an immutability, in, or by Chriſt.

S. Well then, what are the promiſes or mercies made over unto us in Chriſt, *and ſince his coming into the world, by this ſecond Covenant?*

The firſt mercy, Gracious precepts. *C. Firſt*, (that which is peculiar to Chriſt, ſince his coming into the world) the giving us ſuch *precepts* as by their own inward goodneſs are able to approve themſelves to our reaſonable nature, and ſo to the meaneſt as well as learnedeſt men, (whereas the more *Moſaical* obſervances were of another nature, ſuch as whoſe goodneſs depends wholly on Gods Commanding them) and again not outward *carnal* obſervances (as the *Moſaical* were) but *ſpiritual*, to the purifying of affections; *viz. that Law of Faith*, according to which we Chriſtians ought to live. And this is ſet down as a part of that Covenant. *Heb.* 8. 10, 11. (taken out of *Jer.* 31. 31.) where the duty of the *new Covenant*, which under the times of Chriſt ſhould be *revealed*, is ſet down) firſt, privatively) not like that of *Moſaical* Obſervances, external and carnal, *v.* 9. but (poſitively) laws given into their *minds and hearts*, *v.* 10. i. e. agreeable to the rational Soul, and [*I will be their God, and they ſhall be my people*] i. e. ſincere, honeſt *obedience*; not ſuch as was fit to be impoſed on *hard-hearted Jews*, to encumber and traſh them, but ſuch as becomes an ingenuous people: and then it follows, *v.* 11. *They ſhall not teach*, &c. *i. e.* there ſhall be no need of ſuch laborious inſtruction out of the Law, what to doe in point of *abſtinences, ſacrifices, uncleanneſſes, purgations*, &c. as among the *Jews*; and laſtly, *I will be merciful to their unrighteouſneſs*, &c. free pardon to all true penitents, and ſincere ſervants of God, meerly by Gods free *grace* and mercy in Chriſt, without thoſe expiations under the Law. So again, (where this *New Covenant* is ſet down) *Rom.* 10. 8. out of *Deut.* 30. 11, &c. *The commandment which I command thee this day, is not hidden from thee*, (the Hebrew word there is by the Tranſlators beſt expreſt, * *it is not too heavy for thee*) and in other places, † *it is not impoſſible for thee*; and that farther expreſt in *Deut. v.* 12. 13. *it is not in heaven, nor beyond ſea*, &c. *i. e.* it will coſt no great pains to bring you to the *knowing* of it, nor, if you pleaſe, to the *practiſing*, it being very agreeable and conſentaneous to every ones nature, the very ſoul within us being able to tell us, that what *Chriſt commands*, is better even for us, as *men*, than any thing elſe; and therefore it follows, v. 14. *it is very nigh thee, in thy mouth, and in thy heart,*

* οὐκ ἔστιν ὑπερογκον.
† οὐκ ἀδύνατον.

that

that thou maiſt do it, i. e. it is very *eaſie* for thee to *learn* and *underſtand*, *and practiſe* alſo. And what this is, is punctually ſet down in that tenth to the *Roman*, v. 9. *confeſſing of Chriſt, and cordial belief of his Reſurrection*; the firſt containing under it a ſticking faſt to Chriſt when the *Chriſtian* Doctrine or profeſſion is *perſecuted*, and the ſecond, a *riſing* from ſin as he *roſe*, a new *Chriſtian* life, in the practice of thoſe rules of life which he hath left us. To this purpoſe again is that of Saint *John*, that *Chriſts commandments are not grievous*, not *heavy*, or unſupportable; and of Chriſt himſelf, that his *yoke is eaſie*, (the * Greek ſignifies more,) *a good, a gracious yoke*, and *his burthen a light burthen*. The ſecond *mercy* made over to us by the ſecond *Covenant*, is, (that even now intimated) the promiſe of *pardon* or *mercy to our unrighteouſneſs, and our ſins, and our iniquities*, Heb. 8. v. 12. to wit, to the frailties which thoſe that ſerve God ſincerely do yet fall into, and whatever *enormities* they have formerly been guilty, but now repented of. The third is, the giving of *grace* or *ſtrength*, although not perfect, or ſuch as may enable us to live without ever ſinning, yet ſuch as is ſufficient to perform what is neceſſary now under this ſecond Covenant, or ſo as God in *Chriſt* will accept, according to that of Saint *Paul*, that *he can do all things through Chriſt that ſtrengthens him*; able to do nothing of himſelf, in order to the attaining of bliſs, (*We are not ſufficient of our ſelves*, ſaith he in another place, *to do any thing*) but yet through *Chriſt that ſtrengthens me, I can do all things* that are now required of me, (*Our ſufficiency is of God.*)

* χρηστὸς.

The ſecond Mercy, pardon of ſins.

The third Mercy, Giving of ſtrength.

S. *I beſeech you, where is this part of the Promiſes of the ſecond Covenant ſet down in Scripture?*

C. 'Tis intimated in theſe and many other places, but is diſtinctly ſet down in the ſong of *Zachary*, Luk. 1. 74. he there ſpeaks of the *oath which God ſware to our father Abraham*, v. 72. which he ſtyles God's *holy Covenant*, v. 72. and he ſpecifies two parts of it: 1. *Deliverance* or ſafety from the power of our *enemies, Sin and Sathan*, in theſe words, *that we being delivered* † *without fear*, (for ſo the pointing of the Greek words in the moſt ancient copies teach us to read) that is, without danger, ſafe and ſecure, *out of the hand of our enemies*: 2. *Giving of power* or *ſtrength* to us, to enable us *to ſerve him*, ſo as he will accept of, and to perſevere in that ſervice, in the reſt of the words [that *he would grant* (or, as ‖ the word is rendred, *Rev.* 11. 3. *give power*) *unto us that we might ſerve him* (or, *to ſerve him*) *in holineſs and righteouſneſs before him all the days of our life.*]

Luke 1. 74.

† ἀφόβως, ἀκινδύνως.

‖ δοῦναι.

S. *This place is, I acknowledge, a clear one to the purpoſe, and I have nothing to object againſt it; onely pardon my curioſity, if having been told by you, that this ſecond Covenant was repeated to* Abraham, *Gen.* 22. 16. *and finding it here called the Oath ſworn to* Abraham, *and yet by reading of that Oath in* Gen. *not finding any ſuch form of words there expreſt, I beſeech you to ſatisfie this ſcruple of mine, and reconcile thoſe two places, which both you and the margents of our Bibles acknowledge to be parallel the one to the other, but the ſound of the words doth not ſo readily conſent to it. The granting me this favour may, I hope, make the whole matter more perſpicuous.*

The Oath unto *Abraham.*

C. I am of your opinion, and therefore ſhall readily do it, and it will coſt me no more pains than this. 1. To tell you that there is one part of the *Oath* mentioned in *Gen.* which belonged peculiarly to the temporal proſperity of the people of the *Jews*, which were to ſpring from that *Abraham*, [*I will multiply thy ſeed*, &c.] and indeed that whole verſe 17. may literally and primarily be referred to that; but then, beſides that, (which *Zachary* reſpecteth not) there are three things more promiſed, *ſpiritual bleſſings, ſpiritual victory*, and the *incarnation of Chriſt*: the laſt of theſe *Zachary* mentions not in the words of the Oath, becauſe it is ſuppoſed in his whole ſong, (occaſioned only by it, and uttered on purpoſe to celebrate the Incarnation of *Chriſt*;) but the other two parts are ſpecified and interpreted by him; the victory over (or *poſſeſſing the gates of*) *the enemies* there, is here called *deliverance (without fear or danger) from the hands of our enemies*; and the *bleſſing* there, is explained here to be *giving* us power *to ſerve him in holineſs and righteouſneſs before him all our days*, that is, giving us the Grace of God for the amending of our lives, according to that of the Apoſtle, *Gal.* 3. 14. where the *receiving the promiſe of the Spirit* is called the *bleſſing* of *Abraham*, the power of *Chriſt* (aſſiſting and enabling us to perſevere) being really the moſt ineſtimable *bleſſing* that this life is capable of: to which purpoſe Saint *Peter*, *Acts* 3. 26. ſpeaking of Chriſt *ſent* by *God to bleſs us*, expreſſeth the thing wherein that *bleſſing* conſiſts, to be, *in turning away every one from his iniquities.*

Interpreted.

The bleſſing of *Abraham.*

S. *I have troubled you too far by this extravagance; I ſhall make no delay to recall my ſelf into the rode again, and having been taught by you theſe ſeveral particulars of God's promiſe in the ſecond Covenant, I ſhall deſire you to proceed to tell me what is the condition required of us in this Covenant; unleſs perhaps there be ſome farther particulars promiſed on God's part, which you have not yet mentioned.*

C. The truth is, there be two more Promiſes of God (though implied in the third degree beforementioned, yet fit now to be more explicitely inſiſted on) the firſt, of giving *more grace*, the ſecond, of *crowning with glory*; but both theſe are conditional promiſes. The firſt, upon condition that we make uſe of thoſe former talents, thoſe weaker degrees of grace given us, which is the intimation of the Parable of the Nobleman, *Luk.* 19. 13. the ſumm of which is, that *unto every one that hath* (that is, hath made good uſe of the talent of grace intruſted to him, as *Heb.* 12. 28. *to have grace*, ſignifies to make uſe of it to the end to which it is deſigned) *ſhall be given, and from him that hath not*, (*i. e.* hath not made that uſe he ought) *even that he hath ſhall be taken from him.* The ſecond, upon condition that he be (at the day of death or judgment) ſuch a man, as Chriſt now under the ſecond *Covenant* requires him to be.

The fourth promiſe, Giving more grace.

The fifth promiſe, Crowning with glory.

S. *What then is the condition of the ſecond Covenant, without which there is yet no ſalvation to be had?*

The condition of the ſecond Covenant.

C. I ſhall anſwer you firſt negatively, then poſitively. *Negatively*, it is not, 1 *perfect, exact, unſinning obedience*, the never offending at all in any kind of ſin; (this is the condition of the *firſt Covenant*;) nor 2 is it never to *have* committed any *deliberate* ſin in the former life; nor 3 never to have *gone* on or continued in any habitual or cuſtomary ſin for the time paſt: but it is *Poſitively*, *the new creature*, or renewed, ſincere, honeſt, faithful obedience to the *whole Goſpel*, giving up the *whole heart* unto Chriſt, the performing of that which God enables us to perform, and *bewailing* our infirmities, and frailties, and ſins, both of the paſt and preſent life, and *beſeeching* God's pardon in Chriſt for all ſuch; and ſincerely labouring to mortifie every ſin, and perform uniform obedience to God, and

Negatively.

Poſitively.

from every fall rising again by repentance and reformation. In a word, the *condition* required of us, is a *constellation* or conjuncture of all those *Gospel graces*, *Faith*, *Hope*, *Charity*, *Self-denial*, *Repentance*, and the rest, every one of them truly and sincerely rooted in the Christian heart, though mixed with much weakness and imperfection, and perhaps with many sins, so they be not wilfully and impenitently lived and died in, for in that case nothing but perdition is to be expected.

S. *What part of the Promises is it, of which this condition is required to make us capable?*

C. *Pardon* of sins, and *Salvation*: by which you see that no man shall be *pardoned* or *saved*, but he that observes this *condition*.

S. *What condition is then required to make us capable of that other part of the conditional promise, to wit, of* more grace, *or* continuance *of that we have already?*

C. A careful industrious *husbanding* of it, and daily *prayer* for daily *increase*, and attending diligently to the *means* of grace.

S. *Methinks I understand somewhat of the nature and difference of these two* Covenants, *and shall not need to ask you which of them it is, in which we* Christians *are now concerned, for I take it for granted that it is the second. Only be pleased to tell me which of these two it was by which the* Jews *were to expect salvation?*

C. Both *Jew* and *Gentile*, that is, every man that ever was or shall be saved from the beginning of the world, was, and is, and shall be saved by this *second Covenant*.

S. *How then were the* Jews *obliged to the observation of the Law? is not the Law the first* Covenant?

The Jews concernment in the *second Covenant*.

C. The *Judaical* law was not the first *Covenant*, (in the notion wherein now we take it) but the *Law* of unsinning perfect *Obedience* made with *Adam* in innocency. The truth is, the *Judaical* Law did represent unto us the first *Covenant*, and that especially, and therefore is so called, *Heb.* 8. but so it did the second also: the first by requiring perfect *obedience*, and pronouncing a curse on him that *continued not in all* those many burthensome ordinances which the law gave no power to any to perform; the second, in the *sacrifices*, and many other *rites*, which served as Emblems to shew us *Christ*, and in him the *second Covenant*.

S. *I shall not interpose any more difficulties, which my ignorance might suggest, but only put you in mind, that you told me that this doctrine had a most present influence on our lives: be pleased to shew me how.*

The influence of this doctrine on mens lives.

C. It hath so, many ways; I shall mention a few. First, By prescribing the *condition*, it sets us a work to the performance of it, and that is, living well. Secondly, By shewing us how possible or feasible that condition is by the grace and help of *Christ*, it first obliges us to a diligent *performance* of that duty of *Prayer* for that *Grace*, and then stirs us up to Endeavour and Industry in doing what we are enabled to do, that we receive not *the grace of God in vain*. Thirdly, By shewing us the necessity, indispensible necessity of sincere Obedience; it shuts the door against all temptations to carnal security, sloth, presumption, hypocrisie, partial obedience, or habitual going on in sin. And fourthly, By shewing the true grounds of *hope*, it fortifies us against *desperation*. And lastly, If we need any encouragements in our *Christian* walk, his *promise* to *enable* first, and then to *accept*, will most abundantly contribute to that purpose.

S. *I acknowledge the usefulness of your Directions, and I beseech God to assist me in bringing forth the fruit which it is just for you to expect, and for God to require from them: and I promise you by his help to be mindful of your Admonitions.*

Sect. II. *Of the names of Christ.*

I shall desire you to proceed to the second kind of Doctrine which at first you mentioned; the names, *and in one of them the* offices *of* Christ. *I beseech you, What names do you mean?*

C. Those two eminent and vulgarly known, so often repeated, but so little weighed, *Jesus* and *Christ*.

S. *I pray you what is the importance of the word* Jesus?

Of the name JESUS. Matth. 1. 21.

C. It is an *Hebrew* word which signifies *Saviour* or *Salvation*. I shall not need to prove it, when an Angel hath asserted it, *Matth.* 1, 21. *Thou shalt call his name* Jesus: *for he shall* save *his people from their sins.*

S. *The place you cite I have considered, and find some difficulty in it, by giving my self liberty to read on to the two next verses, the words of which are these*: All this was done that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the Prophet, saying, Behold, a Virgin shall conceive and bear a *Son*, and they shall call his name *Emmanuel*. *How could his name be called* Jesus *and* Emmanuel *too?* or, *How could the calling his name* Jesus, *be the fulfilling of that Prophecy that foretold that they should call his name* Emmanuel?

C. You are to know that in the *Hebrew* tongue, *word* and *thing*, and so also *calling* and *being*, *name* and *person*, are all one; *No word shall be impossible with God*, is, *nothing shall be impossible*: and, *My house shall be called a house of Prayer*, is, my house *shall be* the house of Prayer, *to all People*, that is, to the *Gentiles* as well as *Jews*: and, so many *names*, that is, so many *men*: and according to that idiom, (retained both in the *Prophets* of the *Old* and *Evangelists* of the *New Testament*) this phrase [*they shall call his name Emmanuel*] is in signification no more than this, *He shall be God with us*, or *God incarnate* in our flesh; which incarnation of his, being on purpose *to save his people from their sins*, that Prophecy which foretold it, was perfectly fulfilled in his birth and circumcision, at which time he was called *Jesus*. Which name was but a signification of his design in his coming into the world, according to another place; *This day there is born in the City of David a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord.*

Emmanuel.

S. *By the answering of my impertinent scruple, I have gained thus much knowledge*, viz. *that the whole end of* Christs *birth, of all he did and suffered for us, was that he might save us. I pray you then, what is meant by* Saving?

Saving from sin.

C. *To save* is to *redeem* from *sin*, as you will acknowledge, if you observe but these two plain places; first, that which even now I cited, *Matth.* 1. 21. [*He shall save his people from their sins,*] (which is the only reason there rendred, why he is called a *Saviour*) then *Tit.* 2. 14. *Christ gave himself* to be crucified for us, that he *might redeem us from all iniquity.*

S. *Wherein doth this saving or redeeming from sin consist?*

In three things.

C. In three things: First, in obtaining *pardon* for sin, or reconciling us to God, and (consequently to

to that) in delivering us from the eternal torments which from *God* as *Judge*, and from *Satan* as *accuſer* firſt, and then as *executioner*, are, in ſtrict juſtice, or by the firſt *Covenant*, due to ſin. Secondly, in calling men to Repentance, thereby weakening the *reigning* power of *ſin*, and the *tempting* power of *Satan*, by mortifying the old man, (that is, the ſinful *deſires* of the *natural* and ſinful *habits* of the *carnal* man) and by implanting a new *principle* of holineſs in the heart. And thirdly, in *perfecting* and accompliſhing all theſe ſo happy beginnings, at the end of this life in Heaven.

S. *How can it be ſaid that* Chriſt *came thus to* ſave, *to do all this, when ſo many, ſo long after his coming, are ſo far from being thus ſaved in all or any of theſe three ſences?*

How then it comes that all are not ſaved.

C. That he came to *ſave* is certainly true, whatſoever objections you can have againſt it: and that by *ſaving* theſe three things are meant, if you pleaſe, I ſhall manifeſt from other Scriptures. The firſt ſence is contained in the word, (as it is uſed, *Luke* 1. 71.) * *ſalvation*, or *that we ſhould be ſaved from our enemies*, which muſt needs be our ſpiritual enemies, Sin and Satan: and if you doubt whether *ſin* be there meant, or the *pardon of ſin* by that ſaving, the next verſe will clear the difficulty, where it follows, [a] to *perform the mercy*, or *mercifully* to deal with our *fathers*, and *to remember his holy Covenant*, of which Covenant you know this is one ſpecial part, *Heb.* 8. 12. [b] *I will be merciful to their ſins*, (which explains the merciful dealing there) and *their iniquities will I remember no more.* And then for the ſecond ſence, that *ſaving* ſignifies calling to Repentance, may appear not only by comparing thoſe two places, [*I came to call ſinners to Repentance*] and [*Chriſt Jeſus came into the world to ſave ſinners*;] but alſo by a notable place, *Acts* 2. very uſeful for the explaining of that word, *v.* 38. 'tis reported that Saint *Peter* ſaid unto them, *Repent, &c.* and *v.* 40. [c] *in more other words he teſtified unto them, or preached* unto them, ſaying, [d] *Be ye ſaved*, or *eſcape ye, from this perverſe generation*: whence it is clear, that being ſaved, *&c.* is but more other words to ſignifie Repentance, and therefore ſurely that word, *v.* 47. which we render [e] *ſuch as ſhould be ſaved*, but is literally [*the ſaved*] ſignifies peculiarly thoſe who received that exhortation, *v.* 41. that is, thoſe that repented of their ſins; and accordingly it is rendred by the Syriack [*The Lord added daily ſuch as became ſafe in the Church*] *i. e.* which recovered themſelves from that danger in which they were involved in that *wicked generation*, and betook themſelves to the Church, as to a Sanctuary. But this by the way. As for the laſt acception of the phraſe, it is ſo ordinary for *Salvation* to ſignify the holy pure life in heaven, that I ſhall not need give you any proof of it. Having therefore cleared the truth, this were ſufficient, although I wanted skill to anſwer your objection: but yet that may eaſily be done too, by ſaying that *Chriſt* hath really performed his part toward every one of theſe, and that whoſoever hath not the effect and fruit of it, it is through his own wilful neglect, and even deſpiſing of ſo great ſalvation. *Light came into the world, and men loved darkneſs more than light:* and, having made a *Covenant with death* and damnation, are moſt *worthy to have their portion therein.*

* σωτηρια.

[a] ποιῆσαι ἔλεον μετὰ, &c.

[b] ἵλεως ἔσομαι.

Acts 2. 40.

[c] ἑτέροις πλείοσι.

[d] σώθητε.

[e] σωζόμενοι.

S. *What then is the ſhort or ſum of* Chriſt's *being* Jeſus?

How Chriſt is a Saviour.

C. 'Tis this, that he came into the world to fetch back ſinners to heaven, [f] that whoſoever of mankind ſhould truly repent and fly to him, ſhall through him obtain *pardon of ſin and ſalvation*; a mercy vouchſafed to *men*, but denied to *Angels*, who being once fallen, are left in that wretched eſtate, and no courſe taken, and conſequently no *poſſibility* left for their *recovery*: which moſt comfortable truth is clearly ſet down by the Apoſtle, *Heb.* 2. 16. though in our *Engliſh* reading of it, it be ſomewhat obſcured. The words rightly rendred run thus: [g] *He doth not take hold of Angels, but of the ſeed of Abraham he taketh hold.* Where the word which I render *taking hold of*, ſignifies to *catch* any one who is either running away, or falling on the ground, or into a pit, *to fetch back* or *recover again.* This Chriſt did for men in being born, and ſuffering in our fleſh, but for *Angels* he did it not.

[f] Χειρὶ αἵματι παντὶ κόσμῳ μεταvοίας χάριν ἐκήρυξεν, *Clem. Rom. Ep. ad Cor.* p. 10.

Heb. 2. 16.

[g] Οὐ γὰρ δήπου ἀγγέλων ἐπιλαμβάνεται, ἀλλὰ σπέρματος Ἀβραὰμ ἐπιλαμβάνεται.

S. *What ſpecial influence will this whole Doctrine have upon our lives?*

The influence of this on mens lives.

C. I will ſhew you. 1. It is proper to *ſtir up* our moſt affectionate *love* and *gratitude to this Saviour*, who hath deſcended ſo low, even to the *death* of the *croſs*, to ſatisfie for our ſins, to obtain *pardon* for us: this *love of Chriſt conſtraineth us*, ſaith the Apoſtle. 2. It is proper to beget in us a juſt *hatred of ſin*, which brought God out of heaven to make expiation for it. 3. It is a moſt proper enforcement of *repentance* and *amendment* of life, to remember, 1. That without *that* we are likely to be little benefited by this Saviour; *except we repent*, *Salvation* it ſelf ſhall not keep us from *periſhing*: 2. That *that* was an end of *Chriſt*'s death, *to redeem us from all iniquity, and purifie to himſelf a peculiar people, zealous of good works*, and not only to *ſatisfie* for us. 4. It is proper to teach us *fear of offending*, and keep us from ſecurity, when 1. we find what an *exemplary puniſhment* God ſaw fit, if not neceſſary, to inflict on ſin in the perſon of his Son: and 2. remember how much more guilty we now ſhall prove, if we will ſtill damn our ſelves in deſpight of all theſe precious means of ſaving us.

Of the name *Chriſt*, and his three Offices.

S. *I beſeech God to open my heart to theſe Conſiderations, and then I ſhall further importune you to proceed, and tell me the ſignification of the word* Chriſt, *wherein you told me the* Offices *of* Chriſt *were intimated: but I beſeech you firſt, What do you mean by* Offices?

What Office ſignifies.

C. I mean by that word, places of *charge* and *dignity*, to which God thought fit to deſign Chriſt, that he might the better accompliſh the end for which he ſent him; the *truſt* or *charge* ſuppoſing ſomewhat to be done by him, and the *dignity* implying ſomewhat to be returned by us, as you will ſee in the particulars.

S. *What then is meant by the word* Chriſt?

C. *Anointed*, and that intimates the three *offices* to which men were at any time inaugurated by God, ſuch inauguration being fitly expreſt (becauſe ordinarily ſolemnized among men) by the ceremony of *anointing*.

S. *What are thoſe three offices?*

C. Of *King*, and of *Prieſt*, and of *Prophet*.

Of *Chriſt*'s Kingly Office.

S. *What belonged to* Chriſt *to do as* King?

C. To ſet up his *throne* in our *hearts*, or to *reign* in the *ſouls* of men, and to give evidence of his power through the whole world.

S. *What was required of him to that purpoſe?*

C. 1.

Over his Enemies, Temporal and Spiritual.

C. 1. To weaken and shorten the power of Satan, which Christ really did at his suffering, *Heb.* 2. 14. by *death* destroying the *Devil*, *casting Lucifer from Heaven*, that is, from the more unlimited power which he had before, and 2. to give *strength* and grace to overcome all rebellious lusts, and habits of sin, to bring them down in obedience to his *Kingdom*, and this he hath done also by sending his Spirit, (in reference to which are those words cited out of the Psalmist, *He hath led captivity captive, and given gifts unto men,*) and in a word, *to reign till he had brought all his enemies under his feet*, 1 Cor. 15. 25.

S. What and how many be those enemies?

C. He hath many enemies, some *temporal*, but most *spiritual*.

S. What mean you by his temporal enemies?

Temporal, 1. the Jewes.

C. I mean first the *Jewish* Nation, that rejected and crucified him, which within the compass of one generation were, according to his prediction, destroyed by the *Romans*, and preyed upon by those *Eagles*, *Mat.* 24. 28. by which allusively are noted the *Roman* Armies (whose *Ensign* was the [h] *Eagle*) which found them out (as such [i] *Vultures* do the carcase, *Job* 39. 30.) whereseever they dispersed themselves. For that that prophecy of Christ's, *Mat.* 24. belongs to this matter, primarily or strictly, (not to the day of Judgment) to the destruction of those present *crucifiers*, and the *Jewish* state, and not to the destruction of *all enemies* at his great Appearing yet to come, is apparent by the 34 verse, *This generation shall not pass till all these things be fulfilled*: where the word [k] *generation* signifies such a space that they that were then alive, might and should live to see it, in that sence as the word is used, *Matth.* 1. where the time or space of fourteen mens lives in a line succeeding one another, is called fourteen *generations*; not that *generation* signifies the whole space of a mans life; (for that is oft sixty, eighty, or an hundred years) but rather [l] the third part of that: For of any mans age, part he lives in his fathers life time, and part after his sons birth; and thereupon it is wont to be said that three Generations make one *sæcle* or hundred years, as you shall find it did in the *Genealogies*, *Mat.* 1. and ordinarily it doth. So that the plain meaning of that speech of Christ [*this generation shall not pass*, &c.] is this, that all this should come to pass in their *age*, or within the life of some that were then men, as [m] *Matth.* 16. 28. *There be some standing here which shall not taste of death till they see the Son of man coming in his Kingdom.* Which though some by the next chapter following are perswaded to interpret of the *transfiguration*, (as if that were *Christ's coming in his Kingdom*) may yet more properly be interpreted of this matter, so immediately consequent to his being killed by the *Jews*, and *rising again*, v. 21. (which was the ground of this speech of his) *viz.* Christ's illustrious *coming* to destroy those *Jews*: to which also that other place belongs, (which will clear both these) [n] *Joh.* 21. 22.) *If I will that John tarry till I come, what is that to thee?* which (saith S. *John*) was not to be interpreted, *that he should never die*, v. 23. but only that he should *tarry* till this coming of Christ; which of all the Disciples peculiarly, (and I think, only) *John* lived to see, and (as I think I have reason to believe) immediately before it, saw many visions concerning it, which are set down in his *Revelation*. This destroying or subduing his Enemies and Crucifiers (so terrible, that when it is foretold, *Matth.* 24. it is generally mistaken for the day of final judgment) is many times in the *New Testament* styled the *Kingdom of God*, and *the coming of Christ*, the *end of all things*, and the *end of the world*, because Christ's powerful presence was so very discernible in destroying of that Nation, and in that effect of his *Kingdom*, in *bringing* his *enemies under his feet*: and is without doubt the thing designed in that whole 24*th* Chapter of Saint *Matthew*, and every part of it, and particularly in those ver. 29, 30, 31. (which are by most thought to belong to another matter. For the *darkning* of the *Sun and Moon*, *and falling of the Stars from Heaven*, are not *literally* to be understood, (or if they were, would perhaps as little belong to the day of the *last judgment*) but in the same sence that the Prophets use them, *Isai* 13. 10. and 34. 4. *Ezek.* 32. 7. *Joel* 2. 31. perhaps to signifie no more, but only a great slaughter, or effusion of blood; that (say the Naturalists) sending forth abundance of hot exhalations, which first fill the air with black clouds, taking away the light of heaven, the sight of the stars, *&c.* and at last turn into meteors in the shape of falling stars, as *Esa.* 34. 4. and *Rev.* 6. 13. On which ground it is, that those phrases of *the Sun being turn'd into darkness*, *and the Moon not giving her light*, *and the falling of the stars from heaven*, are used in Prophetical (which seldom are clear) speeches, for great slaughters and destructions, and nothing else. But there is another more commodious way of interpreting that whole verse; by the *Sun* and *Moon* and *Stars* understanding the *Temple* and City of *Jerusalem*, and the rest of the Cities of *Judea*, and by the *darkning* and *falling* of them, the great *tribulations* and *destructions* that should befal all these; both which are very agreeable to the style wherein Prophecies are written. Which being supposed to be the interpretation of the 29*th*. verse, that of the *sign of the Son of man*, and his *coming*, ver. 30. and *the sound of the trumpet gathering of the Elect*, ver. 31. will without much difficulty belong to it also, and signifie the remarkableness of this punishment on the *Jews*, as an act of signal revenge from the *crucified* Christ, and the saving or delivering of a *remnant* (according to all the Prophecies) *i. e.* of some few *Jews*, out of this general incredulity and slaughter.

[h] Καὶ γὰρ ἀετοὶ ἔφων λαγεώνων δόξα πεσεῖται, *Sib. Or. l.* 8. *p.* 3. speaking of the *Roman* power.

[i] *Homer* calls the Eagle περκνὸν θηρητῆρα, Ιλ. ω. *a sagacious hunter.*

[k] Γενεὰ Homero, Tullio, *ætas, triginta annorum spatium. vid. Rhodig. l.* 19. *c.* 22. *& Homer of Nest.* Ιλ. α. Τῷ δ' ἤδη δύο μὲν γενεαὶ, *& Herodot. lib.* 2. *p.* 114. Καὶ τοι τριακοσίαι μὲν ἀνδρῶν γενεαὶ διωδέκαται μέσεα ἔτεα, *& Clem. Alex. Strom. l.* 2. *p.* 334. ὡς τὰ ἑκατὸν ἔτη τρεῖς ἐγκαλαλίγουσιν γενεαί. *Vid. Hesych.* with whom the word is taken to signify either the life of a man, or 30 years, or 25, or 20. as it is also for 7 years by the *Physicians*, and for 10. clearly in *Jer. Epist. v.* 2.

[m] Mat. 16. 28.

[n] Joh. 21. 22.

S. Were there any other sort of Temporal enemies to be destroyed by him?

2 The *Romans*.

C. Yes, those other who joined with the *Jews* in crucifying of him; I mean, the *Romans themselves*, or heathen *Rome*; On which that another *cup* of *Gods wrath* was to be poured out, is, I conceive, the importance of another great part of the *Revelation*, which was remarkably fulfilled by *Alaricus* and others, in sacking it and destroying the *Heathen*, but sparing the *Christian* part of it: In which also was remarkably founded the conversion of that City and Empire from *Heathenism* to *Christianity*, and so the subjecting it to Christ's Kingdom.

S. You have satisfied both my reason and my curiosity in this particular, and I shall not importune you further; I pray then, besides these rebellious crucifying Jews and Romans, what other enemies did you mean?

Spiritual Enemies: Sin. Satan.

C. First, *Sin*, the great enemy of Souls, which he labours to destroy in this life by the power of his grace, and will totally destroy at the day of Judgment. Secondly, *Satan*, (which I told you of) who therefore, when Christ comes to dispossess him of his hold in the poor man, demands, *Art thou come to*

destroy

deſtroy us? Mark 1. 24. and at another time, *Art thou come to torment us before our time?* acknowledging that Chriſt was to deſtroy him, (he underſtood ſo much in the ſacred predictions) but withal hoping it was not yet the time for that execution, and in the mean while counting it a kind of deſtruction and torment to him to be caſt out or deprived of any of the power which he had over the bodies or ſouls of men.

S. *Are there no other enemies that this King muſt deſtroy?*

C. Yes, two more: Firſt, all wicked and ungodly men, that after all his methods of recalling them to amendment, do ſtill perſevere in impenitent rebellions, to whom eternal perdition belongs by the ſentence of this King, *Thoſe that will not let me reign over them, muſt be brought forth and ſlain before their King.* Secondly, *Death* it ſelf, according to that of the Apoſtle, 1 *Cor.* 15. *The laſt enemy that ſhall be deſtroyed, is death:* he ſhall deſpoil the grave, and make it reſtore all its captives, and then *death ſhall be no more*, ſhall be *ſwallowed up in victory.* Wicked men. Death.

S. *What is required of us in anſwer and return to this office of his?*

C. Principally and by indiſpenſable neceſſity, that we render our ſelves *obedient, faithful, conſtant ſubjects* to this King, hold not out any diſloyal Fort, any rebel luſt, or ſin againſt him, but as to a *King*, vow and perform entire allegiance unto him. And then conſequently that we entruſt him with our protection, addreſs all our petitions to him, have no war or peace, but with thoſe who are his and our common enemies or friends, fight his battels againſt *ſin* and *Satan*, pay him our tribute of *honour*, reverence, obedience: yea, and of our goods alſo, when they may be uſeful to any poor member of his. Our returns to Chriſt's Regal Office, &c.

S. *I ſhall detain you no longer with leſs neceſſary Queries about this office of his, as, When* Chriſt *was inaugurated to it: becauſe I have had the chance to obſerve, by comparing two known places of Scripture together (*Pſal. 110. 1. *and* 1 Cor. 15. 25.*) that* [*Chriſt's* reigning] and [*his* ſitting at God's right hand] *are all one; from whence I collect that the time of his ſolemn inauguration to his Regal Office was at his Aſcenſion.*

C. You have gueſſed aright, and therefore I ſhall not farther explain that unto you, nor put you in mind of any other niceties; but in ſtead of ſuch, rather remember you of the practical concluſion that this Office of Chriſt's may ſuggeſt unto you, that *you are no farther a Chriſtian, than you are an obedient ſubject of* Chriſt's; that his Goſpel conſiſts of *Commands* as well as *Promiſes*, the one the object of the Chriſtian *Faith* as well as the other.

S. *O Lord, increaſe this Faith in me.*

Pleaſe you now to proceed to the ſecond Office of Chriſt, that of his Prieſthood. Of Chriſt's Prieſtly Office.

C. I ſhall, and firſt tell you, that the nature of this Office of Chriſt is a little obſcure, and therefore I ſhall tell you nothing of it, but what the Scripture gives me clear ground to aſſert.

S. *What doth the Scripture tell us of* Prieſthood?

C. It mentions two orders of Prieſthood, one after the order of *Aaron*, the other after the order of *Melchizedek*. Two Prieſthoods.

S. *What was the office of the* Aaronical *Prieſt?* *Aaronical.*

C. To *offer ſacrifice* and to *bleſs* the people, but eſpecially to *ſacrifice.*

S. *What of the* Melchizedekian *Prieſt?* *Melchizedekian*

C. It is not improbable that *Melchizedek* offered ſacrifice alſo; but becauſe the ſacred ſtory mentions nothing of him as belonging to his Prieſthood, but only his bleſſing of *Abraham*, therefore it is reſolved that the *Melchizekian* Prieſthood conſiſted only in bleſſing. This you will beſt diſcern by looking into the ſtory of *Melchizedek* meeting *Abraham*, Gen. 14. 18, 19.

S. *What is there ſaid of him?*

C. It is ſaid that *Melchizedek* King of Salem *brought forth bread and wine*, (i. e. *treated and entertained* Abraham *as a King*) *and he was Prieſt of the moſt high God, and he bleſſed him, and ſaid, Bleſſed be* Abraham *of the moſt high God, which hath delivered thine enemies into thine hand.*

S. *Which of theſe kind of Prieſts was* Chriſt *to be?*

C. Chriſt being conſidered in the whole purpoſe of God concerning him, was to undertake both theſe Offices of *Prieſthood*, to be an *Aaronical* Prieſt firſt, and then for ever after a *Melchizedekian* Prieſt; he was appointed firſt to offer up ſacrifice for the ſins of the world, which he performed once for all upon the Croſs, and therein exerciſed the office of an *Aaronical* Prieſt, and withal compleated and perfected that whole work of ſatisfaction for ſin, to which all the old legal ſacrifices referred; and that being done, he was to enter upon his other office of *Melchizedekian* Prieſthood, and exerciſe that continually from that time to the end of the world, and therefore is called a *Prieſt for ever after the order of Melchizedek.* And this ſecond kind of Prieſthood is that which the Scriptures of the New Teſtament, eſpecially the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, doth mainly refer to, when it ſpeaks of *Chriſt*; and is to be conceived to ſpeak of that, whenſoever it indefinitely mentions *Chriſt*'s Prieſthood. Both in *Chriſt.*

S. *But what then? is not* Chriſt *a Prieſt after the order of* Aaron?

C. I told you that he *was*, but now I tell you that he *is* not: he was one in his death, but never was to repeat any act of that afterwards; and ſo now all the Prieſthood that belongs to him is the *Mechizedekian.* I will ſet this down more plainly. It is moſt truly ſaid and reſolved, that *Chriſt*'s death was a voluntary offering and ſacrifice of himſelf once for us, and that will ſerve to denominate him an *Aaronical* Prieſt in his death, or rather to conclude that his death was the completion of all the Rites and Ceremonies (ſuch as the ſacrifices) of the *Aaronical* Prieſthood. But this being but one act never to be repeated again, is not the thing that *Chriſt*'s eternal Prieſthood (denoted eſpecially by his Unction or Chriſm) refers to; but that other *Melchizedek* Prieſthood that he was to exerciſe ° for ever. Beſides, it may be ſaid that this ſacrifice at his death, may under that notion of an *Aaronical* ſacrifice, paſs for the Rite and Ceremony before his Conſecration, or at the conſecrating him to be our eternal high Prieſt. For ſuch ſacrifices we find mentioned, *Lev.* 8. 22. the *ram*, the *ram of conſecration*; and of this nature I conceive the death of *Chriſt* to be, a previous or preparatory But now only the *Melchizedekian.* ° *vi; & alibi.*

ratory *rite* to *Christ*'s Consecration to his great eternal Priesthood after the order of *Melchizedek*, whereupon it is said that it *became* [p] *God to consecrate the Captain of our salvation by sufferings*, *Heb.* 2. 10. for so the word signifies, which we render to *make perfect*. This suffering and satisfying for our sins, fitted him for the office of *Intercessor*. To which purpose you may observe two things: 1. That *Christ*'s Priesthood is said to be an *eternal* Priesthood [thou *art a Priest for ever*] and a Priesthood [q] not transitive, but for ever fastened in the person of Christ, *Heb.* 7. 24. *after the power* [r] *of an indissoluble life*, ver. 16. which cannot appertain to that one single finite unrepeated sacrifice of himself upon the Cross. 2. That *Christ* was not inaugurated to this his Priesthood till after his Resurrection, for then only he was instated in that indissoluble life: and this seemeth to be the importance of *Acts* 3. 26. where it is said, that *God having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you*: where questionless that [mission to bless] notes the office of the *Melchizedekian* Priesthood, and most probably the phrase of [*Raising him up*] denotes his Resurrection.

[p] τελειῶν.

[q] ἀπαράβατον.

[r] ἀκαταλύτου.

S. *Will not this notion of* Christ's *Priesthood derogate something from the suffering of* Christ, *or satisfaction wrought by it?*

The necessity of Christs death in two things.

C. No, nothing at all, but rather demonstrate that this death of his was necessary in a double respect: 1. As an act of an *Aaronical* Priest, and a completion of all those legal Rites which vanished at the presence of this great sacrifice. 2. That in respect of the satisfaction wrought by it, it was necessary to make him our eternal Priest, or to make us capable of the benefits of that Priesthood of his.

S. *Well then, I shall acknowledge those plain words of Scripture, that* Christ *is now to us* (*and* ever *shall be*) *a Priest of* Melchizedek's *order, and not strive to phansie him still an* Aaronical Priest (*that sacrifice being offered up once for all*) *because I have no ground now for such phansie. But then I beseech you, wherein lies the parallel betwixt* Melchizedek's *Priesthood and* Christ's? *Is it in* offering of bread and wine, *which we read of* Melchizedek, *or in any thing answerable to that?*

The parallel between *Melchizedek* and *Christ*.

Negatively.

C. No, that is the Papists phansie, caused by a great mistake of theirs: they conceive that *Melchizedek offered up bread and wine to God*, and that in that respect he is called a Priest, or that he was sacrificing, or did sacrifice. But in this there are two mistakes. For first, *Melchizedek brought forth* this *bread and wine*, and presented it to *Abraham*, did not offer it to God; (and therefore *Philo* a Jew, well seen in that story, sets it as an act of Hospitality in *Melchizedek*, not of Priesthood) contrary to the crabbed niggardliness of *Amalek*; *he would not allow water, but* Melchizedek *brought forth bread and wine*. Secondly, this he did as a King; and so Christ as a King may perhaps be said to entertain and feed us in the *Sacrament* with *bread* and *wine*, and the spiritual food annexed to, or represented by it, the giving of Grace and Pardon being a Donative of his Kingly Office; but the Priestly acts of *Melchizedek* are those that follow, wherein only *Christ*'s Eternal or *Melchizedek* Priesthood consists.

Positively, in

S. *What are they?*

C. 1 Blessing us. 2. Blessing God for us.

S. *What is the meaning of* Christ's blessing us?

1. Blessing us.

C. You will see that by reviewing the place even now cited, *Acts* 3. 26. *God having raised up his Son Jesus sent him to bless us*; which now you perceive is a denotation of his Priestly Office, every Priest, especially the *Melchizedek*-Priest, being to bless.

S. *I do so, but how doth that shew me what that blessing is?*

C. Yes, there are words that immediately follow, which clearly describe wherein this *blessing* consists, in *turning away every one of you from his iniquities*.

S. *Be pleased then to make use of that Key for me, and shew me clearly wherein that part of Christ's Priesthood*, his blessing *of us, consists*.

C. In using all powerful means to *convert* or *turn*, *i. e.* to bring all mankind to repentance.

S. *What be those means?*

The parts and branches of that.

C. First, the communicating that *spirit to us, whereby he raised up Jesus from the dead*, *Rom.* 8. 11. Secondly, *sending the Holy Ghost* (*to convince the world of sin, and righteousness, and of judgment*) that is, appointing a succession of Ministers to the end of the world to work in mens hearts a cordial subjection to that doctrine, which at Christ's preaching on earth was not believed. Thirdly, the giving of grace, inspiring of that strength into all humble Christian hearts, that may enable them to get victory over sin. Fourthly, his interceding with God for us, (which you know is the peculiar Office of the Priest) as he promised he would for Saint *Peter*, *that his faith fail not*; that is, that God will give us the grace of perseverance, (which intercession of his being now with power and authority, (*all power is given to me*, saith Christ) is all one in effect with the actual donation of that grace) and as a crown of this follows another kind of blessing, actual bestowing of heaven upon such blessed persevering children of his Father.

Our returns thereto.

S. *What is required of us in answer to this part of his Office?*

C. First, to seek and pray for grace to descend towards us through this conduit of conveyance. Secondly, to receive it when it thus flows, with humble grateful hearts. Thirdly, to count grace the greatest blessing in the world. Fourthly, to make use of it to the end designed by *Christ*; not to pride or wantonness or contempt of our meaner brethren, but to the converting and reforming of our lives. And fifthly, to look for no final benefit, pardon of sins, or eternal salvation from that Priest, either as suffering or satisfying for us, but upon the good use of his grace, which will engage us to walk painfully here, and to approach humbly to receive our reward, the crown not of our *works*, but God's *graces*, hereafter.

S. *What is the second part of* Christ's Melchizedekian Priesthood?

2. Blessing God for us.

C. Blessing or praising God for ever in heaven for his goodness, his mercy, his grace towards us poor sinful enemies of his, in giving us the victory over our so bitter adversaries, *sin*, and *Satan*, and *death*, and *hell*, by the *blood of the Lamb*, *and the power of his grace*.

S. *What is our part in this business?*

C. To follow this *Precentor* of ours, in blessing and magnifying that God of all grace, and never yielding

yielding to those enemies, which he hath died to purchase (and given us) power to resist and overcome.

S. *I do already discern the influence of this Office, thus explain'd, upon our lives: yet if you please, give me your direction and opinion, what is the main practical Doctrine emergent from this Office of* Christ, *especially as it consists in blessing?*

The influence of this Doctrine on our lives.

C. This is it, that from hence we learn, How far forth we may expect Justification and Salvation from the sufferings of Christ no farther, it appears, than we are wrought on by his renewing and sanctifying and assisting grace, this being the very end of his giving himself for us, not that absolutely or presently we might be acquitted and saved, but that he *might redeem us from all iniquity*, from the reigning power, as well as guilt, and that impartially, of *all iniquity*, and *purifie unto himself a peculiar people zealous of good works*, Tit. 2. 14. without which acquisition of purity, and zeal of good works in us, as in a peculiar people, Christ fails of his aim and design in dying for us, he is deprived of that reward of his sufferings, which is mentioned, *Isa.* 53. 10. *The seeing of his seed*, the having the *pleasure of the Lord* (which is said to be our *Sanctification*, 1 *Thess.* 4. 3.) *prosper in his hand, the seeing of the travail of his soul*, v. 11. *dividing his portion with the great, and the spoil with the strong*, verse 12. that is, rescuing men out of the power of sin to amendment of life, and to holiness, which is the crown and reward of his *pouring out of his Soul to death, and making intercession for the transgressors*. And if he fail of his hope, much more shall we of ours; after all that Christ hath done and suffered, the impenitent unreformed fiduciary shall perish. And what can you imagine more obligatory to good life than this?

S. *I acknowledge the truth of what you say to be very convincing, and shall think my self bound in charity to my poor tottering soul, no longer to flatter and fool my self with such vain hope, that* Christ's *active and passive obedience shall be imputed to me, unless I am by his blessing thus qualified to receive this benefit from his death. Yet now I think of it, if* Christ's *active obedience may be imputed to me, then what need have I of obeying my self? If the righteousness that was in him by never sinning be reckoned to me, what need I any other initial imperfect inherent righteousness or holiness of my own? this is to me a scruple yet not answered by you.*

Of Christ's active obedience.

C. I confess it is, for I have had no occasion to mention that *Active Obedience* of Christ, it being no part of his Priestly Office. And now if you will have my opinion of it, I conceive that Christ's *active Obedience* is not imputed unto any other person, so as he shall be thought perfectly to have obeyed by this only, because Christ hath perfectly obeyed; much less to him that lives in all kind of disobedience, and means Christs obedience shall serve his turn. For, first, if Christ's *active obedience* were thus imputed to me, then by that I should be reckoned of and accepted by God as if I had fulfilled the whole Law, and never sinned; and then I should have no need that Christ should suffer for my sins, and so this would exclude all possibility of having Christ's Passive obedience imputed to me. For what imaginable reason could be given, why I should suffer for sin, or any other surety for me, if by some former act I am accounted to have performed perfect unsinning Obedience, at least have the benefit of that obedience (performed by that Surety of mine, and accepted for me?) 'Tis true, when the penitent believer's sins are pardoned by the sufferings of Christ, Christ's perfect obeying the Law may so far be imputed to such an one, as to give a gloss or tincture to his still imperfect obedience, at least so far as that they shall be accepted by God: but that will not belong at all to, or avail for such as obey not sincerely; (for their impenitent sins are far different from those imperfections:) but only for them, that *walk not after the flesh, but after the spirit*, Rom. 8. 4. the prime place which seems to belong to that matter. Secondly, the truth is clear, that Christ's *active Obedience* was required in his person, as a necessary qualification to make it possible for him to suffer or satisfie for us: for, had he not performed *active* Obedience, that is, had *any guile* been *found in his mouth* or heart, had he ever sinned, he must have suffered for himself, and could no more have made satisfaction for us, than one of us sinners can do for another. It is true indeed, Christ merited as well as satisfied for us; but that by which he merited was not his never sinning or perfect obedience; (for that was due to the Law under which he was born) but his voluntary giving up himself to death, even to the death of the Cross, (and all that was preparative to it performed by him) freely, without any obligation or duty lying upon him (as a man) to do so, according to that of *Heb.* 10. 7. out of the *Psalmist*, *Then said I, Lo I come, to do thy will, O God; I am content to do it*; and *Phil.* 2. 6. Christ Jesus *being in the form of God*, &c. *made himself of no reputation, and took on him the form of a servant, and was made in likeness of men, and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the Cross*, which is there set as the foundation of his merit, [*Wherefore God hath highly exalted him*, &c.] By this means (it is true that) he merited for us as well as for himself: For us he merited grace and glory; for himself, that he might have the power of dispensing them to whom, and in what manner and measure he pleased: this was the meaning of those words, [*All power is given to me*, &c.] and [*God hath given him a name which is above every name*;] and [*when he ascended up on high, he gave gifts unto men.*] But all this you see is quite another matter from his *active obedience*, or fulfilling the Law, being so imputed to us, as that the drunkard shall be accounted sober, the Adulterer chaste on this one score, because Christ was sober and chaste in our stead. No, that which he merited for us, being the gift of grace, (which was on purpose to deliver us from the reigning power of sin, and to *bless us in turning every man from his iniquities*) a power of serving *God acceptably in righteousness and godly fear*, he is so far from meriting for us any excuse or immunity from the indispensable force of this obligation, that he *gave himself for us*, did and suffered all this to this very end, *Tit.* 2. 14. *That he might redeem us from all iniquity*, rescue us out of the slavery of every evil habit, and *purifie unto himself a peculiar people zealous of good works*: and if this use be not made of the grace which he purchased for us, if we do not *work out our own salvation with fear and trembling*, (which is the use which Saint *Paul* makes of the Doctrine of Christ's merit, *Phil.* 2. 12.) we shall have little priviledge by that part of his merit, and shall *fall short of the glory* purchased also. By all which 'tis clear that Christ's *active obedience* will not supply the place of ours, or make ours (I mean our sincere renewed obedience) less necessary, and consequently that

our renewed obedience and ſanctification, or ſincere, honeſt, faithful purpoſe of new life (witneſſed to be ſuch by the conformity of the future action) is ſtill moſt indiſpenſably required (though mixed with much of weakneſs, ignorance, frailties, recidivations) to make us capable of pardon of ſin or ſalvation, which ſure is the intimation of thoſe places which impute our Juſtification rather to the Reſurrection of Chriſt (and the conſequents of that, the ſubſequent acts of his Prieſthood heretofore mentioned) than to his death. Such are *Rom.* 8. 34. *It is God that juſtifieth, who is he that condemneth? It is Chriſt that died, yea rather that is riſen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who alſo maketh interceſſion for us:* which laſt words refer peculiarly to that act of this his Prieſthood in bleſſing or interceeding for us: And *Rom.* 4. 25. *who was delivered* (to death) *for our offences, and was raiſed again for our juſtification*; the Death of Chriſt not juſtifying any who hath not his part in his Reſurrection.

S. *I perceive this theme of Chriſt's Prieſthood to be a rich mine of Chriſtian knowledge, every ſcruple of mine opening ſo large a field of matter before you. I ſhall ſatisfie my ſelf with this competency which you have afforded me; I beſeech God, I may be able to digeſt it into kindly juice, that I may grow thereby.*

Of the Prophetick Office of Chriſt.

Pleaſe you now to proceed to the third and laſt Office of Chriſt, *that of a Prophet?*

C. I ſhall, and promiſe you not to exerciſe your patience ſo largely in that, as in the former.

Wherein it conſiſts.

S. *Wherein doth his Prophetick Office conſiſt? In foretelling what things ſhould happen to his Church?*

C. No, that is not the notion we have now of a Prophet, (although that he hath alſo done in ſome meaſure as far as is uſeful for us.)

S. *What other notion have you of a Prophet?*

C. The ſame that the Apoſtle hath of Propheſying, 1 *Cor.* 11. 4. and 14. 6.

S. *What is that?*

C. Expounding, ſignifying or making known the will of God to us.

S. *Wherein did Chriſt do that?*

C. In his Sermons, but eſpecially that on the Mount, telling us on what terms Bleſſedneſs is now to be had under the Goſpel, and revealing ſome Commands of God which before were (either not at all, or) ſo obſcurely revealed in the Old Teſtament, that men thought not themſelves obliged to ſuch obedience. Beſides this, the Prophetick Office was exerciſed in ordaining ceremonies and diſcipline for his Church, the uſe of the Sacraments, and the Power of the Keys, that is, the Cenſures of the Church.

S. *What elſe belongs to his Prophetick Office?*

C. Whatſoever elſe he revealed concerning the Eſſence and Attributes of God, concerning the myſtery of the calling of the *Gentiles*, and whatſoever other divine truth he revealed to his auditors, either in Parables or plain enunciations.

What we muſt return to it.

S. *What are we to return to this office of his?*

C. Our willing full aſſent, never doubting of the truth of any affirmation of his; a ready obedience to his inſtitutions and commands, neither deſpiſing nor neglecting the uſe of what he hath thought fit to preſcribe us, and ſubduing carnal proud Reaſon to the obedience of Faith.

S. *You have gone before me through the Names and Offices of Chriſt ſeverally: Is there any influence on practice that all of them jointly may be thought to have over and above what from the ſeverals you have ſhewed me?*

C. I ſhall commend only one conſideration to you for this purpoſe, that Chriſt being an union of theſe three Offices, *is a Jeſus, or Saviour finally to none but thoſe who receive him under all his three Offices uniformly into their hearts.*

S. *The Lord grant that I may do ſo, that I may be not a little way, or a partial, unſincere, but a true Chriſtian.*

Sect. III.

What hinders but that you now proceed, according to your method propoſed, to the particulars of the third rank, the Theological graces and Chriſtian vertues?

C. I ſhall, if your patience and appetite continue to you.

Of Faith.

S. *To begin then with the firſt, What is Faith?*

The ſeveral acceptions of the word.

C. There is not any one word which hath more ſignifications than this hath in the Word of God, eſpecially in the New Teſtament. It ſometimes ſignifies the acknowledgment of the true God, in oppoſition to *Heatheniſm*; ſometimes the *Chriſtian* Religion, in oppoſition to *Judaiſm*; ſometimes the *believing* the power of Chriſt to heal diſeaſes; ſometimes the *believing* that he is the promiſed *Meſſias*; ſometimes *fidelity* or faithfulneſs; ſometimes a *reſolution of Conſcience* concerning the lawfulneſs of any thing; ſometimes a *reliance*, *affiance*, or *dependence* on Chriſt either for temporal or ſpiritual matters; ſometimes *believing* the truth of all divine relations; ſometimes *obedience* to God's commands in the Evangelical not Legal ſence; ſometimes the *Doctrine of the Goſpel*, in oppoſition to the *Law* of *Moſes*; ſometimes it is an *aggregate* of all other graces; ſometimes the *condition* of the *ſecond Covenant* in oppoſition to the *firſt*: and other ſences of it alſo there are diſtinguiſhable by the contexture, and the matter treated of where the word is uſed.

S. *I ſhall not be ſo importunate as to expect you ſhould travel with me through every of theſe ſeverals, but ſhall confine your trouble to that which ſeems moſt neceſſary for me to know more particularly. As firſt, which of all theſe is the notion of that* Faith *which is the Theological grace, diſtinct from Hope and Charity,*

1 Cor. 13. 13.

1 Cor. 13. 13.

C. It is there the *aſſenting to*, or *believing* the whole Word of God, particularly the Goſpel, and in that the Commands, and Threats, and Promiſes of that word, eſpecially the Promiſes. This you will acknowledge if you look on verſe 12. of that Chapter, and there obſerve and conſider,

Faith oppoſed to Viſion.

that Viſion in the next life is the perfecting of that Faith in this life, or that Faith here is turned into Viſion there, (as hope into enjoying) for this argues Faith here to be this aſſent to thoſe things which here come to us by hearing, and are ſo believed by adherence, or dark ænigmatical knowledge, but hereafter are ſeen or known demonſtratively, or *face to face*. Hence it is that Faith is defined by the Apoſtle, *Heb.* 11. 1. the [r] *confident expectation of things hoped for*, the [s] *conviction* (or being convinced, or aſſured) *of things which we do not ſee*. The confident expectation of things future, and at a diſtance,

[r] ὑπόστασις.
[s] ἔλεγχος.

diſtance, out of our reach, and the being convinced of the truth of thoſe things, for which there is no other demonſtration, but only the word and promiſe of God, and yet upon that, an inclination to believe them as aſſuredly as if I had the greateſt evidence in the world.

S. *I cannot but deſire one trouble more from you in this matter,* i. e. *to know what kind of Faith was the Faith of* Abraham, *which is ſo ſpoken of in the New Teſtament,* Rom. 4. Gal. 3. Heb. 11. Jam. 2. *and ſeems to be meant as the pattern by which our Faith ſhould be cut out, and upon which both he was, and we may expect to be, juſtified.* *Abraham's Faith.*

C. I cannot but commend the ſeaſonableneſs of the queſtion before I anſwer it, for certainly you have pitcht upon that which is the only ſure foundation and groundwork of all true knowledge and reſolution in this matter, *Abraham* being the *Father of the Faithful,* in whom that grace was moſt eminent, very highly commended and rewarded in the Scripture, and like whom we muſt be, if ever we expect to approve our ſelves to (or to be juſtified by) God.

S. *But what then was the Faith of* Abraham?

C. Many acts of *Abraham's* Faith there are mentioned in the New Teſtament, which were ſeveral exerciſes of that grace in him, and they are mentioned indiſtinctly, *Gal.* 3. as the pattern of that Faith which is now required under the Goſpel. But more eſpecially two there are, by which in two trials of his Faith he approved himſelf to God ſo far as that God imputed them to him for Righteouſneſs, *i. e.* accepted of thoſe acts of his as graciouſly as if he had performed perfect unſinning obedience, had lived exactly without any ſlip or fall all his life; yea, and gave him the honour of being called the *Friend of God.* Two ſpecial acts of it.

S. *What was the firſt of thoſe Acts?*

C. That which Saint *Paul* refers to *Rom.* 4. his *believing the Promiſe of God* made unto him, *Gen.* 15.

S. *What was that Promiſe?*

C. It conſiſted of two parts. Firſt, that God would ſhield and defend, or take him into his protection, and withal reward him abundantly for all the ſervice that he ſhould ever perform unto him. This Promiſe is ſet down, ver. 1. in theſe words, *Fear not, Abraham, I am thy ſhield and exceeding great reward.* The ſum of which is, that God will protect all thoſe that depend and truſt on him, reward all his faithful ſervants in a manner and meaſure inexpreſſibly abundant, and particularly, that he would then deal ſo with *Abraham,* a true faithful ſervant of his, and conſequently that he ſhould not fear. This promiſe it is not ſaid in the Text expreſly that *Abraham* believed; but yet it is ſo far implied that there is no doubt of it: for *Abraham's* queſtion, *ver.* 2. [*What wilt thou give me ſeeing I go childleſs?*] is in effect a bowing and yielding conſent to the truth of this promiſe, and firmly depending upon it, and thereupon proceeding to a ſpecial particular, wherein he deſired that favour of God to be made good to him, the giving him a Child for his Reward, whereas otherwiſe (having none, and ſo his ſervant being his only heir apparent) all the wealth in the world would not be valuable to him: and thereupon as a Reward of that his former Faith on the former Promiſe, God proceeds to make him that ſecond more particular Promiſe, which I called the ſecond part of it. The firſt conſiſting of two parts.

S. *What was that?*

C. The promiſe that he ſhould have an heir of his own body, from whom ſhould come a poſterity as numerous (or rather innumerable) as the ſtars of heaven, (and among them at length the *Meſſias,* in whom all the people of the world ſhould be bleſſed) for that is the meaning of [*ſo ſhall thy ſeed be, ver.* 5. and of the ſame words delivered by way of *Ellipſis,* Rom. 4. 18. *who believed that he ſhould be the father of many nations, according as had been ſaid to him by God*] *So* (i. e. *as the ſtars of heaven) ſhall thy ſeed be.* The ſecond part of the Promiſe being a particular contained before under the general of rewarding him exceedingly, but not till now explicitely revealed to *Abraham,* that God would then reward him by giving him a ſon, and a numerous poſterity, and the *Meſſias* to come from him, was a particular Trial whether his former belief were ſincere, *i. e.* whether he would truſt and depend on God or no, there being little reaſon for him to expect a child then, having remained ſo long without one, and ſo ſome difficulty in ſo believing; and then it follows that in this trial he was found faithful, *he believed,* v. 6. (or, as Saint *Paul* heightens it, *beſides,* or *beyond hope he believed, Rom.* 4. 18.) *and God counted it to him for righteouſneſs, i. e.* took this for ſuch an expreſſion of his faithfulneſs and ſincerity and true piety, that he accepted him as a righteous perſon upon this performance, though no doubt he had many infirmities and ſins, which he was or had been guilty of in his life, unreconcileable with perfect righteouſneſs.

S. *What was the ſecond of thoſe acts of* Abraham's *faith?*

C. That which Saint *James* mentions, *chap.* 2. 21. and Saint *Paul,* Heb. 11. 17. *offering up his Son* Iſaac upon the Altar. For God having made trial before of his faith in one particular, that of believing his Promiſe, makes now a new trial of it in another, that of obedience to his Commands: for when God gives Commands as well as Promiſes, the one is as perfect a ſeaſon and means of trial of faith as the other; and to ſay I have faith, and not thus to evidence it, not to bring forth that fruit of it, when God by expecting it and requiring it puts me to the trial, is either to manifeſt that I have no faith at all, or elſe not a through faith, but only for cheaper eaſier ſervices, not able to hold out to all trials, or elſe that this is but a dull liveleſs habit of faith without any vital acts flowing from it: which yet are the things that God commands, and without yielding of which in time of trial (or when occaſion is offered) the habit will not be accepted by him. The ſecond.

And this I conceive the cleareſt way of reconciling Saint *James* and Saint *Paul* in what is affirmed by them in this matter. *Abraham was juſtified by Faith,* ſaith Saint *Paul, Rom.* 4. and *not by works,* i. e. by believing and depending on God for the performance of his promiſe, and reſigning up wholly to him to obey his Precepts; or more clearly, by that Faith which, howſoever it was tried, whether by Promiſes of ſtrange incredible things, or Commands of very hard duties, (killing his only Son) did conſtantly approve it ſelf to be a true Faith, and ſo was accepted by God, without performance of abſolute unſinning obedience, much more without performance of the Moſaical Law, (*Abraham* then being uncircumciſed:) which two things, one or both, are generally by St. *Paul* meant Saint *James* reconciled with Saint *Paul.*

by *works*. But then ſaith Saint *James*, *Abraham was juſtified by works*, i. e. his Faith did approve its ſelf by faithful actions, particularly by offering up his ſon, that being an act of the greateſt fidelity and ſincerity and obedience in the world; and if in time of trial he had not done ſo, he had never paſſed for the faithful *Abraham*, had never been juſtified, *i. e.* approved or accepted by God: which is in effect all one with that which Saint *Paul* hath ſaid; neither one nor the other excluding or ſeparating faithful actions, or acts of faith from faith, or the condition of Juſtification, but both abſolutely requiring them as the only things by which the man is juſtified: only St. *Paul* diſputing againſt the Jew, who relied and depended on his legal righteouſneſs, mentions the works of the Law, and excludes them from having any thing to do toward Juſtification, leaving the whole work to Faith; and St. *James* diſputing not againſt the Jews, but uncharitable Gnoſticks, the pattern of all preſumptuous fiduciaries, hath no occaſion to add that excluſive part to ſhut out works, which belonged only to the Jew, but rather to prevent or cure that other diſeaſe, which he ſaw the minds of men through miſtake and abuſe of Saint *Paul*'s doctrine poſſeſſed with, or ſubject to, (thinking that a dead habit of Faith would ſerve the turn, and miſtaking every ſlight motion or formal profeſſion (ſuch as *bidding the poor go, and be rich*, and *giving them nothing*, ver. 16.) for that habit of faith) and in oppoſition to that, reſolveth that the *Faith which in time of trial*, when occaſion is offered, doth not bring forth acts, is ſuch a dead carcaſe of faith that God will never be content with to the juſtifying or accepting of any, or counting any man (as *Abraham*) *his friend*, for ſuch are none, ſaith Chriſt, but *thoſe which do whatſoever he commands them*, John 15. 14.

S. *I thank you for this very plain delineation of* Abraham's *Faith: be only now pleaſed, (to prevent any miſtake of mine) to change the ſcene, and bring home the whole matter to my own heart, and tell me what is that Faith which is required of me, and which alone will ſuffice to denominate me a child of faithful* Abraham, *and which will be ſure to be accounted to me for righteouſneſs by God. And this you may pleaſe to do only with reflexion, and in proportion to what you have already told me of* Abraham.

What faith in us is parallel to that by which *Abraham* was juſtified.

C. I will obey you. The Faith which is now required of you, and which God will thus accept to your Juſtification, is a cordial ſincere giving up your ſelf unto God, particularly to Chriſt, firmly to rely on all his Promiſes, and faithfully to obey all his commands delivered in the Goſpel, which will never be accounted by God that ſincere cordial faith, unleſs it be ſuch as will (whenſoever any trial is made of you) act and perform accordingly, believe what Chriſt hath promiſed in the Goſpel, againſt all ſpiritual or worldly temptations to the contrary, and practiſe what Chriſt commands, againſt all the invitations of pleaſure, or profit, or vain glory to the contrary; to which purpoſe it is that Chriſt ſaith, that they *cannot believe which receive the praiſe of men*, Jo. 5. 44. by that one carnal motive, (and that now-adays a moſt prevailing one, the notion of honour being moſtly taken from Women and Children, and the worſt of men, and ſo making all vice neceſſary to a good reputation, and all vertue, eſpecially the moſt precious Chriſtian vertues, meekneſs, *&c.* the only reproachful thing) by that one carnal motive, I ſay, as by an example or inſtance of the reſt, illuſtrating this truth, that he that, the *World*, or *Fleſh*, or *Devil* can carry away from the profeſſion of and obedience to Chriſt, is no ſon of the faithful *Abraham*, no believing Diſciple of his. For if it be ſaid that *Abraham* was faithful before thoſe acts of his faith, at leaſt before the ſecond of them, that of Obedience, being juſtified upon the believing the Promiſe before, *Gen.* 15. and ſo that you may have true Faith before you produce theſe effects of it, at leaſt, that by believing the Promiſes of Chriſt you are ſo juſtified, without reſpect unto (or abſtracting from) this obedience to his Commands; I ſhall ſoon ſatisfie that ſcruple, by confeſſing the truth of it as far as concerned *Abraham* on this ground, becauſe *Abraham* was by God (who ſaw his heart) diſcerned to be faithful before any of theſe trials, nay had formerly given evidence of it, by *going out of his countrey* at God's Command, which was an act of great "ὑπήκουσεν ἐξελθεῖν. Obedience, *Gen.* 12. 1. and *Heb.* 11. 8. And after, being tried at that time only with a Promiſe, he gave full credit to that Promiſe, and ſtill gave evidence of his Fidelity as faſt as occaſions were offered, which God, that ſaw no maim in him, did accept of, even before he had made thoſe other trials. And proportionably it will ſtill hold true of you, that if your heart be ſincerely given up to Chriſt, if there be in you a reſolution of uniform Obedience unto Chriſt, which the ſearcher of hearts ſees to be ſincere, and ſuch as would hold out in time of temptation, this will be certainly accepted by God to thy juſtification: nay, if God try thee only with the Promiſe, as, (be it but this) that God *will give reſt to all that being weary come to him*, or for temporal things, that *he will never fail thee, nor forſake thee*, if thou do thus come unto him, and confidently depend on the truth of this without any doubting or ſtaggering, this will be accepted by God to thy juſtification, without any further act of Faith or obedience to his commands, in caſe, or ſuppoſing, there were no ſuch other command as yet given to thee, or no occaſion of obeying it. But now thy caſe being in one reſpect diſtinguiſhed from that of *Abraham*'s, the whole Goſpel being already revealed and propoſed to thee as a ſummary of what thou art bound to believe and what to do, (and no need of any ſuch particular revelations of God's will, either by way of promiſe or particular precept, as was to *Abraham*) the Object of thy Faith is already ſet thee, all the Affirmations, all the Promiſes, and all the Commands, yea and Threats of the Goſpel; and all theſe are to be received uniformly with a cordial Faith proportioned to each of them, aſſent to all his Affirmations, dependence on all his Promiſes, reſolution of Obedience to all his commands, (even thoſe hardeſt ſayings of his, moſt unacceptable to fleſh and blood) and fear and awe of his Threats, without any flattering fallacious hope of poſſibility to eſcape them. Thy faith, if it be true, muſt be made up of all theſe parts, and not of ſome one or more of them; and then whenſoever any trial ſhall be particularly made of thee, (in which kind ſoever it happens to be firſt) thou muſt expreſs and evidence thy fidelity, or elſe this Faith will not at that time be accepted by God to thy *juſtification*, *i. e.* will not be approved by him, or accounted for thy *righteouſneſs*: and the ſame muſt be reſolved, when and how often ſoever occaſions ſhall offer themſelves either of aſſenting or adhering, or obeying or fearing God, (*i. e.* whenſoever any difficulty or other temptation interpoſes in any one of theſe) for then it is with thee as it was with *Abraham* when God tempted him, and there is no hope of God's approbation of thee to be had, but upon paſſing faithfully, (I ſay not, without all ſin, all blemiſh, all imperfection, but without all falſeneſs,

falſeneſs, faithleſneſs, hypocriſie) honeſtly, ſincerely, couragiouſly through ſuch trials. For though God may approve and juſtifie thy faith and thee before or without any trial, any performance, (beholding all in the heart which men do in the actions;) yet when thoſe trials are made, and the performance not met with, it is then apparent even to men and thy own ſoul, that thy reſolutions were not before ſincere, (*i. e.* thy *faith* true) and conſequently God, that ſaw that before thoſe trials, cannot be thought to have juſtified that unſincere reſolver, that dead, heartleſs, liveleſs *Faith*. But when upon ſuch trials God meets with his deſired expected returns, he then juſtifies the Fidelity or faith of that man, and conſequently that man himſelf, who hath ſhewed himſelf ſo faithful; and ſo (by the purport of the New Covenant, through the ſufferings and ſatisfaction of Chriſt) he imputeth not to that man the ſins of his former, nor frailties and infirmities of his preſent life.

S. *You have given me a large account of my demand, and I can find nothing wanting to my preſent ſatisfaction, but the more diſtinct deſcending to the ſeveral parts and branches of Faith, that I may more nearly look into the ſeverals of my duty in this matter, wherein I am ſo mightily concerned.*

C. I ſhall give you that without detaining you long, or adding much to what hath been already ſaid, only by giving you the Object of true Faith, which is of two ſorts; either God himſelf, or the Word of God; God who is believed in, and the Word of God as the rule of that Faith, or matter to be believed; and that Word entirely conſidered, ſignifying whatſoever I am (or may ever be) convinced to come from him, and in it (as it is now ſhut up and compriſed in the Books of Canonical Scripture) theſe ſpecial parts, which do divide the whole Scripture between them. 1. The Affirmations of Scripture, whether by way of Hiſtorical Narration, or by way of Doctrine. 2. The Promiſes of God both in the Old and New Teſtament, but eſpecially the Promiſes of the Goſpel, both ſuch as belong to this life, and eſpecially thoſe that belong to another. 3. The Commands of God, whether the Natural Law of all mankind written in our hearts by the finger of God, made up in the frame of the humane ſoul, and more clearly revealed both in the Decalogue and other parts of Sacred writ; or whether the Commands of Chriſt, raiſing nature to a higher pitch in the Sermon on the Mount, and ſuperadding ſome poſitive inſtitutions, as thoſe of the Sacraments and Cenſures of the Church, in other parts of the New Teſtament. 4. The Threats of the Goſpel, thoſe terrours of the Lord ſet on purpoſe to drive and haſten us to amendment of our ſinful lives. All theſe put together are the adæquate object of our Faith, which is then cordial and ſuch as God will accept of, when it affords to every one of theſe that reception which is apportioned to it, aſſent to the truth of the Affirmations, fiducial reliance on the Promiſes, obediential ſubmiſſion to the Commands, and humble fear and awe to the Threats.

The objects of true Faith.

The ſeverals of God's Word reduced to four heads.

S. *I cannot but acknowledge the truth of all this, but yet have ſome objection to propoſe againſt the laſt branch of it, wherein you make Fear of the Threats a part of Faith, whereas Faith ought to be* made perfect by love, *ſaith Saint* James; *and Saint* John, 1 *Joh.* 4. 18. *tells us that* perfect love caſts out fear; *and beſides, fear including doubting, ſeems to be moſt contrary to Faith.*

How Fear is reconcileable with Faith.

C. That the terrors of the Lord, and Threats of eternal puniſhment to all unreformed ſinners, are one part of the Goſpel, there is no doubt; and being ſo, they muſt needs be the object of our Faith, and that Faith deſcending to the heart, becomes that Fear and Awe forementioned (in the ſame kind, as believing the Commands becomes obedience.) Thus in the caſe of *Noah*'s faith, *Heb.* 11. which was believing the Threats of God againſt the old world, it is ſaid, *ver.* 7. that *Noah by faith* (being warned by God) being [w] *poſſeſt* with fear or awe, to wit, of thoſe Threats) *prepared an ark*, &c. And ſo there can be no doubt of the truth of that doctrine, nor danger in the expreſſion. As for that place of Saint *John*, [that *perfect love caſts out fear*] the Fear which that excludes is not the fear of God's wrath, but of Perſecutions and temporal dangers: for ſo that love of Chriſt, if it be perfect, ſuch as Chriſt's was to us, *chap.* 3. 16. which is referred to again chap. 4. 17. *that as he is, ſo we ſhould be in this world*, (or as he is in this world, whileſt here on earth, ſo we ſhould be) will make us venture any thing for the Beloved, even death it ſelf, confeſs him in time of the greateſt hazard; but ſure, not the diſpleaſing of God or torments of Hell. And ſo that place is miſapplied to this buſineſs. And as little pertinent is the other part of the objection; that becauſe Faith is contrary to doubting, therefore 'tis not reconcileable with fear. For the doubting which faith excludes, is the doubting of the truth of that which we are commanded to believe, or the not adhering and in our practice keeping faſt unto it: but the Fear which we ſpeak of, ſuppoſes us to believe, and not thus to doubt; and indeed is in this caſe the direct contrary to doubting: for when a judgment is denounced againſt me, then the leſs I doubt of the truth of the denunciation, the more I ſhall be afraid of the judgment: and my want of fear, if it be at all rational, muſt be founded and built in want of this faith, in doubting or not believing. And indeed this fear is in ſome caſes the only, in all a moſt excellent means to keep me ſafe, to help me work, and work out my own ſalvation: and therefore *knowing the terrours of the Lord, we perſwade men*, ſaith the Apoſtle; the terrours are as fit to perſwade, as the love of God to conſtrain us to perform our duty. As for the duty of *ſerving God without fear*, Luke 1. you have [x] formerly had an account of that, that it belongs not to this matter.

[w] ευλαβηθεὶς. 1 John 4. 18.

[x] Pag. 3.

S. *You have ſatisfied my objection; I ſhall now more chearfully proceed. I have heard much of a General and a Particular Faith, and that the General is little worth without the Particular. Tell me whether that be appliable to the Faith you now ſpeak of.*

C. Being rightly underſtood, it is.

S. *What then is the General and Particular Faith as it refers to the affirmation of Scripture?*

C. The General is a belief of God's Veracity, that whatſoever is affirmed by him is infallibly true: the Particular is the full giving up my aſſent to every particular which I am convinced to be affirmed by God, aſſoon as ever I am ſo convinced, or have means ſufficient offered me ſo to convince me; and yet more particularly, the acknowledging of thoſe Truths which have ſpecial marks ſet upon them in Scripture to ſignifie them to be of more weight than others, as, *That God is*, Heb. 11. 6. That Chriſt is the Meſſias of the world, the acknowledging of which is ſaid to be *life eternal*, *Joh.* 17. 3. The Doctrine of the Trinity, into which all are commanded to be baptized, and thoſe other fundamentals of faith, which all men were inſtructed in anciently before they were permitted to be baptized,

The General and Particular Faith in reference to Affirmations.

Vide Cyril. Hieros. Catec.

baptized, contrived briefly into the compass of the Apostles Creed, a summary of *Christian* faith or doctrine necessary to be believed.

Commands.

S. *What is the General and Particular Faith as it refers to the Commands of the Gospel?*

C. The General is an assent to the truth and goodness of those Commands in general, as they concern all men, that is, believing that Christ hath given such a law to all his Disciples, to all *Christians*, and that that law is most fit to be given by him. The Particular is the applying these Commands to my self, as the necessary and proper rule of my life, the resolving to perform faithful obedience to them.

Threats.

S. *What is it as it refers to the Threats?*

C. The general is to believe that those Threats will be (and that it is must just they should be) executed upon all against whom they are denounced. The Threats under Oath, absolutely, non-admission into God's rest to all disobedient provokers, *Heb.* 3. 11. the conditional Threats, conditionally, *i. e. unless we repent*, and use the means to avert them. The Particular is to resolve, that except I get out of that number, I shall certainly find my part in them.

Promises.

S. *What as it refers to the Promises?*

C. The general is the believing the truth, infallible truth of the Promises, particularly of those Promises which concern the pardon of sin, and salvation, (the looking at and receiving or embracing of Christ, as the only remedy against sin, the only propitiation for it:) which Promises, (the object of that Faith) being generally conditional, not absolute Promises, great care must be taken, that the Faith be proportioned to the nature of the Promises: as when the Promise of Rest is made peculiarly to the *weary and heavy laden* thus coming to Christ, the general Faith is to believe undoubtedly, that this Rest shall be given to all that perform this Condition, to all humble faithful penitentiaries; and to believe that it belongs either absolutely to all, or to any but those who are so qualified, is to believe a lie; no piece of Faith, but phancy or vain conceit, which sure will never advantage, but betray any that depend upon it.

S. *What then is the Particular Faith terminated in this conditional Promise?*

C. Not the believing that the Promise belongs absolutely to me, (for it doth not any longer than I am so qualified) nor the believing that I am so qualified, (for 1. perhaps I am not; and 2. that is no object of Faith, no part of the Promise, or of any other piece of God's Word) but it is made up of these three things. 1. The confident perswasion that if I fail not in my part, Christ will never fail in his; if I do repent, and lay hold on Christ for pardon, no power of heaven, or earth, or hell, no malice of Satan, no secret unrevealed decree shall ever be able to deprive me of my part in the Promise. 2. A setting my self to perform the condition on which the Promise is made; as when Rest being promised upon condition of Coming, I come upon that invitation, then this coming of mine may be called particular Application: as when a Picture is so designed and set, as to look on every one that comes in at the door, and on none else, the way to be particularly lookt on, *i. e.* to apply the eye of the picture particularly to me, is to come in at the door. And 3. the comparing the conditional Promise to my particular present estate by way of self-examination, and thence concluding upon sight of the condition in my self, that I am such a one to whom the Promise belongs, and shall have my part in it, if I continue and persevere. The second of these, if it be real and sincere, gives me a [a] certainty of the object, seals the promise to me in heaven, which will remain firm though I never know of it. The third, if it be on right judgement of my self, may give me the other [b] certainty, *i. e.* ascertain me that I am in the number of God's children: but there being so much uncertainty whether I judge aright of my self or no, and there being no particular affirmation in God's word concerning the sincerity of my present, or perseverance of my future condition, that assurance reflexive, of which this is one ingredient, cannot be a divine Faith, but at the most an humane, yet such as perhaps I may have no doubting mixed with, nor reason that I should so doubt. For at the conclusion of life, having *finished his course* and *persevered*, St. *Paul* could say without doubting, *Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness.* Which if another man be not able to say with that assurance, 'twill not presently be want of Faith in him, as long as this want of assurance proceeds not from any distrust of the truth of God's Promises, but only from an humble conceit of his own repentance, that 'tis not such as God requires of him. And if that place, 2 *Cor.* 13. [*Know ye not that Christ Jesus is in you except ye be reprobates?*] be objected, to prove that all are Reprobates that know not that Christ is in them; the answer will be satisfactory, that the words rendred [*in you*] signifie (very frequently in the Scripture, and peculiarly in a place parallel to this) *Exod.* 17. 17. *among you*, or *in your Congregation.* And so the sence will be best dissolved into a question and answer, *Know ye not* (by the miracles and preaching, the demonstration of the Spirit and of Power) *that Christ Jesus is among you?* (by way of interrogation, for so 'tis in the *Greek*, and the meaning appears by the context to be) *Know ye not, discern you not your selves, that the power of the Gospel is come among you by my Apostleship?* and then by way of answer; [*except ye be reprobates*] you are obdurate insensate creatures, or (as our *margent*, *Rom.* 1. 28 renders the word) [c] *void of Judgment*, undoubtedly, unless you do.

[a] *Certitudinem objecti.*
[b] *Certitudinem subjecti.*
2 Cor. 13. 5. ἐν ὑμῖν.
[c] ἀδόκιμος.

Justifying Faith.

S. *You have shewed me the difference betwixt General and Particular Faith, and I shall not follow that matter any farther, but I pray help me in one difficulty. We are said in Scripture to be* Justified by Faith; *and we hear much talk of a* Justifying Faith; *I pray tell me what faith this is, to which* Justification *is attributed.*

Faith no efficient of our Justification.

C. First, let me tell you that Faith, in whatever acceptation, is no proper efficient cause of Justification, for such is only God through the satisfaction of Christ, accepting our persons and our weak performances, and not imputing our sins: In which act nothing in us can possibly have any, so much as inferior Instrmental efficiency. It is true, the habit of Faith may in some sence be called the cause of the acts of Faith, and so of this act of receiving or embracing of Christ, in which sence 'tis called the eye and hand of Faith: but then it is clear, that this receiving of Christ is a thing very distinct from justification; the one is clearly the act of man, the other of God: and therefore to conclude that Faith is an efficient, though but instrumental, of justification, because it is an Instrument

ſtrument of receiving Chriſt is no ſolid argument; and ſo in like manner from its activity in other things, to infer its efficiency in juſtification. The moſt that can be ſaid is, that 'tis a condition without which God, that juſtifies the penitent believer, will never juſtifie the impenitent Infidel; and therefore 'tis obſervable that 'tis no where ſaid in Scripture, that Faith juſtifies, but we are juſtified by Faith, which particle [[a] *by*] is a peculiar note of a condition, not a cauſe. Only a Condition.

[a] διὰ cum genitivo.

S. *But then what Faith is this which is the condition of our Juſtification?*

C. That Faith which we ſhewed you was *Abraham*'s faith; or in fewer words, the receiving the whole Chriſt in all his Offices, as my King, my Prieſt, my Prophet, whereby I believe the Commands as well as the Promiſes of the Goſpel; or take the Promiſes as they are, *i.e.* not as abſolute, but as conditional Promiſes. And this is a cordial practical belief, a firm reſolution of uniform Obedience and Diſcipleſhip, *faith made perfect by works*, Jam. 2. 22. Intimating, that without the addition of ſuch *works*, ſuch Obedience Evangelical, any other act, or part, or notion of faith, would be imperfect, unſufficient to this end, that is, to our *Juſtification*. The ſame is called in a parallel phraſe, *Faith* [b] *conſummate by love*, Gal. 5. 6. (which indeed we render *working by love*, but the Greek and Syriack ſignifies *conſummate by love*) that is, by acts of Chriſtian charity; and therefore in two parallel places it is thus varied; in one we read, in ſtead of it, the *new creature*, Gal. 6. 15. in another, the *keeping the Commandments of God*, 1 Cor. 7. 19.

[b] ἐνεργουμένη δι ἀγάπης.

S. *But how then is it ſo often ſaid, that we are not juſtified by works*, Gal. 1. 16. *and* Rom. 3. 28. *that we are juſtified by faith without the deeds of the law?* Juſtification by Faith.

C. I have in effect already told you, and ſhall in a word again tell you. The word [*works*] and [*deeds of the law*] in thoſe places ſignifies legal obedience, or circumciſion, and the like Judaical outdated ceremonies; and [*Faith*] the Evangelical Grace of giving up the whole heart to Chriſt, without any ſuch obedience or Judaical obſervances: and ſo 'tis truly ſaid, *we are juſtified by faith without them, i.e.* without ſuch *works*, ſuch *obedience*; yet not excluding, but including that Evangelical obedience, for without that *faith is dead*, ſaith S. *James*, 2. 17. and then ſure not able to juſtifie any. And therefore you may obſerve in that Apoſtle's diſcourſe, *James* 2. he affirms that *Abraham was juſtified by works*, ver. 21. and makes that a parallel phraſe to that of the Old Teſtament, *Abraham believed God, and it was imputed to him for righteouſneſs*, ver. 23. where, as [*Juſtification*] and [*imputed to him for righteouſneſs*] are phraſes of the ſame importance, ſo are [*works*] and [*believing*] alſo.

S. *The reaſon of it, I conceive, is becauſe faith always brings forth good works, or if it do not, it is no true faith.*

C. I am not altogether of your opinion, for I conceive it very poſſible for me to believe, and yet not to live accordingly. The truth is, that is not a juſtifying Faith, or ſuch as even now I defined, and ſo no true faith in that ſence, but yet it may be a true Faith, for ſo much as it is; or if you will, it is one part of true Faith, which is oft miſtaken for the whole. I may truly, without all doubting, believe the Promiſe of mercy and ſalvation to the true penitent, and none elſe, which belief is very fit and proper to ſet me a reforming and amending, and yet 'tis poſſible for temptations of carnal objects to perſwade me to defer this duty, nay never to think fit to ſet my ſelf to the performance of it, the preſent *pleaſures of ſin* may out-weigh in my debauched choice thoſe future ſpiritual joyes; nay, I may ſee and like them, and yet for the preſent embrace the contrary, the Will of man being a middle free faculty, not abſolutely obliged to do or chuſe what the Underſtanding judgeth moſt honeſt, *i.e.* what *Reaſon*, and *Faith*, and the *Spirit* of God commandeth to be done. The truth is, if this *Faith* get once to be radicated in the heart, to rule and reign there, if the *Will* chuſeth what *Faith* recommendeth, then it bringeth forth all manner of good works; and ſo then 'tis the conſummation of that former act of *Faith* by this latter, or (in the words of Saint *Paul* and Saint *James*) the conſummation of *Faith* by Charity and good Works, that God accepteth in Chriſt to *juſtification*, and not the bare aptneſs of *faith* to bring forth *works*, if thoſe *works*, by the fault of a rebellious infidel will not be brought forth. Works do not infallibly follow Faith.

S. *But is there no one peculiar act of* Faith *to which* juſtification *is particularly imputable?*

C. That to which Juſtification is promiſed, is certainly the giving up of the whole ſoul intirely unto Chriſt, accepting his Promiſes on his conditions, undertaking Diſcipleſhip upon Chriſt's terms. But yet 'tis poſſible that ſome one act of *Faith* may be more excellent and acceptable in the ſight of God than others; as that humble act of the faithful ſervant, that when he hath done all, acknowledges himſelf unprofitable, and ſo *excludes all glorying*, (which the Apoſtle makes very neceſſary to *juſtification*, *Rom.* 4.) expects all good from God's free mercy in Chriſt, without any reflexion on any of his own performances; or again, that of full truſt, affiance, reliance, rolling ones ſelf on God, depending on his All-ſufficiency in the midſt of all difficulties, on the fidelity of him that hath promiſed, when all worldly probabilities are to the contrary: but then this muſt be accompanied with other acts of Faith, when occaſion is offered for them, and with uſe of the means preſcribed by Chriſt, or elſe reliance may prove preſumption after all. And however it is, *We muſt add to our faith vertue, &c.* or elſe our Faith may ſtill be dead, liveleſs, being alone, that is, unable to ſtand us in any ſtead to the deſired end. Some acts of Faith more excellent than others.

S. *I could hear you, and propoſe ſcruples to you much longer on this argument, but I deſire to carry away only ſo much of this ſubject of Faith as may tend to the increaſe of all vertue in me, and I am ſenſible how long I have detained you on this theme; and therefore I ſhall importune you no farther about it: but yet only vary, not end, your trouble, and advance to the next Theological Grace, that of Hope, and deſire your directions in that particular.*

C. This *Grace* is ſubject to ſome miſtaking, and therefore I ſhall deſire you to mark carefully what I conceive of it.

S. *What is Hope?*

C. It is a patient comfortable expectation of the performance of God's Promiſes, belonging to this life or a better. Of Hope.

S. *What is the ground of Hope?* The Ground

C. Some ſure word of *Promiſe* aſſented unto by *Faith?*

S. *What*

S. *What is the Object of Hope?*

The Object two-fold.

C. It is made up of two things; 1. The thing promised. 2. The Cause or Author of it. 1. The thing promised, or the performance of that Promise. Such is the *Resurrection of the dead*, which nature cannot help us to see any thing into, but being believed by *Faith* becomes the object of *Hope*. And it is observable, that seven times in the *Acts* of the *Apostles* the word *Hope* refers to this one object, the *Resurrection* or future state or life in another world; which indeed is the supreme object of the Christian hope, and all other things but in an inferiour degree, and as they refer to that, and in order to that great treasure of our rejoycing. Though the truth is, as there be *promises of this life* as well as of another, (as that God will give us all things necessary for us, and the like) so is there a *Secular Hope*, or an *Hope* of *this life*, and an object of that *Hope*.

S. *What is that Secular Hope?*

Secular Hope.

C. A reliance on God, that he will send me whatsoever is good for me.

S. *What is the object of that Hope?*

C. Good successes, good things.

S. *Am I bound to hope that all things that are good for me, shall befall me?*

The conditions of that.

C. I must answer you with some caution. First, those Promises are conditional, *All things shall tend to good to them that love God.* If we be lovers of God, then that Promise belongs to us, not else. And consequently then we are to *hope* it, not else. *Ye that fear the Lord, hope in the Lord*, saith the Psalmist.

S. *But is every true servant of God bound to hope that God will give him all secular good things, as wealth, peace, honour, and the like.*

C. There is another condition required in him first before that Promise belongs to him, and consequently before he is bound to that Hope.

S. *What is that?*

C. To pray for them, for the Having and Finding is promised to none but to them which ask and seek; yea, and to use the means ordinary and lawful, which are in order to that end, as labour, and the like, (among which mercifulness and liberality is one, to which the Promise of secular wealth is most frequently made, and the contrary threatned with want.)

S. *Well then, must the servant of God having prayed, and used those means, hope and be assured that that which he thus prays for shall be granted him?*

C. Yes, either formally, or by way of equivalence; either that, or something that is better; or again, either now, or when God sees fitter for him: for this must be allowed God, to be able to chuse for us better than we can for our selves, both for the thing it self, and the time of conferring it. For many times, that which we ask, would, if it should be granted, be worse for us, and perhaps tend to our destruction; and then God by denying the particular matter of our Prayers, doth grant the general matter of them, which always is that which is best for us. Sometimes again he defers to grant, that we may re-inforce our impression, pray more ardently; and for us to be so exercised in prayer and hope, is best for us also.

S. *Are we bound then thus to expect and hope in every thing that we pray for?*

C. Yes, we are, and the want of that is the sin of doubting, noted by Christ and his Apostles.

S. *Well, but you told me there was another part of the object of Hope, besides the thing promised, which you called the Cause or Author of it. What is that?*

The Author of our hope.

C. The person that is to make good his Promise to me, which is God himself. And therefore we are so often exhorted to *hope in the Lord*, &c. For as in the other affections, we are not only angry at the injury or the provoking thing done to us, but at him that did it, and we do not only fear pain and punishment, but him also that can inflict it on us; so we do not only hope for heaven, or for any other good thing, but for God as the Fountain of our bliss, and through whose mercy it is that it befalls us. This is called *hope in him*, or (as it should rather be rendred) *hope on him*, 1 *John* 3. 3. And this is a special act of *Christian* hope, to be thus unbottom'd of our selves, and fastned upon God with a full reliance, and trust, and dependance on his mercy.

S. *I thank you for this direction. Give me leave to proceed. What be the seasons and opportunities of this hope?*

Seasons of Hope.

ʸ δοκιμή.

C. 1. Time of Tribulation, *Rom.* 5. 4. *Tribulation worketh patience, and patience experience, and experience hope, and hope maketh not ashamed.* Where the word which we render, ʸ *experience*, signifies *approved upon a tryal*, and the sence runs thus; Tribulation is a season and a means to work patience, and that patience to produce approbation, as of one that is tried in the fire, and has past the test; and this is a means to work an hope or expectation of reward, and that hope will not confound or shame, that is, deceive, any that relies on it, and besides will keep from being ashamed of those sufferings, and make us rather glory, *ver.* 3. that is, rejoice in them, as in the most benign auspicious signs, that in another world there is a reward for the righteous, because in this life 'tis the contrary rather. So *Rom.* 12. 12. *Rejoycing in hope*, and *patience in tribulation*, are joined together. 2. Time of Temptation, when some present delight is ready to invite to sin, or present bitterness to deter from the ways of God, then the hope of future joys (to be exchanged for that bitterness, and to outvy and preponderate that pleasure) comes in seasonably. 3. The time of Mourning for the dead, which the assured hope of a Resurrection will moderate and alleviate.

S. *You told me, the ground of Christian hope was the Promises. I pray, is a man to hope for nothing but that for which he hath some promise in Scripture?*

C. He may perhaps lawfully hope for some things for which there is no Promise, so there be nothing to the contrary; but then this is not the Grace of hope, but a good natural assurance or confidence, which *Aristotle* observes ᶻ young men to be full of, and old men not so inclined to. But if it be for any spiritual matter, it is (if it be not grounded on some Promise) but presumption.

ᶻ νεότης ἐλπίδος πλήρης, γῆρας δύσελπι.

S. *There is no promise in Scripture for every particular mans eternal salvation, yet sure every man is bound to hope he shall be saved.*

C. This

C. This is the miſpriſion I deſired to anticipate and foreſtal in you, and now I muſt be fain to cure, ſeeing I could not prevent it. To which purpoſe you muſt again remember, that God's Promiſes being the ground of Hope, and thoſe Promiſes being but ſeldom abſolute, moſt what conditionate, the hope (if it be the Chriſtian grace of hope) muſt be proportioned and attemperate to the promiſe; and if it exceed that temper and proportion, it becomes a tumour and tympany of hope. For example, that there ſhall be another ſtate or life after the end of this, both for juſt and unjuſt, there is an abſolute promiſe, and therefore every man may juſtly hope for that; though to the ungodly it may be matter rather of fear than hope; but for a happy or joyful reſurrection to life, a bleſſed future ſtate, there is no abſolute unlimited, but conditional limited promiſe, to the true penitent believer, and to none elſe; for to all others God hath ſworn, they *ſhall not enter into his reſt.* And then he that is ſuch, may no more hope for his part in the *reſurrection of the juſt*, than for the moſt impoſſible thing: or if he do hope, that hope will ſtand him in no ſtead, will never make that true by hoping it, which was otherwiſe falſe; *The hope of the hypocrite ſhall periſh*, ſaith *Job*; and ſo the carnal impenitent, his hope ſhall periſh alſo, ſure will never be able to keep him from periſhing. Whether every man be bound to hope he ſhall be ſaved.

S. What then is the Chriſtian hope in this particular?

C. It is an aſſurance, 1. That though my ſins be never ſo great, they may be pardoned me, if the condition to obtain that pardon be not neglected. 2. To hope chearfully and confidently upon the obſervation of thoſe means. 3. (which is the prime act and evidence of the Chriſtian hope) to ſet induſtriouſly and piouſly to the performance of that condition on which the promiſe is made; as Saint *John* ſaith, *Every man that hath this hope purifies himſelf.* And 4. upon view of the ſincerity of that performance of mine, to hope comfortably and chearfully for God's performance. In brief, the hypocrite or unreformed ſinner may have ſome room for hope ſuppoſitively, if he do change and repent; the honeſt penitent may hope, poſitively. The former may hope as for a future poſſibility, the latter at the preſent as for a certainty. But the latter of theſe is the only Chriſtian hope. For by this you ſhall know a Chriſtian hope from all other, that he that hath it *purifies himſelf*, 1 John 3. 3. The hypocrite or carnal man hopes, and is the wickeder for hoping; he fears nothing, and ſo diſcerns not the neceſſity of mending: the beſt way to reform ſuch a man, is to rob him of his hope, to bring him to a ſenſe of his danger, that he may get out of it, to conduct him by the gates of hell to a poſſibility of heaven. But the Scripture-hope, the [*this hope*] as Saint *John* calls it, *i. e. the hope of ſeeing God*, 1 John 3. 2. being grounded on conditional promiſes, (and that condition being purity, *holineſs, without which no man ſhall ſee the Lord*) ſets preſently to performing that condition, that is, to purifying, according as you ſhall ſee the practice of it in Saint *Paul*, 2 Cor. 7. 1. *Having therefore theſe Promiſes*, (what promiſes? conditional promiſes, chap. 6. 17.) *let us purifie our ſelves*, &c. The Chriſtian hope in this matter.

S. But is not Deſpair a ſin? and doth not that conſiſt in not hoping for heaven? Deſpair.

C. The want of the Chriſtian hope, is a ſinful *Deſpair*, but not the want of all kind of *Hope*; the thinking it impoſſible his ſins ſhould be forgiven, though he ſhould be never ſo truly penitent, is a ſin, but that rather of Infidelity than Deſpair, it being the disbelieving an eternal truth of God's. A conſequent of this indeed may be deſperation, (as on the contrary *hope* is a conſequent ſuperſtructed on *faith*) to wit, when he that believes himſelf uncapable of pardon, goes on without any care or thought of reforming; ſuch a one we vulgarly call a *deſperate perſon*, and that ſure is a moſt damning ſin: but for him that lives an impenitent ſinner, not to hope for mercy as long as he doth ſo, is ſure no ſin ſuperadded to his impenitence; his impenitence is a ſin, but that being ſuppoſed, his not hoping is but duty and juſtice; the contrary would be a greater ſin and a more deſperate ſign. So that not every not hoping for Heaven is the ſin of *Deſpair*, but rather the peremptory contempt of the *condition*, which is the ground of *Hope*; the going on (not only in terrours and amazement of conſcience, but alſo) boldly, hopingly, confidently, in wilful habits of ſin, which therefore is called *deſperateneſs* alſo; and the more bold thus, the more deſperate.

S. But what if a godly penitent man ſhould either doubt of his ſalvation, or not hope at all for it?

C. If that doubting or not hoping be only grounded in a falſe judgment of his own repentance and ſincerity, in conceiting too meanly of himſelf, in thinking himſelf no true penitent when he is, this will not be the ſin of *Deſpair*; no nor infidelity neither: becauſe if he could believe his penitence ſincere, (the want of which belief is not the diſ-believing of any part of God's Word, becauſe that ſaith nothing of him particularly) he would aſſuredly hope; and now that only his humility makes him ſo comfortleſs, there is certainly no ſin in that. Doubting of Salvation.

S. But what if a ſinner be ſo overwhelmed with ſorrow, as not to lay hold on the Promiſes at all, is not this the ſin of Deſpair? Exceſſive ſorrow.

C. The trial of him will be by examining whether he purifie or no, that is, whether his ſorrow bring forth fruits of amendment; if ſo, this is not the ſin of *Deſperation* yet; he hath the *Grace* of *Hope*, which brings forth fruits of *Hope*, though it be clouded over with a melancholy vapour, that it be not diſcernible even to himſelf. But if this trouble of mind ſet him a ſinning farther, like *Judas*, who had *ſorrow*, but then killed himſelf, this is *Deſpair* indeed.

S. I ſhall ſollicite you no further in this point, but for your Prayers that God will keep me from all premature perſwaſion of my being in Chriſt; *that he will give me that Hope that may ſet me a purifying, and not ſuffer me to go on preſumptuouſly or deſperately in any courſe. Only upon an occaſion of this Grace of Hope, give me leave to ask you, Whether he that now lives in ſin, and hopes he ſhall one day repent, and go to heaven (this Repentance and that Heaven being a future good, and ſo the object of Hope) may be ſaid to have the Grace of Hope in any kind?* The ſinners hope of repentance and mercy.

C. By no means: Becauſe God hath made no ſuch promiſe that he ſhall repent, nor without *Repentance* that any man ſhall have Heaven. This is a ground-work of carnal ſecurity, and no degree of the *Grace of Hope*.

S. Once more, May he that hath gone on in a continued courſe of ſin, and at laſt is overtaken with God's judgments, (and ſeeing Hell gates open upon him, doth grieve for his wicked life, and upon that hopes for mercy) be conceived to be ſaved by that Hope?

The death-bed sorrow and hope. [a] λύπη κατὰ θεόν.

C. I list not to pass sentence on any particular, because I cannot throughly discern his state; only I can say in general, I know no promise of pardon in Scripture, to a bare death-bed sorrow, because indeed none to any sorrow at any time, but that which is [a] *godly sorrow which worketh repentance:* which repentance, as it is available if true, though never so late, so is seldom true when it is late; nor can well be known to be true but by persevering fruits, which require time. And though a serious purpose of amendment and true acts of contrition, before or without the habit, may be accepted by God to my salvation; yet in this case there is no sure judgment whether this purpose be serious, or these acts true acts of contrition. And so in this case there is no sure foundation for his hope: and then a groundless hope, or a bare hope, without the other conditions to which the Promises belong, will never be able to save any.

Of Charity.

S. Shall we now proceed to the third Grace, that of Love *or* Charity?

C. Most willingly: it is a precious Grace, and that which Saint *Paul* prefers before *Hope* and *Faith.*

S. But is any grace to be preferred before that of Faith? (I thought that had been the most necessary Gospel-Grace.)

The preeminence of that before Faith.

C. It is most certain there is, (*Faith* being taken in that notion which I told you belongs to that place) because Saint *Paul* hath affirmed it, that *Charity is the greatest of the three,* 1 Cor. 13. 13. And it is as sure, that no other Scripture hath contradicted this. And although very great things are said of *Faith,* as of the only condition of *Justification* and *Salvation,* yet, 1. This is when it is in conjunction with *Charity, Faith consummate by love.* And 2. it is observable, that the most *imperfect* things are always the most *necessary,* and consequently the great necessity of *Faith* is no argument of its dignity in comparison of this other grace. For indeed *Faith* is necessary, as that without which *Charity* cannot be had: but then this alone is insufficient to save any, if Charity be not added to it. *Faith* is the foundation, which though it be the most necessary part of the building, yet is it the lowest and most imperfect; *Charity* the superstruction, which is never firmly built but when grounded in *Faith,* and when it is so, it is far more excellent than its foundation. Besides, *Charity* is a grace not out-dated in Heaven, as *Faith* and *Hope* are.

S. But what is Charity?

C. The sincere love of God, and of our Neighbour for his sake.

S. Wherein doth the love of God consist?

Love of God of two sorts.

C. As love in its latitude is of two sorts, of Friendship, and of Desire; the 1. betwixt Friends, the 2. betwixt Lovers; the 1. a rational, the 2. a sensitive love: so our love of God consists of two parts, 1. Esteeming, prizing, valuing of God; 2. Desiring of him.

Estimation.

S. How shall I know, whether I do esteem God as I ought to do?

C. If you would be content to do any thing or suffer any thing rather than lose his favour, rather than displease him. *If you love me* (saith he) *keep my Commandments.* And therefore loving him and obeying him, love and works (to wit, Evangelical works) are taken for the same thing in Scripture.

S. How must this love be qualified?

C. The special Qualification, or rather indeed essential property of *Charity,* is the Sincerity of it, as that is opposite to Hypocrisie, or a double heart, or divided love, or joining any rival or competitour in our hearts with him. The loving God above all, and all other for his sake; this is set down both by *Moses,* Deut. 6. 5. and by Christ, *Matth.* 22. 37. and *Mark* 12. 30. and *Luke* 10. 27. (with a little variation by Saint *Matthew*) in these words, *Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, with all thy soul, with all thy mind, and with all thy strength.* The *Heart,* as I conceive, signifying the *Affections*; the *Soul* the *Will* or elective faculty; the *Mind,* the *Understanding,* or rational faculty, and the *Strength* the powers of the *body* for action; and all four together making up the whole man, and the word *All,* affixt to each, not to exclude all other things from any inferiour part in my love, but only from an equal or superiour interest to exclude a partial or a half-love.

S. What are the motives that may stir up this love in my heart?

Motives to it.

C. 1. The consideration of God's infinite essence. And 2. of his most glorious Attributes. And 3. of his bounteous actions towards us in creating, redeeming, preserving, and providing such rewards for those that love him.

S. What is that other part of Love which you call the Desiring of him?

Desire.

C. The actual appetition or fastning our affections on him, desiring to enjoy 1. his *Grace* or sanctifying Spirit here, and 2. the perpetual Vision of him hereafter. The former part of this is called *hungring and thirsting after righteousness,* a hatred and impatience of sin, a desiring to be out of that polluted condition, and to be made like unto God in Holiness and Purity, (and you may know the sincerity of that, 1. by Assiduity and frequency and fervency in Prayer, that way of conversing and communing with God, a most infallible concomitant of this kind of love: 2. By loving and seeking the means, 1. of resisting sin, and 2. of receiving, and 3. of improving of Grace: that one principal *Desire* of *David*'s, *That he might dwell in the house of the Lord all the days of his life, to behold the fair beauty of the Lord, and to visit his Temple:*) The latter part of this is called by the same *David,* the *longing of the soul after God*; by Saint *Paul, desiring to be dissolved and to be with Christ.*

Trial of that.

S. What are the motives to this kind of love?

Motives to it.

C. 1. God's loving us first, and dying for us, an expression of that love, able to constrain and extort a reciprocation or return of love. 2. The true superlative Delight even to flesh and blood that is in Sanctity, and the practice of Christian Vertues, beyond all that any sensual pleasure affords; so great, that when they are expresst by the Apostle in these words, 1 *Cor.* 2. 9. [*Neither eye hath seen, nor ear heard, neither hath it entred into the heart of man to conceive what things God hath prepared for them that love him*] (which in that place clearly belongs to the *hidden wisdom of God,* v. 7. and the *deep things of God,* v. 10. and the *things that are freely given to us of God,* v. 12. the spiritual *Manna,* or *Preparation* for the lover of God to feed on) they are ordinarily mistaken for the description of *Heaven.*

3. Those

3. Thoſe joys in the Viſion of God in another life, thus deſcribed by the Pſalmiſt, *In thy preſence are fulneſs of joys, and at thy right hand pleaſures for evermore.*

S. *Well, you have gone through the two parts of the love of God; and told me that the ſincerity required in it requires me to love God with all my heart. May not I then love any thing elſe but God?*

Love of other things beſide God.

C. You may, but with theſe conditions; 1. That it be not ſome prohibited object, as the world and the things of the world; that is, any thing that is vain or ſinful in it, *for if any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him*, 1 John 2.15. 2. That it be in a degree inferiour to the love of God: thus God being loved above all, other things may lawfully in a lower degree be loved alſo. 3. That thoſe other things be loved for God's ſake, and in that order that he preſcribes them.

S. *But may not the outward expreſſions of love in many good Chriſtians be greater to ſome other object than to God? or is this incompetible with the ſincerity of the love of God?*

Outward expreſſions of love more to other things than to God.

C. Our love of God may be ſincere, though it be accompanied with ſome frailties: now the ſenſitive faculty may have a ſenſitive love of ſome ſenſitive objects: which though it be moderated ſo as not to fall into ſin either in reſpect of the object or the exceſs, yet through the nature of mans ſenſe may expreſs it ſelf more ſenſitively towards that inferiour object than towards God himſelf; and this is a piece of humane frailty, not to be wholly put off in this life. And yet for all this the love of God may be more deeply radicated in that ſoul; and that will be tried by this, that if one were to be parted with, I would part with any thing rather than God. But that not to be judged by what I would anſwer, if I were asked the queſtion; nay, nor what I would reſolve at a diſtance: but in time of temptation and actual competition betwixt God and that any thing elſe that could not be held without ſinning againſt God, what then I would really do. This may beſt be underſtood by that other paſſion of ſorrow. I may weep more for the loſs of a friend than for my ſins; yet my ſorrow for ſin may be the deeper and more durable ſorrow, though it be not ſo profuſe of theſe ſenſitive expreſſions. So may and muſt our love of God be moſt firmly rooted, though not ſo paſſionately expreſt, as through the infirmity of our fleſh and nearneſs of other objects to it, our love to them is wont to be.

Paſſionate ſorrow.

S. *Shall we proceed to the other branch of Charity, that of our Neighbour? and firſt, What do you mean by the word* Neighbour?

Charity to the Neighbour.

C. Every man in the world, for ſo Chriſt hath extended the word, *Luke* 10. 36, 37. not only to ſignifie the *Jew* in relation to the fellow-*Jew*, who was the Old-Teſtament-Neighbour, but to the *Samaritan* in relation to the *Jew*, *i. e.* to him that was moſt hated by him, as appears by the parable in that place.

S. *What is the love of my Neighbour?*

C. 1. The valuing him as the Image of God, one for whom Chriſt died, and one whom God hath made the proxy of his love, to receive thoſe effects of it from us which we cannot ſo well beſtow on God. 2. The deſiring, and 3. The endeavouring his good of all kinds.

S. *In what degree muſt this be done?*

The degree of it.

C. As I deſire it ſhould be done to my ſelf.

S. *How is that?*

C. Why, in all things to deal with other men as (if I might be my own chuſer) I would wiſh that other men, nay God himſelf, ſhould do to me. This will certainly retain me within the ſtricteſt bounds of Juſtice to all men I have to deal with, (becauſe it is natural to deſire that all men ſhould deal juſtly with me) and teach me all mercy to others both in giving and forgiving and bleſſing them, becauſe I cannot but deſire that God ſhould be thus merciful to me.

S. *But will not my love of God be ſufficient (without this other love of my Neighbour) to denominate me charitable?*

C. It will not. 1. Becauſe this loving my Neighbour is one, nay many, of the Commandments which he that loveth God muſt keep, 1 *Jo.* 3. 23. 2. Becauſe God hath pleaſed to appoint that as the teſt of the ſincerity of the love of God, in judging of which we might otherwiſe deceive our ſelves and prove liars, had we not this evidence to teſtifie the truth of our love, according to that of Saint *John*, 1 Epiſt. 4. 20. *For he that loveth not his brother whom he hath ſeen, how can he love God whom he hath not ſeen?* Which place argues that all the arguments or motives which we have to love God, we have to love our brother alſo, God having devolved all his right to our love upon our brethren here, (and therefore interpreting whatſoever is done to them as done to himſelf) not ſo as to deveſt himſelf of it, but to accumulate it on his image here below, communicating all his claims to it; to which claims of God our relation to our Brethren ſuperadding one more, that of acquaintance, and affinity of our humane nature, expreſt by thoſe words, [*his brother whom he hath ſeen*] it follows in all neceſſity, that he that loves not his brother, that behaves not himſelf to all men, ſuperiours, equals, inferiours, ſtrangers, friends, enemies, Turks, Jews, Heathens, Hereticks, Sinners, according as the rules of Chriſtian charity, of juſtice and mercy oblige him, is not a lover of God.

S. *Is there any more that I need know concerning this grace?*

C. No more at this time: The particulars farther conſiderable will come in our rode hereafter.

Of Repentance.

S. *Your propoſed method then leads me to* Repentance *next; what is Repentance?*

C. A change of mind, or a converſion from ſin to God. Not ſome one bare act of change, but a laſting durable ſtate of new life, which I told you was call'd alſo *Regeneration*.

Regeneration.

S. *But is not* Regeneration *an Act of new birth?*

C. Not only that, but it is alſo the ſtate of new life, (called the *New creature*) living a godly life, or ſuch as will become the ſons or children of God; for the Scripture-phraſe, to be *regenerate* or *born again*, or * *from above*, is all one with being a *child of God*, that is, one, who, as he hath his ſeed of new life from the *Spirit of God*, ſo returns him the obedience of a Son-like gracious heart, lives like a ſon in his family, and never goes from him with the Prodigal into the far Countrey.

* ἄνωθεν.

S. *Of what parts doth Repentance conſiſt?*

C. Not properly of any, it being nothing elſe but a Change of mind or *new life*; yet there are many

preparatives in the paſſage to this ſtate, every of which doth alſo in ſome meaſure accompany it where-ever it is.

S. *What are thoſe preparatives then?*

Preparatives to Repenrance. C. 1. Senſe of ſin. 2. Sorrow or contrition for ſin, 3. Confeſſion of ſin. 4. Diſclaiming, forſaking, reſolving againſt ſin.

S. *Wherein doth the Senſe of ſin conſiſt?*

Senſe of ſin. C. In diſcerning, 1. the Odiouſneſs, 2. the Danger of it.

S. *What Odiouſneſs?*

The odiouſneſs. C. 1. How it diſpleaſeth God, and makes us odious in his ſight. 2. How it defiles and defames us, turns the *members of Chriſt into members of an harlot.* 3. Makes us odious to all good men. 4. Makes us uncapable of heaven, wherein *nothing ſhall enter that defileth. Rev.* 21. 27.

S. *Wherein doth the Danger conſiſt?*

The danger. C. In bringing, 1. the curſes of this life upon us: 2. temporal death: 3. eternal plagues and torments in another world.

S. *What then is a* Senſe of *theſe?*

C. 1. A conviction of the truth of theſe. 2. A ſerious conſideration and pondering of this important truth as it concerns our endleſs weal and woe. 3. A being affected with it, ſo as to humble our ſouls in that ſenſe, which leads to ſorrow and contrition.

Contrition. S. *What is ſorrow and* Contrition *for ſin?*

C. A being grieved with the conſcience of ſin, not only that we have thereby incurred ſuch danger, but alſo that we have ſo unkindly grieved and provoked ſo good a God, ſo compaſſionate a Father, ſo gracious a Redeemer, ſo bleſſed a Sanctifier.

S. *Is it not ſufficient to grieve in reſpect of the danger and damnation which ſin betrays me to? and is not ſuch grief* Contrition?

Attrition. C. No, it is but Attrition (as the Schools uſe to ſpeak) a fretting of the heart, not breaking of it; which any man living would have, when he ſaw ſuch danger near; he would be prickt at heart, and be ill pleaſed to ſee hell gaping upon him: and you may obſerve, that where ſuch preſent danger is the only cauſe of ſorrow, when that danger is over, there ſeldom or never follows reformation. And therefore that opinion and doctrine of the Papiſts, who teach that this Attrition (or ſorrow that we ſhall be puniſhed) without producing amendment of life in the ſinner, yet by the *power of the Keys*, i. e. by the *abſolution of the Prieſt*, is turned into Contrition, is a moſt unkind deceit of Souls; for there being no Promiſe of Scripture that ſuch Attrition alone, or flying from the *wrath to come*, Matt. 3. 7, 8. ſhall be ſufficient to obtain pardon without *bringing forth meet fruits of repentance*, the Prieſt that abſolves any on no better grounds than thoſe, goes beyond his Commiſſion, and by telling a lie, can never make that lie become truth; by abſolving an uncontrite ſinner, cannot make him contrite, either in reality, or in God's acceptation of him; becauſe he hath not promiſed to accept any but the broken and contrite, and therefore not any thing elſe in ſtead of Contrition.

S. *What think you then of that ſorrow and compunction that the approach of death and terrors of the Goſpel bring men to?*

Death-bed Compunction. C. If it be a bare ſorrow and compunction, only reſpecting thoſe preſent terrors, and advancing no higher, then certainly it hath no Promiſe of mercy belonging to it. But if that which begins thus, by Gods mercy allowing of time, and by his grace uſing theſe terrors for the ſoftning of the heart improve farther into ſorrow for diſpleaſing of God, and from thence into a real ſincere reſolution to amend and forſake ſin, then theſe ſuperſtructions have a promiſe of mercy belonging to them, though that foundation had not. The only thing then in this matter to be conſidered is, whether it be thus improved or no: and that no man can certainly judge of, neither Confeſſor nor Patient himſelf, but by the fruits of it afterwards in time of Temptation. For 1. the man himſelf may through ſelf-love take that for Godly ſorrow and reſolution of amendment, which is only ſorrow for his own danger, and willingneſs to avoid that: and again, when foreign temptations are out of the way, and by diſeaſe, *&c.* inner flames quencht in him, he may reſolve againſt thoſe ſins which before he had lived in; or, by way of natural revenge, he may vow never to return to thoſe ſins which he hath had ſuch experience of, for the emptineſs and damningneſs of them, and ſo think himſelf a compleat penitent. And 2. the ſenſitive expreſſions being oft as great for the one as the other, nay greater for danger than for ſin, and from weakneſs of body than change of mind, the *Confeſſor* may eaſily miſtake likewiſe; but when God pleaſeth to reſtore health and ſtrength, when thoſe preſent apprehenſions are over, and temptations of the world and fleſh return again, and perhaps ſome new that were not before in his rode, then if the ſorrow continue as great and the reſolution as earneſt, and perſevere to hold out in deſpight of temptations to the contrary, and take not up any new ſins in exchange for the old, this is a comfortable evidence that that ſorrow was contrition, and that reſolution a ſincere reſolution. But if this time and means of trial being allowed, the matter prove otherwiſe, if the penitent return to his vomit in ſpight of the loathſomeneſs of it, if he overcome his diſlikes to ſin, and ſo fall back to his former jollity and luxury; or in ſtead of thoſe nauſeated ſins, make ſome other choice of a new path to hell, entertain covetouſneſs in ſtead of prodigality, ſpiritual pride in ſtead of carnal ſecurity, envy, malice, ſedition, faction, in commutation for luſt, and the like: this is a demonſtration that that ſorrow was not contrition, that reſolution no ſincere reſolution, and conſequently that if that man had then died, there would not have been found any thing in him which God hath promiſed to accept of. But if the caſe be ſet in a third or middle way, that the Patient die before any ſuch trial hath been made, either to evidence the ſincerity or unſincerity, then that which remains for us, is, not to judge, but to leave him to God's inſpection, who can ſee without thoſe ways of trial, and diſcern what it was in its ſelf, attrition, or contrition, ſincere, or not ſincere, whether it would have continued (or no) a through change of mind; and conſequently will *accept the will for the deed*, if it be a firm and ratified will, and not elſe. And ſo in brief, God may have mercy on him whoſe Repentance began never ſo late, if he ſee it was ſincere

cere Repentance. But in this case there is small matter of comfort to us, because there is no such way of assurance that we are ordinarily capable of, nor reason to hope that God will afford us any extraordinary; and for any man to put off his present Repentance, on contemplation of a possibility that his later Repentance may serve the turn, is the most wretchless presumption in the world, and that which I am sure hath no Promise of Mercy annexed to it.

S. *I shall satisfie my self with these grounds of resolution for this matter, and conceive that any more particular difficulty will be solved by the application of these grounds to it, and so not object what was obvious to have done, the example of the Thief on the Cross, which is so common a ground of security and presumption to carnal livers; because I alrtady discern reason to think his state the state of true* Contrition *and* Conversion, *and not of* Attrition, *because in those minutes he lived on the Cross, he gave such evidence of this in confessing and praying to Christ, when his own Disciples had forsaken him; and beside, Christ, who knew his sincerity, and will not accept the unsincere, revealed to him his acceptance of him. I shall therefore detain you no longer with questions of this nature, but procted to enquire more particularly of* Contrition.

What sins must be taken in by it? or, For what must this godly sorrow be conceived?

C. For all kinds and sorts of sin. 1. For the weaknesses, frailties, and pollutions of our nature, our proneness and inclinations to sin; for though these being unconsented to are no actual sins, yet are they matters of true sorrow and grief and humiliation to a true Christian (as infelicities, if not as sins) that he is such a polluted unclean creature, and so apt to fall into all sin, if he be not restrained and prevented by God's Grace. 2. For the sinful acts and habits of our unregenerate life, with all the aggravations belonging to them. 3. The slips and relapses of our most regenerate life, and the infinite frailties and infirmities that still adhere to it. What sins Contrition belongs to.

S. *Are any of those which you named under the first head,* Infelicities *only, and not* Sins?

C. Yes, the *weakness of our nature*, as that signifies the want of strength, the not being able (since God withdrew his extraordinary gift of Grace) to perform the perfect will of God; this cannot it self be called a sin, but rather a punishment of *Adam*'s sin, and so to us an unhappiness and infelicity. So likewise our inclination to sin, as that signifies the inclination of the flesh to the carnal object, the bending of the eye to the beauty, the taste to the sweetness, which is naturally acceptable to it, and was discernable in *Eve* before the Fall, and so cannot be said to be sin in that notion, but rather *temptation*, which to resist is an act of *virtue*, and *victory*; though as it signifies the inclination of the will to one side rather than the other, to the *evil* more than the *good*, to the *carnal* forbidden than to the *spiritual Christian* object, it is a kind of aversion from God, and a degree of *conversion* to the *creature*, and so a sin in that respect.

S. *But how can* Contrition, *which you called a Preparative to Repentance, and so to Regeneration, include sorrow for the sins of the regenerate life?*

C. I told you, these Preparatives to Repentance do also accompany it whereseever it is; and in that respect it will be clear, that *Contrition* is not one initial act of sorrow for *sin past*, but also a current permanent state of sorrow and humiliation for *sin present*, and through the whole life never out-dated.

S. *What now is* Confession *of sin?* Confession

C. It is of two sorts; 1. To God, 2. To men; especially the *Presbyters*.

S. *What is* Confession *to God?*

C. An humble sorrowful acknowledgement of sin in prayer to God. 1. By confessing that I am a sinner, who have worthily deserved his wrath. 2. By enumeration of the particular sorts of sin of which I know my self guilty. 3. By aggravating these sins upon my self, by the circumstances and heightning accidents of them. 4. By comprizing all my unknown, unconfest sins under some *such* penitentiary form as that of *David*'s, *Who can tell how often he offendeth? cleanse thou me from my secret faults.* to God:

S. *How doth the necessity of this appear?*

C. Beside the practice of *David* and other holy men in Scripture, by these expres Texts; *If we confess our sins, God is faithful and just to forgive us our sins*; and, *He that confesseth and forsaketh, shall have mercy.*

S. *But why then should we confess to men, and particularly to Presbyters?* to man:

C. 1. Because we are commanded by Saint *James* 5. 16. *to confess our faults one to another*, that we may be capable of one anothers prayers. 2. Because our sins may possibly be such wherein other men are injured, and then Confession to them is the first degree towards Reconciliation, *Matth.* 5. 24. Or if they be only against God, then *Confession* of them to his Ministers also will be no way improper, but in some kind necessary to him which desires their Absolution, *verse* 15. 3. Because there being two parts in sin, the guilt and the corruption, the one to be pardoned, the other cured; the first being confessed to God, to obtain his pardon, ought also, if it have been offensive and scandalous to the Congregation, to be acknowledged to them, that that expression of Repentance may make Satisfaction to them for the ill Example, and avert and deterr from sin whom it had invited to it. And for the cure, it will sure be very profitable to advise with others, especially the Physicians of the soul, how and by what means this cure may be wrought, how a raging sin may be subdued, the occasions to it avoided; to which end alone the disclosing of the particular state is more than profitable: and this being supposed, it will be acknowledged necessary for a Christian not to despise such proper useful means to a necessary end, unless without that help he can direct himself, which ignorant men and habituate sinners in any kind will hardly be able to do. 4. Because this may much tend to my comfort, when another (whose office it is) upon a strict survey and shrift of my former life, and present testification of my Repentance, may upon good grounds give me Absolution, and pass judgment on me, better than I can do on my self. to the Minister.

S. *What is the fourth Preparative to Repentance?*

C. A firm Resolution and vow of new life. 1. An abjuring of all my former evil ways, *i. e.* both of the sins themselves, and the occasions which were wont to bring me to those sins; 2. A resigning my self up to do the will of Christ; 3. The pitching on some particular duties of Piety, and Vow of New life.

and Charity, which were most criminously omitted before, and are most agreeable to my calling to perform, and to bring forth all other meet fruits of Repentance.

S. *What now is the penitent state?*

The Penitent state.

C. The actual continued performance of these Resolutions both when occasions are offered, and when Temptations to the contrary.

S. *But what if those Resolutions be not then performed?*

C. Then is not that to be accounted a Penitent or Regenerate man.

S. *But what? are no sins competible with a Regenerate estate?*

What sins competible therewith.

C. Yes, 1. Sins of infirmity; 2. of ignorance, and (under that head of infirmity) 3. sins of sudden surreption; and 4. such as by daily incursion of temptations (though constantly resisted, yet) through the length of the work, and our frailty, and *Satans* vigilance sometimes are gained from us: all these (together with those which 5. through levity of the matter insensibly steal from us) are, by general Repentance, (*i. e.* humbling our selves before God for them, begging God's pardon in Christ, and labouring against them more diligently for the future) reconcileable with a regenerate estate; these are *spots*, but those *spots of sons*, though they be never totally overcome in this life. 6. Some one wilful act of deliberate sin, which we might have resisted, if it be presently retracted with Contrition and Confession, and re-inforcing of our resolution and Vigilance against it, and so not favoured or indulged unto, may be also reconcileable with a regenerate state so far, as not wholly to *quench the spirit* of God, to cause spiritual desertion, though it do grieve that Spirit, waste the conscience, wound the soul, and provoke God's displeasure (from which nothing but hearty Repentance can deliver us) and commonly bring some temporal judgment upon us.

What incompetible.

S. *What then are unreconcileable with a Regenerate state?*

C. Whatsoever are not competible with an honest heart, a sincere endeavour: particularly these two, Hypocrisie and Custom of any sin. *Whatsoever is born of God doth not commit sin*, 1 John 3. 9. (*i. e.* doth not *live* in sin as in a trade or course) *for his seed remaineth in him*; (there is in the Regenerate a new principle or seed of life, a principle of Cognation with God, which whilest it continues in him, is still a hazening him out of sin) *and he cannot sin in such manner, because he is born of God*: or if he do, he is no longer a *child of God*, or Regenerate person: or, as Saint *Paul* saith, *Gal.* 5. 16. *Walk in the Spirit, and you shall not fulfil the lusts of the flesh, i. e.* these two are unreconcileable; as when we say, an honest man cannot do this or that, our meaning is not to affirm any natural impossibility, that he is not able, but that he cannot think fit to do it; the Principles of Honesty within him, as here the Seed of God, or new Principle in him, will resist it; or if he do it, he is no longer to be accounted an honest man.

ὁ ποιῶν ἁμαρτίαν, *non operatur peccatum.*

S. *This place in Saint* John's *Epistle hath sure great difficulty, I beseech you make it as intelligible to me as you may.*

Interpreted.

C. I shall do it, and that most clearly, by bringing down the sence of the whole Chapter from the beginning to this place, in this brief Paraphrase; do you look upon the words in your Bible, whilest I do it. Ver. 1. *God's love to us is very great in that he hath accepted us Christians to be his children*, (which, by the way, is the reason that the world which rejected Christ, rejecteth us also.) Ver. 2. *And being Children, though we know not exactly the future benefit which shall accrue to us by this means, yet this we know, that when this shall be revealed to us, we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is, and that Vision will assimilate us unto him.* Ver. 3. *And the very hope of it now*, if it be fastened on God, *hath the same power of making us pure, as he is pure.* For 1. *Hope* includes Desire and Love of the thing hoped for, which being Heaven, a place of purity, the hope of Heaven must include a desire of Purity: and therefore the Heaven that the sensual man desires, if he desire it for the present, is a mock-heaven; and if it be the true Heaven, the state of purity, then he desires it not for the present, but hereafter when sensual pleasures shall have forsaken him. And 2. the Condition of God's Promises being our Purification or Sanctification, and the particular Condition of this *seeing God* being *holiness*, it is madness for us to hope any thing but upon those grounds; and therefore he that hath *this hope of seeing him*, or *being like him* hereafter, labours to become like him now in *Purity*, (a special imitable quality of his.) And (Ver 4.) *He that wants it*, (*i. e.* every one that committeth sin) *is guilty of the breach of the law, of this Evangelical law of his; and that sin it self is that breach, upon which consequently follows the forfeiture of those Promises contained in it.* (Ver. 5.) *And to that end, that we, for whom Christ died, should not thus sin, it was without doubt that he came amongst us; and sin, or any such impenitent committer of sin is not in him.* (Ver. 6.) *For every one that remaineth in him, as a member of his, sinneth not wilful deliberate sins: if any man do so, pretend or profess he what he will, he hath neither seen nor known Christ.* (Ver. 7.) *I pray, suffer not your selves to be deceived. Christ you know is righteous, and the way to be like him is to be righteous also; and that cannot be, but by doing righteousness, living a constant Christian life.* (Ver. 8.) *He that doth not so, but goes on in a course of sin, is of the Devil, and by his actions expresses the stock he comes of. For 'tis the Devil that began his age with sin, and so continued it, and so sin is his trade, his work; and this was a special part of the end of Christ's coming, to destroy his trade, to dissolve that fabrick he had wrought,* i. e. *to turn sin out of the world.* (Ver. 9.) *And therefore sure no child of God's, none of that superiour stock will go on in that accursed trade, because he hath God's seed in him*, that original of cognation between God and him, *God's grace that Principle of his new birth, which gives him continual dislikes to sin, such as* (though they do not force or constrain him not to yield to Satan's temptations, yet) *are sufficient to get him out of those snares*; and if he be a child of God, of *Christ's making, like him that begat him in purity*, &c. * *he cannot, he will not thus go on in sin.* (Ver. 10.) *So that hereby you may clearly distinguish a child of God from a child of the Devil: he that doth not live a righteous and charitable life, (do justice and love mercy*, as *Micah* saith) *is no child of God's, hath no relation of consanguinity to him.* I shall need proceed no farther; by this you will understand the sence of the Verse to be this, and no more: *Those that are like Christ, and so God's Children, 'tis supposed that they have such a Seed or Principle of Grace in them, that inclines them to dislike, and*

* *Hæc non admittet omnino qui natus è Deo fuerit, non futurus Dei filius si admiserit.* Tertul. de pudicit. And to the same sence, *Virtus sine ulla intermissione perpetua est, nec discedere ab ea potest qui semel eam cœpit. Nam si habeat intervallum, si quando eâ cadere possumus, redeunt protinus peccata, quæ virtutem semper impugnant.* Lactant.

enables

enables them to resist all deliberate sins; and if they do not make that use of that grace, sure they are not like Christ, none of his fellow-sons of God: a Regenerate man remaining such, will not, nay morally cannot, do so; so doing is contrary to a Regenerate state.

S. *I heartily thank you for this trouble, I shall divert you by another scruple, which is this*; *Will not, I pray you*, the flesh, *as long as we continue in these houses of clay, be we never so regenerate*, lust against the spirit, the members war against the mind, *and so keep us from* doing the thing that we would, *yea and* captivate us to the law of sin? *and so will not this captivity and thraldom to sin, so it be joined with a contrary striving and dislike, be reconcileable with a regenerate estate?*

C. Your question cannot be answered with a single Yea, or Nay, because there be several parts in it, some to be affirmed, others to be denied; and therefore to satisfie you, I shall answer by degrees. 1. That there is a double strife in a man, the one called a *war* betwixt the *law in the members and the law in the mind*, the other the *lusting betwixt the spirit and the flesh*. The former, betwixt the law in the members and in the mind, is the perswasion of sin or carnal objects on one side, and the law of God inviting us on the other side, commanding us the contrary: and in this case, *the law*, as the Apostle saith, *being weak*, and not able of it self to help any man to do what it commands him, it must needs follow, that they that have no other strength but the bare light of the *law in the mind*, no grace of Christ to sustain them in their combats, will by their carnal appetite be led to do those things which the law tells them they should not; which if they do and continue in them, this condition you will have no colour of reason to mistake for a regenerate state. 1. Because it is the state of him only that knows the Law (which is not able to quicken or renew) considered without the grace of Christ, which is necessary to a regenerate man. 2. Because this *law in the mind*, when it is not obeyed, but despised, doth serve only to testifie against us, that we *knew our Masters will, and did it not*, i. e. that what we did was against the dictates of our own Conscience, which sure will never help to excuse a sin, (but rather to aggravate it) or consequently to make that Act reconcileable with a regenerate estate, which otherwise would not be so. And therefore, 2. Of this kind of composition of a man, when his mind or upper soul being instructed in its duty, dislikes the sins he commits, and yet he continues to commit them, you may resolve, that this striving or this dislike of his mind is no excuse or apology for his sin, much less any argument of his regeneracy or good estate; but on the other side, his *serving of, or captivity to, the law of sin in his members*, is all one with the *reigning of sin in his body, to fulfil the lusts thereof*, and that a sure token of an unregenerate: for of every regenerate 'tis said, 1 *John* 5. 4. *that he overcometh the world*, which is quite contrary to *being sold under sin*, (a phrase referring to the Romans custom of selling slaves under a spear, or to that which is said of *Ahab*, 1 Kings 21. 25. *that he was sold to do evil*) being a slave of sin, or *serving with the flesh the law of sin*; and therefore you may conclude, that he, whosoever it is, *that with the mind serves the law of God*, i. e. approves of God's command, or *consents to it, that it is good*, and yet *with the flesh, the members, serves the law of sin*, that not only commits some act of sin, but lives indulgently in it, and appears thereby to be enslaved to it, is never to be counted of as a regenerate man, but only as one that by law is taught the knowledge of his duty, but by that bare knowledge is not enabled to perform it.

The war betwixt the law in the members, and in the mind, *Rom.* 7.

S. *But what then is the other thing you told me of*, the lusting of the spirit and the flesh one against the other?

C. Those words you will find *Gal.* 5. where by the *spirit* is meant the Seed of grace planted in my heart by God, as a principle of new life, or the mind and upper soul elevated yet higher (above the condition it is in by nature, or by the bare light of the law) by that supernatural principle; and by the flesh is meant again the carnal appetite still remaining in the most regenerate in this life; and the *lusting of one of these against the other*, is the absolute contrariety that is betwixt these two, that whatsoever one likes the other dislikes; whatsoever the one commends to the Will, the other quarrelleth at.

The lusting of the flesh and spirit.

S. *What then is the meaning of that which follows this contrariety*, Gal. 5. 17. *in these words*, [so that you cannot do the things that you would?]

C. The words in Greek are not [that *you cannot do*] but [that *you do not*,] and the sence is, either 1. That this contrariety always interposes some objections to hinder or trash you from *doing the things that you would*, i. e. sometimes the spirit trashes you from doing the thing that your flesh would have done, sometimes the flesh trashes you from doing the thing that the spirit would have done. And 2. whatsoever you do, you do, first against one velleity (or wouldingness) or other; and secondly, with some mixture of the contrary: Or else that this contrariety gives you trouble, that whatsoever you do on either side, you do it not quietly, stilly, but with a great deal of resistance and opposition of the contrary faculty.

ἵνα μὴ ποιῆτε.

S. *Well then, may this* * wrestling, *this resistance be in a regenerate man?*

C. Undoubtedly it may, and in some degrees it will be, as long as we carry flesh about us, for the flesh will always dislike what the spirit likes. But then we must be sure that the flesh do not carry it against the spirit, *i. e.* do not get the consent of the will to it, for if it do, *lust conceives and brings forth sin*, even those works of the flesh mentioned, *ver.* 19. for though this wrestling be reconcileable with a regenerate state, *i. e.* that a man may be and continue regenerate for all this, yet it is not an argument of a regenerate estate, so that every one that hath it, shall by that be concluded regenerate; for if the flesh carry it from the spirit, to *fulfil the lusts thereof*, it seems that man *walks not in the spirit*, ver. 16. and consequently is not in a regenerate state.

* *Lucta.*

The reluctance of the flesh.

S. *But is every man unregenerate that doth any thing that the flesh would have?*

C. I told you, Frailties and imperfections, and also sins of sudden surreption, and those that by daily incursion, continual importunity, at some one time gained in upon us, (so they were as suddenly taken and repented of) were reconcileable with a regenerate state; and therefore if it proceed no farther, it is only mixture of the flesh in our best actions, or else slips and trips or falls suddenly recovered again; but not carnality, or *walking after the flesh*. And for these you know the remedy I prescribed you, daily prayer for daily slips, and daily caution and care and endeavour to prevent them. But as for indulgence in sin, or habits of carnality, 'tis not the *lusting of the spirit against the flesh* that

that will excuſe them from being *works of the fleſh*, or him that is guilty of them from being carnal. For it being too too poſſible and ordinary for the *luſtings of the ſpirit*, (*i. e.* ſpiritual motions) to be reſiſted, it will be little advantage to any to have had theſe motions, unleſs he have obeyed them, *i. e.* unleſs he walk *in the ſpirit*, and be *led by it*; for to ſuch only it is that there *is no condemnation*, Rom. 8. 1.

* *Votum pœnitentiæ*, the wiſh to be penitent.

S. *I ſhall detain you but with one ſcruple more, and that is, whether* * *a vow or a wiſh that I were penitent, will not be accepted by God for repentance?*

C. If you take that Vow and that Wiſh to be all one, you are miſtaken; a wiſh is a far lower degree than a vow; and therefore I muſt diſſolve your demand into two parts; and to the firſt, anſwer, that the vow or reſolution to amend, if it be ſincere, and ſuch as is apt to bring forth fruits, is ſure to be accepted by God; and that it is not ſincere we ſhall not be able to diſcern, but by ſeeing it prove otherwiſe in time of temptation: only God that ſees the heart can judge of it before ſuch trial, and if he find it ſincere, he will accept of it. But for the wiſh that I were penitent, there is no promiſe in holy Writ that that ſhall be accepted, nor appearance of reaſon, why he that wiſhes he were penitent, but is not, ſhould be accounted the better for that wiſh; 1. Becauſe when the reward of penitents and puniſhment of impenitents is once aſſented to as true, 'tis impoſſible but the mind of man ſhould wiſh for the one, and have diſlikes to the other, and ſo there will be no vertue in that neceſſity. 2. Becauſe that wiſhing is only a bare airy ſpeculative act of the mind, and not a practical of the will, which alone is puniſhable or rewardable. 3. Becauſe the actions being contrary to ſuch wiſhings are more accuſable of deliberate ſin, and ſin againſt conſcience, than if thoſe motives which produced thoſe wiſhes had never been repreſented to the faculty.

Prayers for grace of Repentance.

S. *But are not* prayers *for the grace of Repentance, (which are but a kind of articulate wiſhes, put in form of the Court, and addreſſed to God) accepted by God?*

C. Not ſo far as to ſave them that go no farther. Accepted they ſhall be (if rightly qualified with humility, and ardency, and perſeverance, or not fainting) ſo far as concerns the end immediate to them; *i. e.* God hath promiſed to hear them, in granting the grace prayed for, ſtrength to convert from ſin to God, (which is the clear Goſpel-promiſe, *How much more ſhall your heavenly Father give the holy Spirit to them that ask?*) and then when this grace, or ſtrength given, is thus made uſe of to actual reformation, then the promiſe of that other acceptance belongs to them alſo; and ſo prayer is a good means, and wiſhing a good thing too, as previous or preparative to that, and both without doubt proceeding from the good Spirit of God. But yet if the whole work be no more but this, if he be advanced no farther toward repentance, but only to wiſh and to pray that he were penitent, this perſon remains ſtill impenitent; and ſo long the impenitent's portion belongs to him, and none other; for ſtill *he that is born of God overcometh the world*; and he that is advanced no farther toward a victory, than to wiſh or to pray for it, is for that preſent far enough from being a Conqueror; and if for the future he add not the ſincerity of endeavour to the importunity of prayer, the *Joſhuah*'s hands held up to fight, as well as the *Moſes*'s to pray, the ſword of *Gideon* as the ſword of the Lord, there is yet little hope that ſuch victories will be atchieved.

S. *God grant me this grace, and an heart to make uſe of it. But we have ſkipt over one particular forementioned, the grace of Self-denial. And I do not remember that you mentioned taking up of the Croſs, which in Chriſt's preſcriptions is wont to be annexed to it. Give me leave to recal them to your memory. And firſt,* Of Self-denial. *what is meant by* Self-denial?

C. The abnegation or renouncing of all his own holds, and intereſts, and truſts of all that man is moſt apt to depend upon, that he may the more expeditely follow Chriſt.

S. *What are theſe ſeverals that we are thus to renounce?*

C. In general, whatſoever comes at any time in competition with Chriſt. In particular; the particulars whereof every man is made up, his ſoul, his body, his eſtate, his good name.

What it is in reſpect of the ſoul.

S. *What under the firſt head, that of his* Soul?

C. 1. His Reaſon, when the word of Chriſt is contradicted or checkt by it: As in the buſineſs of the Reſurrection, and the like, I muſt deny my reaſon, and believe Chriſt, bow down the head and worſhip, captivate my underſtanding to the obedience of Faith.

Denial of my reaſon.

S. *But I have heard that God cannot do contradictions, or make two contradictions true at once, and in one reſpect. How then can I be bound to believe God, when that which he ſaith contradicts reaſon?*

C. I am not glad that you have met with that ſubtlety, yet ſeeing 'tis proper to the particular we are upon, and that a branch of a practical point, I will endeavour to ſatisfie you in it; 1. by granting the truth of your rule, that, To make both parts of a contradiction true, is abſolutely impoſſible, a thing which God's infinite power and veracity makes as unfit for God to be able to do, as to lie or ſin; becauſe it were not an exceſs but defect of power, to be able to do theſe. But then ſecondly, you muſt know what is meant by contradictions, nothing but affirmation and negation of the ſame thing in all the ſame reſpects; as, to be and not to be, to be a man and not a man, to be two yards long and not two yards long; which therefore are thus abſolutely impoſſible to be done, even by divine power. But then, thirdly, that which you called reaſons contradicting of Chriſt, is a very diſtant thing from this. For when reaſon ſaith one thing, and Chriſt the contradictory to that, reaſon doth not oblige me to believe reaſon; or if it doth, it bids me disbelieve Chriſt, and ſo ſtill I believe not contradictories, whetherſoever of the contradictories I believe. All that reaſon hath to do in this caſe, is to judge which is likelieſt to judge of (or affirm) the truth, its ſelf or God; wherein if it judge of its own ſide againſt God, it is very partial and very Atheiſtical, it being very reaſonable, that God, which cannot lie, ſhould be believed rather than my own reaſon, which is often deceived in judging of natural things, (its only proper object) but is quite blind in ſupernatural, till God be pleaſed to reveal thoſe unto it. The ſhort is. Reaſon tells me (and in that it is impoſſible it ſhould erre, eſpecially God having revealed nothing to the contrary, it is doubtleſs that it doth not erre) that theſe two propoſitions cannot be both true, [there is another life] and [there is not another life;] and therefore I am not bound by Chriſt to believe both: but it doth not tell me, that to affirm another life implies a contradiction, but only profeſſeth that it cannot perceive, or that it is

How far. Not to believe contradictions.

But to believe God rather than my reaſon.

above

above reaſon to diſcern, how there can be a return from a total privation to a habit again. And the like objections reaſon hath againſt ſome things ſuppoſed in the Reſurrection, which though nature cannot do, and conſequently natural reaſon cannot tell how they are done, yet reaſon may acknowledge that the God of nature can do them, and will do them, if he ſaith he will; and illuminated reaſon having revelation of this will of God, muſt and doth believe they ſhall be done, or elſe makes God a liar.

S. *What then is it to deny my reaſon?*

C. Whenſoever my reaſon objects any thing to what God affirms, to reſolve that God ſhall be true in deſpight of all my appearances and objections to the contrary.

S. *Is there any thing then elſe in the ſoul which I am to deny?*

C. Something there is which men are apt to overvalue, and ſomething there is thought to be which is not, and both thoſe muſt be equally renounced.

S. *What do you mean by that ſomething which is overvalued?*

C. Natural ſtrength, which is now ſo weakned, that it is not at all able to bring us to our journeys end, without ſome addition of ſpecial grace of God, to prevent and aſſiſt in that work; and therefore all ſtrength in my ſelf, *i. e.* all ſufficiency in my ſelf, as of my ſelf, I muſt renounce, and apply my ſelf humbly in prayer for, and truſt in dependence on, that ſpecial grace of Chriſt, to help me both to will and to do whatſoever is good, and that is to deny my ſelf, that is, all opinion of my own abilities toward the attaining any ſupernatural end. Not over-valuing natural ſtrength.

S. *What is that other ſort of things which you ſay is thought to be, but is not?*

C. Any righteouſneſs of my own: for as for perfect unſinning righteouſneſs, he that ſhould pretend to that, *deceives himſelf, and the truth is not in him*; and for imperfect righteouſneſs, ſuch as by the help of grace this life is capable of, though that be a condition without which *no man ſhall ſee God*, (be either juſtified or ſaved) yet muſt not that be depended on as the cauſe of either, but only the free mercy of God in Chriſt, *not imputing of ſin*; and ſo I am to deny my own righteouſneſs, renounce all truſt in that for ſalvation. My own righteouſneſs.

S. *What now doth Self-denial as it refers to the* body *ſignifie?*

C. It ſignifies renouncing of all the unlawful ſinful deſires of the fleſh, and even lawful liberty and life it ſelf, when they come in competition with Chriſt, ſo that either Chriſt muſt be parted with or theſe. And the ſame is to be conceived both of eſtate and good name. He *that forſaketh not houſe and land*, Matt. 19. 29. that will not part with any worldly hope or poſſeſſion, rather than do any thing contrary to Chriſt's commands, *is not worthy of Chriſt*; and, If *you receive the praiſe of men, how can you believe?* He that is not reſolved to part with reputation and honour, when it comes in competition with Chriſt, can never go for a good Chriſtian: and not only thus, when theſe things come in competition with Chriſt's ſervice, but even abſolutely taken, ſome kind of ſelf denial is required by us of Chriſt, of which the particulars are not ſpecified by him, but referred to our free choice, our voluntary performing them. We muſt not always do what is lawful to do, but wean our ſelves from, and deny our ſelves the enjoying of, many lawful pleaſures of the world, that we may have the better command over our ſelves, and that we may be the more vacant for God's ſervice. Thus faſting, *&c.* becomes our duty, yea and revenge, or contrary abſtinence in caſe of former exceſs. In reſpect of the Body and Eſtate.

S. *This grace, by the hints you have afforded me, I diſcern to be a moſt eminent Chriſtian vertue; the God of heaven plant it in my heart. But what do you think needful to add to this, about* taking up the Croſs?

C. That it is a precept peculiar to the Goſpel, that nothing but Chriſtianity could make ſo very fit and reaſonable to be commanded us. Of taking up the Croſs.

S. *What do you mean by the* Croſs, *and by* taking it up?

C. By the Croſs I mean any affliction that God in his providence ſees fit to lay upon us, or to lay in our way toward piety; any puniſhment which befalls us either for righteouſneſs ſake, or not for unrighteouſneſs.

S. *What mean you by* taking it up?

C. 1. Not receding from any Chriſtian performance upon ſight of that lying in the way, which in the parable of the ſower is expreſſed by [*not being offended*, or *ſcandalized*, or diſcouraged, or falling away in time of *tribulation*.] 2. Bearing of it, *patiently*, *chearfully*, and *comfortably*. 3. Giving God *thanks* for it.

S. *Is a man bound to be glad that he is afflicted?*

C. He is. 1. Becauſe he ſees it is God's will, when 'tis actually upon him; and then he ought to be willing and joyful that God's will is done. 2. Becauſe Chriſt commands him to *rejoyce*, and *be exceeding glad*, Mat. 5. 12. *Rejoyce and leap for joy*, Luke 6. 22. *To think it all joy*, James 1. 2. 3. Becauſe it is a conforming us to the *Image* of the crucified Chriſt, to which every beloved Child of God is *predeſtinate*, Rom. 8. 29. 4. Becauſe it is ſuch a ſign of God's *love*, that every one *that is not chaſtned*, is by that character markt out for a *Baſtard*, *and no ſon*, Heb. 12. 8. Which though it be not ſet down as a duty of ours, for which we are to account; or again as a certain mark by which men are given to diſcern whether they are children of God or no: yet is it as an Aphoriſm of obſervation for God's ordinary acts of providence now under the Goſpel, that he is wont to chaſtiſe thoſe here whom he beſt loves; which is a ſufficient motive of joy to him who finds himſelf in that good number. Rejoycing in tribulations.

S. *But ſure, there are ſome kinds of afflictions (ſharp pains of the body, and the like) which bring with them ſorrow neceſſarily, and ſo cannot be matter of joy to us.*

C. Spiritual joy may well be reconcileable with that ſenſitive ſorrow; at the ſame time when the outward ſmart produceth the one in the body, the contemplation of the hand which ſtrikes, and of the advantages deſigned to the Patient by thoſe fatherly medicinal chaſtiſements, may well be allowed to beget the other in the inward diviner part. Spiritual joy reconcileable with ſenſitive ſorrow.

S. *But the continuance of ſome afflictions, particularly of ſharp pains, doth by certain conſequence make*

a man unfit for performance not only of the duties of the calling, but even of devotions, of prayer it self, and so make the life utterly unprofitable in respect of men and of God; and can any man rationally think fit to rejoyce in, or for that?

How corporal pain can be matter of rejoycing.

C. He that is imployed as God would have him, that behaves himself duly in that state wherein he is set by God, must not be thought to live unprofitably. God cannot receive any real profit or advantage by any our most God-like actions; he wanteth not, and therefore we can no way contribute to him: only when we do what he commands, then are we said to be his good and useful servants. And therefore when by his will and providence (which is an inarticulate command) we are determined to suffering in stead of doing, when we are restrained from an active life, and by God's designation placed in a passive condition, when we are confined to the pains of a weary bed, our patience, and meekness, and Christian deportment under that heavy hand of God, is then a most acceptable service to him; and he that thus magnifies the power of God's Grace in the faithful exercise of such Christian vertues, and thereby reacheth forth to all beholders so many glorious copies for them to transcribe, will never be deemed unprofitable either to God or man; but shall be lookt on by both as an exemplary, imitable combatant and conquerour, which hath wrestled with the stoutest champion in the world, the sharpest of Satan's buffetings, and being proved is found faithful. And then this is still fit and proper to be matter of rejoycing to him.

S. But is a man bound to give thanks for affliction?

Giving thanks for afflictions.

C. Yes he is: 1. Because that is the only spiritual Christian way of expressing to God his rejoycing. 2. Because it comes from God, and is meant by him for our good, a gift or donative of heaven: *To you it is given*, Phil. 1. 29. it is *granted*, as a grace and vouchsafement of God's special favour, *to suffer* for Christ; and that grace designed, 1. to reform what is amiss, 2. to punish here, that there may be nothiug of evil left for another world; to judge us here, that we may not be condemned hereafter. 3. Because we are so *commanded* to *glorifie God in this behalf*, 1 Pet. 4. 16. and in this respect to *sanctifie the Lord God in our hearts*, 1. Pet. 3. 15. *i. e.* to *hallow* or praise him for it.

Afflictions that fall not for righteousness sake, matter of rejoycing also.

S. This is easily assented to, if it fall upon me for righteousness sake, *as the Apostles* went out of the Temple rejoycing that they were thought worthy to suffer shame for Christ's name: *but, What if it be not so, but only that afflictions fall on me I know not how?*

C. They are then not only patiently and thankfully to be received, but to be rejoyced in also; 1. Because of all kind of chastening the Apostle pronounceth, that, *though for the present it seemeth not joyous but grievous, yet afterward it yieldeth the peaceable fruit of righteousness unto them which be exercised thereby*, Heb. 12. 11. 2. Because there is *somewhat behind of the sufferings of Christ to be filled up in our flesh*, Col. 1. 24. *i. e.* some Reliques of that bitter Passion-cup of his for us to drink. 3. Because it is such an expression of a curse to have our Reward, and (with *Dives*) *all our good things in this life*, and that an ominous sign that there is nothing left to be rewarded in another life.

Renouncing of persecuted Duties.

S. What judgment then is to be made of those, who in evil times, when Christian Doctrines and practices are persecuted, think fit to renounce those doctrines and practices, or to preserve themselves from worldly danger by not confessing, and so by not seeming to approve of them?

C. The judging of other men is no part of that lesson which I meant to teach you. But that which every person thus guilty ought to judge of himself, is this, that he is guilty of some degree of that cowardise which is join'd with infidelity, *Rev.* 21. 8. and that he is of the number of those many foretold by Christ, *Matt.* 24. 12. whose love to Christ is grown cold, upon the encreasing of iniquities abroad in the world, which must needs be a great unkindness to Christ, to whom our love and zeal and constancy ought then most to be shewed, when he or his doctrines are most opposed, and so most stands in need of assistants and advocates to maintain them. And I shall tell you one thing more on this matter, that the ancient heresie of the *Gnosticks* (which had its spring from the Magician *Simon*, and against several branches of which the several Epistles of all the Apostles in the New Testament were sent to arm the Churches, and the Epistle of Christ himself by *John* to the seven Churches in *Asia*) is taken notice of by ancient Writers for this prime fundamental doctrine of theirs, that [a] it was an *indifferent thing* (or no sin) *in times of persecution to forswear the faith without any scruple, and to taste of the Idol-sacrifices.* And therefore it is that the Apostles so call for *confession of the mouth*, Rom. 10. 9, 10. and require that perfection of love to Christ, which 1 *John* 4. 18. *casts out fear of persecutions, punishments*, &c. and pronounce *Anathema's* against them that thus *love not the Lord Jesus*, 1 Cor. 16. 22. setting the *love of Christ*, who loved us and died for us, as the example of our *walking in love*, Eph. 5. 2. which clearly contradicts that opinion of the world, that the *preserving of our selves* is the great principle to which all other precepts are but subordinate, binding us no longer than will be reconcileable with that. For sure the copy of Christ's love, which, if need be, we are required to follow both there, *Eph.* 5. 2. and 1 *John* 4. 17. that *as he was in this world, so we should be also*, (farther expresst there, by having [c] *courage* to confess *Christ in the day of Judgment, i. e.* when we are in danger to be sentenced by any Judicature to any punishment, though it be of death it self, as Christ was) obliges us then especially to express our love to Christ, when our danger is greatest from the world in so doing. And therefore Saint *Paul* to *Titus* prescribes not only *soundness in the Faith*, but in *love* and [a] *patience, or endurance also*, chap. 2. 2.

[a] ἀδιαφορίαν εἰδωλοθύτων ὑποκειμένης, καὶ ἐξομνυμένης ἀπερεγγυλάκτως τὴν πίστιν, καὶ τὰς τῶν ἀθλίων καρφάς. Euseb. Hist. l. 4. c. 3. Self-preservation the Worldlings principle.

[c] παῤῥησίαν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ κείσεως.

[a] ὑπομονῆς.

S. What then is to be thought of them who to get the cross off from their own shoulders, and to put it on other mens, will venture on things most contrary to peace, and shake the quiet, perhaps the foundations, of a Kingdom?

Enmity to the Cross.

C. I will say no more (and I can scarely say worse) than that they are of all others the extreamest *enemies to the cross of Christ*, a very ill and sad spectacle among Christians; and that there is nothing more unreasonable than to pretend Christianity for the doing this, which is so perfectly contrary to it.

S. You have now past through all the Christian graces at the first designed for consideration. I shall put you in mind of the next thing whereof you made your self my debtor; the difference of, and dependence between,

tween Justification *and* Sanctification; *wherein first you will please to give me the notion of the single terms. And first, what is* Justification?

C. It is God's accepting our persons, and not imputing our sins, his covering or pardoning our iniquities, his being so reconciled unto us sinners, that he determines not to punish us eternally. Sect. IV. *Of Justification.*

S. *What is the cause of that?*

C. Gods free mercy unto us in Christ, revealed in the new Covenant. The cause of it.

S. *What in us is the Instrumental cause of it?*

C. As an Instrument is logically and properly taken, and signifies an inferior, less principal efficient cause, so nothing in us can have any thing to do (*i. e.* any kind of physical efficiency) in this work; neither is it imaginable it should, it being a work of God's upon us, without us, concerning us, but not within us at all. And if you mark, Justification being in plain terms but the accepting our persons and pardoning of sins, it would be very improper and harsh to affirm that our works, our any thing, even our faith it self, should accept our persons, or pardon our sins, though in never so inferior a notion; which yet they must if they were instrumental in our Justification. 'Tis true indeed, those necessary qualifications which the Gospel requires in us, are conditions or moral instruments without which we shall not be justified; but those are not properly called Instruments or causes.

S. *What are those qualifications?* The qualifications.

C. Faith, repentance, firm purpose of a new life, and the rest of those graces upon which in the Gospel pardon is promised the Christian; all comprizable in the New-creature, Conversion, Regeneration, *&c.*

S. *Are these required in us, so as without them we cannot be justified? How then are we justified by the* free grace of God? Justification by free grace.

C. Yes, these two are very reconcileable; for there is no worth in our Faith or Repentance, or any poor weak grace of ours, to deserve God's favour to our persons, or pardon of what sins are past, or acceptation of our imperfect obedience for the future; 'tis his free grace to pardon, and accept us on such poor conditions as these, and this free grace purchased, and sealed to us by the death of Christ.

S. *What now is* Sanctification?

C. The word may note either a gift of God's, his giving of grace to prevent and sanctifie us; or a duty of ours, our having, *i. e.* making use of that grace: and both these considered together, either as an Act, or as a State. *Of Sanctification.*

S. *What is it as it signifies an* Act?

C. The infusion of holiness in our hearts, or of some degrees of holiness; and parallel to that, the receiving and obeying the good motions of God's sanctifying Spirit, and laying them up to fructifie in an honest heart; the turning of the soul to God, or the first beginning of new life. As it is an Act.

S. *What is it as it signifies a* State?

C. The living a new, a holy, a gracious life, in obedience to the good grace of God, and daily improving and growing, and at last persevering and dying in it. As a State.

S. *What now is the dependence between* Justification *and* Sanctification?

C. This, that the first part of Sanctification, the beginning of new life, must be first had, before God pardons or justifies any; then when God is thus reconciled to the new convert upon his vow of new life, he gives him more grace, enables and assists him for that state of sanctification, wherein, if he makes good use of that grace, he then continues to enjoy this favour and justification; but if he perform not his vow, proceed not in Christian holy life, but relapse into wasting acts or habits of sin, then God chargeth again all his former sins upon him, and those present iniquities of his, and in them, if he return not again, *he shall die*; as appears by *Ezek.* 18. 24. *If the righteous* (*i. e.* the sanctified and justified person) *depart from his righteousness, and committeth iniquity, in his sin that he hath sinned, he shall die:* and by the parable of the King, *Matth.* 18. where he that had the debt pardoned him freely by his Lord, yet, for exacting over severely from his fellow-servant, is again unpardoned and cast into *prison, delivered to the tormentors, till he should pay all that was due unto him*, ver. 34. which parable Christ applies to our present business, ver. 35. *So likewise shall my heavenly Father do also unto you.* The dependence between Justification and Sanctification.

S. *But is not a man* justified *before he is* sanctified; *and if he be, how then can his* Justification *depend on his* Sanctification?

C. If he were justified before he were sanctified in any kind, then would your reasoning hold; for sure by the same reason that Justification might be begun before Repentance, or Resolution of new life, or Conversion to God, it might also be continued to him that repented not, or that returned to his evil way: and therefore without all doubt this kind of Sanctification is precedent in order of nature to Justification, *i. e.* I must first Believe, Repent, and Return, (all which together is that Faith which is required as the Condition of our being justified, a receiving of the whole Christ, a cordial assent to his Commands as well as Promises, a giving up the heart to him, a resolution of Obedience, [a] a proneness or readiness to obey him, the thing without which (saith [b] an ancient Writer) Christ can do none of his Miracles upon our Souls, any more than he could his mighty works among his unbelieving Countrey-men) before God will pardon: (though indeed in respect of time there is no sensible priority, but God's pardon and our change go together: *At what time soever we repent, or convert sincerely, God will have mercy*, i. e. *justifie.*) A further proof of this, if it be needful, you may take from the Author to the *Hebrews*, Chap. 10. where having said, v. 14. that *Christ by his own suffering perfected for ever them that are sanctified*, intimating that they must be *sanctified* before he *perfect* them, he addeth a proof by which these two things are cleared: First, that [to *perfect*] there signifies [to forgive sins or to justifie;] Secondly, that this doctrine of the Priority of Sanctification is agreeable to the description of the second Covenant, *Jer.* 31. 33. That by perfecting he means justifying or pardoning of sins, 'tis apparent by ver. 17. *Their sins and iniquities will I remember no more*; which must needs be acknowledged to be that part of the Testi-

[a] τὸ ἑτοίμως ἔχειν τῆς ὑπακοῆς.
[b] *Jobius ap. Phot. bib.*

[a] τελειόκεν εις τὸ παντελές.

mony that belongs to that part of the Propoſition to be proved by it [[a] *he hath perfected for ever*] (the former part of the Teſtimony belonging to the latter part of the Propoſition) which may further thus appear: To *perfect*, in this Author, ſignifies to Conſecrate to Prieſthood, (Ch. 2. 10. 5. 9. & 7. 28.) that being applied to us, is a phraſe to note Boldneſs or Liberty to *enter into the Holies*, ver. 19. that again to Pray confidently to God, which, ver. 18. is ſet to denote Pardon of ſin. Which being premiſed, the ſecond thing alſo follows; that in *Jeremy* 31. 33. the tenure of the Covenant

[b] προλέγει.

ſets Sanctification before Juſtification: for, ſaith the Apoſtle, he [c] *firſt ſaid, I will put my Law into their hearts, and put or write them in their thoughts or minds*, which is Preparatory on God's part to their Sanctification; and then [c] *after* the ſaying of that [d] *Alſo I will no more remember their ſins, nor their offences.* Many other Scripture-evidences might be added to this matter, if it were needful.

[c] μετὰ τὸ

[d] Juſtification before Sanctification, in what ſence.

As for thoſe that make Juſtification to be before Sanctification, I hope and conceive they mean by Sanctification the ſanctified ſtate, the actual performance and practice of our vows of new life, and our growth in grace; and by our Juſtification that firſt act of pardon, or Reconciliation in God, and then they ſay true: but if they mean, that our ſins are pardoned before we convert to God, and reſolve new life, and that the firſt grace enabling to do theſe is a conſequent of God's having pardoned our ſins; this is a miſtake, which in effect excludes Juſtification by Faith, which is that firſt grace of receiving Chriſt, and reſigning our hearts up to him, and muſt be in order of nature precedent to our Juſtification, or elſe can neither be Condition nor Inſtrument of it: and beſides, this is apt to have an ill influence on Practice, and therefore I thought fit to prevent it. The iſſue of all is, that God will not pardon till we in heart reform and amend. *He that forſaketh, i. e.* in hearty ſincere reſolution abandons, the ſins of the Old man, *ſhall have mercy, and none but he.* And then, God will not continue this gracious favour of his, but to thoſe who make uſe of his aſſiſting grace to perſevere in theſe reſolutions of forſaking: ſo that the Juſtification is ſtill commenſurate to the Sanctification; an act of Juſtification upon an act of Sanctification, or a reſolution of new life; and a continuance of Juſtification, upon continuance of the ſanctified eſtate.

S. *But is not God firſt reconciled unto us, before he gives us any grace to ſanctifie us?*

God reconciled before he gives grace.

C. So far reconciled he is as to give us grace, and ſo far as to make conditional Promiſes of Salvation; but not ſo as to give pardon or juſtifie actually: for you know, *whom God juſtifies, thoſe he glorifies*, i. e. if they paſs out of this life in a juſtified eſtate, they are certainly glorified; but you cannot imagine that God will *glorifie* any who is not yet *ſanctified*; for *without Holineſs no man ſhall ſee the Lord.* And therefore you will eaſily conclude, that God juſtifies none who are unſanctified; for if he did, then ſuppoſing the perſon to die in that inſtant, it muſt follow, either that the unſanctified man is glorified, or the juſtified man not glorified. Any thing elſe God may do to the unſanctified man but either ſave him, or do ſomewhat on which ſaving infallibly follows; and therefore *give him grace* he may, but till that grace be received and treaſured up in an honeſt heart, he will never be throughly reconciled to him, *i. e.* juſtifie or ſave him.

S. *I pray then, from theſe Premiſes ſet me down the Order or Method uſed by God in the ſaving of a ſinner.*

God's method in ſaving a ſinner.

C. I will. It is this. 1. God gives his Son to die for him, and ſatisfie for his ſins; ſo that though he be a ſinner, yet on condition of a new life he may be ſaved. Then 2. in that death of Chriſt he ſtrikes with him a New Covenant, a Covenant of Mercy and Grace. Then 3. according to that Covenant he ſends his Spirit, and by the Word (and that Spirit annexed to it) he calls the ſinner powerfully to Repentance: If he anſwer to that Call, and awake, and ariſe, and make his ſincere faithful Reſolutions of new life; God then 4. juſtifies, accepts his perſon, and pardons his ſins paſt: then 5. gives him more grace, aſſiſts him to *do*, (as before he enabled him to *will*) *i. e.* to perform his good Reſolutions. Then 6. upon Continuance in that ſtate, in thoſe Performances, till the hour of death, he gives to him, as to a faithful ſervant, a crown of life.

S. *The good Lord be thus merciful to me a ſinner. I bleſs God, and give you many thanks for theſe Directions, and ſhall be well pleaſed to continue you my debtor for the other particular you promiſed me, till ſome further time of leiſure, and ſo intermit your trouble for ſome ſmall time.*

LIB. II.

Sect. 1. *Of Chriſt's Sermon in the Mount.*

S. *THE benefit I reaped by your laſt Diſcourſe, hath not ſatisfied, but raiſed my appetite to the more earneſt importunate deſire of what is yet behind, and in the next place, of the conſideration of* Chriſt's Sermon in the Mount, *which I have heard commended for an abſtract of Chriſtian Philoſophy, an elevating of his Diſciples beyond all other men for the practice of vertue: But, I pray, why did Chriſt when he preacht it leave the multitude below, and go up to a* Mount, *accompanied with none but Diſciples?*

Why in the Mount?

C. That he went up *to the Mount*, was to intimate the matter of this Sermon to be the *Chriſtian Law*, as you know the *Jewiſh law* was delivered in a *Mount*, that of *Sinai*. And that he would have no Auditors but Diſciples, it was, 1. Becauſe the Multitude followed him not for Doctrines, but for Cures, Chap. 4. 24, 25. and therefore were not fit Auditors of Precepts. 2. Becauſe theſe Precepts were of an elevated nature, above all that ever any Law-giver gave before; and therefore were to be diſpenſed only to choice Auditors. 3. Becauſe the Heights and Myſteries of Chriſtianity are not wont to be abruptly diſpenſed, but by degrees, to them [a] that have formerly made ſome Progreſs, (at leaſt have delivered themſelves up to Chriſt's Lectures, entred into his School) *i. e.* to his *Diſciples*.

[a] τοῖς προκόπτουσι.

S. *What then? are none but* Diſciples *the men to whom this Sermon belongs? and if ſo, will it not thence follow that the Commands contained in it ſhall oblige only the* Succeſſors *of thoſe Diſciples, the* Miniſters *of the Goſpel, and ſo all others be freed from that ſeverity?*

C. That

C. That it was given only to Disciples then, it is acknowledged; but that will be of latitude enough to contain all Christians: for to be a Disciple of Christ, is no more than so; for you know Christ first called Disciples, and they followed him some time before he sent them out, or gave them Commission to preach, *&c. i. e.* before he gave them the Dignity of Apostles; of which, as only the Pastors of the Church are their Successours, so in Discipleship all Christian Professors. And therefore you must resolve now once for all, that what is in this Sermon said to Disciples, all Christians are concern'd in indifferently; it is Command and Obligatory to all that follow him, or retain to him. Who the Auditors of it.

S. You have engaged me then to think my self concerned so nearly in it, as not to have patience to be longer ignorant of this my duty.

Will you please then to enter upon the substance of the Sermon, wherein I can direct my self so far as to discern the eight Beatitudes *to be the first part? I pray, how far am I concerned in them?* Of the Beatitudes.

C. So far as that you may resolve your self obliged to the belief, 1. That you are no farther a Christian than you have in you every one of those Graces to which the Blessedness is there prefixed. 2. That every one of those Graces hath matter of [b] present Blessedness in it: the word *Blessed* in the front denoting a present condition, abstracted from that which afterwards expects them. 3. That there is assurance of future Blessedness to all those that have attained to those several Graces. All Christians concerned in them at present, and for the future.

[b] ἀρετὴ τῶν ὀφ ἀνθρώποις μόνη Οὐκ ἐν θυσίαις τὰ ἰχνεσι λαμβάνει. Αὐτὴ δ' ἑαυτῇ ἄθλα τῶν πόνων ἔχει. *Trag. incert. ap. Stob.*

S. I shall remember these three Directions, and call upon you to exemplifie them in the particulars as they come to our hands; and therefore, first, I pray, give me the first of these Graces, what it is.

C. Poverty of Spirit. Of Poverty of Spirit.

S. What is meant by that?

C. It may possibly signifie a Preparation of Mind or Spirit to part with all worldly wealth, a contentedness to live poor and bare in this world; but I rather conceive it signifies a lowly opinion of ones self, a thinking my self the meanest vilest creature, *least of Saints*, and *greatest of sinners*; contrary to that spiritual pride of the Church of *Laodicea*, Rev. 3. 17. which said, she was *rich*, and *encreased with goods, and had need of nothing*, not knowing that she was *wretched*, and *miserable*, and *poor*, and *blind*, and *naked*. This is that infant *child-temper* that Christ prescribes, so absolutely necessary to a Christian, *Mat.* 18. 4. and chap. 19. 14. and that in respect of the Humility of such, chap. 18. 4. and the Littleness, *Luke* 9. 48. *i. e.* being in our own conceit (which I conceive is meant here by the phrase [*in spirit*] the least, and lowest, and meanest, and (as children) most impotent, unsufficient of all creatures.

S. What now is the present Blessedness of such?

C. It consists in this. 1. That this is an amiable and lovely quality, a charm of love amongst men whereever 'tis met with; whereas on the other side, pride goes hated, and cursed, and abominated by all, drives away servants, friends, and all but flatterers. 2: In that this is a seed-plot of all Vertue, especially Christian, which thrives best when 'tis rooted deep, *i. e.* in the humble lowly heart. 3. Because it hath the Promise of Grace, [*God giveth grace to the humble*, but, on the contrary, *resisteth the proud.*] The present blessedness of it.

S. What assurance of future Blessedness is there to those that have this grace? The future.

C. It is expresst in these words, [*for theirs*, or [c] *of them, is the Kingdom of Heaven*] which, I conceive, signifie primarily, that Christ's Kingdom of grace, the true Christian Church, is made up peculiarly of such: As in the answer of Christ to *John*, Mat. 11. 5. (a way of assuring him that he was the *Christ*) 'tis in the close, [d] *the poor are evangelized*, or wrought on by the preaching of the Gospel: and as *Mat.* 18. 4. *He that shall humble himself as this child, the same shall be greatest in the Kingdom of Heaven*, i. e. a prime Christian, or Disciple of Christ; and chap. 19. 14. for [e] *of such* (which is a like phrase parallel to [*of them*] here) *is the Kingdom of Heaven, i. e.* the Church, into which he therefore commands them to be permitted to enter by Baptism, and chides his Disciples for forbidding them. Thus is the *Kingdom of Heaven* to be interpreted in Scripture in divers places of the New Testament, which you will be able to observe when you read with care.

[c] ἀυτῶν.

[d] πτωχοὶ ἐυαγγελίζονται.

[e] τῶν τοιούτων.

S. But how doth this belong to future blessedness?

C. Thus, that this Kingdom of *Grace* here is but an inchoation of that *Glory* hereafter; and he that lives here the life of an humble Christian, shall there be sure to reign the life of a victorious Saint.

S. What is Mourning?

C. Contrition, or godly sorrow conceived upon the sense of our wants and sins. Of Mourning.

S. What wants do you mean?

C. Spiritual wants, 1. Of original immaculate Righteousness, and Holiness and Purity. 2. Of Strength and Sufficiency to do the duty which we owe to God our Creator, Christ our Redeemer, and the Spirit our Sanctifier. For Wants,

S. What sins do you mean?

C. 1. Our original depravedness, and proneness of our carnal part to all evil. 2. The actual and habitual sins of our unregenerate; And 3. the many slips and falls of our most regenerate life. For sins.

S. What is the present felicity of these Mourners?

C. That which results from the sense of this blessed temper, there being no condition of soul more wretched than that of the senseless obdurate sinner, that being a kind of numness, and lethargy, and death of soul; and contrariwise, this feeling and sensibleness, and sorrow for sin, the most vital Quality, (as it is said of Feeling, that it is the sense of life) an argument that we have some life in us, and so true matter of joy to all that find it in themselves. And therefore it was very well said of a Father, [f] *Let a Christian man grieve, and then rejoice that he doth so.* Besides, the *mourning* soul is like the *watered* earth, like to prove the more fruitful by that means. The present felicity of Mourners.

[f] *Doleat homo Christianus, & de dolore gaudeat*, Aug.

S. What is the assurance of future felicity that belongs to this Mourner?

C. 'Tis set down in these words, [*for they shall be comforted.*] Christ who hereafter gives, now makes The future.

makes promise of comfort to such; the *reaping in joy* belongs peculiarly to them that *sow in tears*, and *godly sorrow worketh repentance to salvation*, when all other worketh death. And besides, this assurance ariseth from the very nature of Comfort and Refreshment, (by which the joys of Heaven are expresst) of which none are capable but the sad disconsolate *Mourners*: nor indeed is Heaven (the vision of God, and revelation of his favour) matter of so much Bliss, as when it comes to those that wanted Comfort, and when it *wipes away all tears from their eyes*, who *went mourning (all the day)* all their life long.

S. *What is* Meekness?

Of Meekness, in relation to God,

C. A softness, and mildness, and quietness of Spirit, expressing it self in many passages of our life: 1. In relation to God, and then it is a ready willing submission to his will, whether to believe what he affirms, be it never so much above my reason; (*the captivation of the understanding to the obedience of faith*) or to do what he commands, and then 'tis Obedience; or to endure what he sees fit to lay upon us, and then 'tis Patience, chearfulness in affliction, contentedness with our lot whatsoever it is, (contrary to all murmuring and repining, and enmity to the Cross, and all restless unsatisfiedness) the being *dumb* or *silent to the Lord*, Psal. 37. 7. and resolving with old *Ely*, *it is the Lord, let him do what seemeth him good*. All which, Faith, Obedience, Patience, though they be vertues of themselves distinct from Meekness, strictly taken, may yet be very fitly reduced to that head, inasmuch as

to men; Superiours,

Meekness moderates that wrath which would by consequence destroy them. 2. In relation to men, whether Superiours, Equals, or Inferiours. If they be our Superiours, then 'tis modesty, and humility, and reverence to all such in general, (at least reductively, Meekness being an adjunct and help to those vertues, removing that which would hinder them:) but if withal they be our lawful Magistrates, then our Meekness consists in Obedience, active or passive, acting all their legal commands, and submitting (so far at least, as not to make violent resistance) to the punishments which they shall inflict upon us, when we disobey their illegal, in quietness of spirit, and not being given to changes; the direct contrary to all *speaking evil* of dignities, but especially to Sedition, and taking up of Arms against them: which of what sort soever it be, though we may flatter our selves that we are only on the defensive part, will bring upon us *condemnation*, Rom. 13. 2. For, although it be naturally lawful to defend my life from him that would unjustly take it away from me, yet if it be the lawful supreme Magistrate that attempts it, I must not defend my self by assaulting of him; for that is not to *defend* only, but to *offend*; and *God forbid* that, though it were to save my own life, *I should lift up my hand against the Lord's Anointed*. It is true, *Defensive wars* may be possibly lawful at some time, when *Offensive* are not: but of Subjects against their Soveraign neither can, because, if it be *war*, it will come under the phrase, *Resisting the power*, Rom. 13. and so be *damnable*, and quite contrary to the Meekness here, and (farther) to all such *Oaths*, which in every *Kingdom* are taken by the Subjects to the supreme Power, as that of *Allegiance*, &c.

Equals, Friends,

S. *Wherein doth* Meekness *towards our* Equals *consist?*

C. Those may be our friends, or our enemies; or of a middle nature. If they be our friends, then meekness consists, 1. In the not provoking them, for *the wrath of man worketh not the will of God*, Jam. 1. 20. 2. In bearing with their infirmities. 3. In kind, mild, discreet reproof of them; and 4. In patience and thankfulness for the like from them again. 5. In submitting one to another in love, every one thinking another better than himself.

Enemies,

S. *But what if they be our* Enemies?

C. Then it is the meek mans part to love to do good, and bless and pray for them; in no wise to recompense evil with evil, injury with injury, contumely with contumely, in no wise to avenge our selves, but to overcome evil with good.

Neither,

S. *What if they be neither our friends nor foes?*

C. Then meekness consists in humble, civil, modest behaviour towards them, neither striving and contending for trifles, or trespasses, or contumelies; nor molesting with vexatious suits, nor breaking out into causeless anger, *proud wrath*, as *Solomon* calls it, rage or fury; nor doing ought that may provoke them to the like.

The injured,

S. *But there is yet another notion of my Equals considerable, those to whom I have done injury; what is* meekness *towards them?*

C. It consists in acknowledging the fault, and readiness to make satisfaction, in going and desiring to be reconciled to such a brother, and willingly submitting to all honest means tending to that end.

Inferiours.

S. *What is the duty of meekness towards* Inferiours?

C. Condescending, kindness, lovingness, neither oppressing nor tyrannizing, nor using imperiousness, nor taking the rod when it may be spared, nor provoking to wrath Servants, Subjects, or Children.

S. *Is there any other branch of* meekness *which my questions have not put you in mind of, to communicate to me?*

Meekness of the understanding.

C. There is one branch of it scarce toucht yet, the meekness of our understandings in submitting our opinions to those that are placed over us by God: which though it be, in strict speaking, the vertue of humility and obedience, and not the former elicite act of meekness, yet meekness being ordinarily, and sometimes necessarily annexed to these acts of those vertues, I shall place them reductively under meekness.

S. *What must this* Meekness *of our understanding be?*

In several cases.

C. The propereſt rules for the defining it will be these: 1. That where in any matter of *Doctrine*, the plain word of God interposes it self, there we must most readily yield, without Demurs or Resistance. But 2. if it be matter neither defined, nor pretended to be defined in Scripture, then with each particular man among us, the definitions of the Church wherein we live must carry it, so far as to require our yielding and submission; and with that Church which is to define it (if it come in lawful assembly to be debated) the *tradition of the Universal*, or opinion of the *Primitive* Church is to prevail, at least to be hearkened to with great *Reverence* in that debate; and that which the greater

part

part of such a lawful Assembly shall judge to be most agreeable to such rule, or (in case there be no light to be fetcht from thence, then) that which they shall of themselves, according to the wisdom given them by God, agree upon to be most convenient, shall be of force to oblige all inferiours, 1. not to express dissent, 2. to obedience. But 3. if Scripture be pretended for one party in the debate, and the question be concerning the interpretation of that Scripture, and no light from the Scripture it self, either by surveying the context, or comparing of other places, be to be had for the clearing it, then again the judgment of the *Universal*, or my particular Church, is to be of great weight with me; so far as (if it so command) to inhibit my venting my own opinion either publickly or privately, with design to gain *Proselytes*: or if all liberty be absolutely left to all in that particular, then Meekness requires me to enjoy my opinion so, as that I judge not any other contrary-minded.

S. *But what if the particular Church wherein I was baptized shall fall from its own steadfastness, and by authority, or law, set up that which, if it be not contrary to plain words of Scripture, is yet contrary to the Doctrine or Practice of the Universal Church of the first and purest times, what will* Meekness *require me to do in that case?*

C. Meekness will require me to be very wary in passing such judgment on that Church: but if the light be so clear, and the defection so palpably discernible to all, that I cannot but see and acknowledge it, and in case it be true, that I am actually convinced, that the particular Church wherein I live is departed from the Catholick Apostolick Church; then, it being certain that the greater authority must be preferred before the lesser, and that next the Scripture the Catholick Church of the first and purest times (especially when the subsequent Ages do also accord with that for many hundred years) is the greatest Authority, it follows that Meekness requires my Obedience and Submission to the Catholick Apostolick Church, and not to the particular wherein I live: so far, I mean, as that I am to retain that Catholick Apostolick, and not this novel, corrupt, not Catholick doctrine. And if for my doing so I fall under persecution of the Rulers of that particular Church, Meekness then requires me patiently to endure it, but in no case to subscribe to, or act, any thing which is contrary to this Catholick doctrine.

S. *But what if I may not be permitted to live in that particular Church without this submission, or such acting; what doth the doctrine of Meekness then advise?*

C. If the meaning of your words [*may not be permitted to live*] be, that they will put me to death, then Meekness saith, I must meekly bear the loss of life it self, and so follow Christ. Or, if the meaning be, that they will banish me out of the Kingdom, I must venture my cause with God, and meekly submit to that punishment also, and depend on God's Providence for my preservation in some other. Or, if the meaning be, that they will devest me of my possessions, mulct, or otherwise punish me, the answer is still clear, because all these are less than the one loss of life is supposed to be.

S. *But what if they shall excommunicate me? hath the doctrine of Meekness any salve for me then, or any thing which it requires of me?*

C. Yes: Meekly to lie under that Censure, supposing that I am not excommunicate from the Catholick Apostolick Church of Christ by any such Censure, but rather so much the more firmly united to it by this means. Nor am I obliged in this case to seek out some other particular Church, which will receive me into their Communion, out of which this hath ejected me; but to submit to that lot contentedly which God permits to befal me in the discharge of a good Conscience. And in this case, as long as I continue constant to the Doctrine of the Catholick Church, and maintain the inward Communion (that of Charity) with all the true Churches of God, wheresoever they are, and with all particular Churches (and even with this which hath excommunicated me) so far as to embrace them with the arms of Christian Charity, to join even with erroneous Churches so far as they are not erroneous, *i. e.* to embrace all Catholick Truth wheresoever it is, separating only from the corruptions of it, (and that too, only because they will not permit me externally to join with them in the Catholick truths and communion, unless I will profess to join in their corruptions also) in this case, I say, it is no fault of mine, if it should so happen, that I live in no external publick communion at all. The true Christian thus patiently abiding the good pleasure of God, ceaseth not to be such, by being cast upon a Desart, or other equal Hermitage in the midst of Men and Christians. Though after all this, if there be any purer Church that will receive me, or if any Church equally corrupt will yet give me liberty to join with them in the publick Service of God, without complying or joining with them (or seeming and appearing, to the scandal of others, so to do) in their corruptions, I doubt not but it is lawful for me to associate with them; unless my particular calling or condition be such, as that (by some accident) some sin be consequent to my doing thus, as the forsaking those which I am bound to cleave to, and the like.

S. *But, What if this particular erroneous Church of which I am, do not excommunicate or exclude me from her communion, what doth Meekness then prescribe in respect of that communion?*

C. To communicate with her in all but her corruptions. My meaning is this, some other Obligations there are upon every Christian (wherein Meekness interposeth not) which do require me not to depart from any Catholick Apostolick truth or practice, at least not to submit to (or act) the contrary, or to do any thing which is apt to confirm others in so doing, or to lead those that doubt (by my example) to do what they doubt to be unlawful. For in all these particulars, the Christian law of scandal obliges me, not only not to yield to any schism from the Catholick Apostolick Church, or other the like corruption, but not to do those things by which I shall be thought by prudent men to do so. And therefore thus far I must abstain. But this caution being given and observed, Meekness then requires me, as far as I may without breach of these Obligations, to communicate with that particular Church, as long as I live in her arms; but permits me also, to seek out for some purer Church, if that may conveniently be had for me. Nay, if I am by my calling fitted for it, and can prudently hope to plant (or contribute to the planting) such a pure Apostolick Church, where there is none, or to reconcile and restore peace between divided members of the Church Catholick,

my

my endeavour to do ſo is in this caſe extremely commendable, and that which God's Providence ſeems to direct me to, by what is thus befallen me.

S. *But there is one caſe yet that ſeems not to have been mentioned; I ſhall now gather it up, as pertinent to my former queſtions about the* meekneſs *of the* underſtanding, *though to thoſe which I have ſince propoſed not altogether ſo agreeable: and it is this, What if there be on both ſides great probabilities, but no demonſtration from Chriſtian Principles, or interpoſing of the Church univerſal or particular, which way will meekneſs then direct me to propend or incline?*

C. That which muſt then direct me is mine own Conſcience, to take to that which ſeems to me moſt probable; and in that my meekneſs hath nothing to do, nor can it oblige me to believe that which I am convinced is not true, nor to disbelieve that which I am convinc'd is true: but yet before I am thus convinced, Meekneſs will give me its directions, not to rely too over-weeningly on my own judgment, but to compare my ſelf with other men, my Equals, but eſpecially my Superiours, and to have great Jealouſies of any my own ſingular opinions, which (being repreſented to others as judicious as my ſelf, together with the reaſons that have perſwaded me to them) do not to them prove perſwaſive; nay, after I am convinced, Meekneſs may again move me to hearken to other reaſons, that other men judge more prevailing, and, if occaſion be, to reverſe my former judgment thus paſt upon that matter; it being very reaſonable for me (though not to believe what I am not convinced of, yet) to conceive it poſſible for me not to ſee thoſe grounds of Conviction which another ſees, and ſo to be really miſtaken, though I think I am not: and then what is thus reaſonable to be concluded poſſible, my Meekneſs will bid me conclude poſſible; and having done that, adviſe me to chuſe the ſafer part, and reſolve rather to offend and err by too much flexibility, than too much perverſeneſs; by meekneſs, than by ſelf-love.

S. *What is the preſent felicity of the meek man?*

The meek mans preſent felicity.

C. 1. The very poſſeſſion of that grace, being of all others moſt delightful and comfortable, both as that that adorns us, and ſets us out beautiful and lovely in the eyes of others, (and is therefore called the *ornament of a meek and quiet ſpirit*, 1 Pet. 3. 4.) and as that that affords us moſt matter of inward comfort. As for example, that part of meekneſs which is oppoſed to revenge, and conſiſts in bearing, and not retributing of injuries, this to a ſpiritual-minded man is matter of infinite delight; 1. In conquering that mad, wild, deviliſh paſſion of revenge, getting victory over ones ſelf, which is the greateſt act of valour, the thought of which is conſequently moſt delighful. 2. In conquering the enemy, of which there is no ſuch way as the [g] *ſoft anſwer*, which, ſaith the wiſe man, *turneth away wrath*; and *feeding the hungry* enemy, which, ſaith Saint *Paul*, is the *heaping live-coals upon his head*; and that the way that Metalliſts uſe to melt thoſe things that will not be wrought on by putting of fire under them, which he farther expreſſes by *overcoming evil with good*. 3. In conquering or out-ſtripping all the Jewiſh and Heathen world, which had never attained to this skill of *loving of enemies*, (at the leaſt of thinking it a duty) which is a peculiar pitch [h] of *Chriſtianity* to which they are elevated by Chriſt: and the honour of this muſt needs be a moſt pleaſant thing. 2. It is matter of preſent felicity to us, in reſpect of the Tranquillity and Quiet it gains us here within our own breaſts, a calm from thoſe ſtorms that Pride and Anger and Revenge are wont to raiſe in us. And 3. in reſpect of the quiet peaceable living with others, without ſtrife and debate, without puniſhments and executions, that are the portion of the ſeditious, turbulent, diſobedient ſpirits. Which is the meaning undoubtedly of the Promiſe in the Pſalmiſt, *The meek ſhall inherit the earth*, i. e. ſhall generally have the richeſt portion of the good things of this life; from whence this place in the Goſpel being taken, though it may be accommodated to a ſpiritual ſence, by interpreting the Earth for the [i] *land of the living*; yet undoubtedly it literally notes the land of *Canaan*, or *Judea*, which is oft in the Old and New Teſtament called the *Earth*: and ſo then the Promiſe of *inheriting the Earth* will be all one with that annexed to the fifth Commandment, *that thy days may be long in the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee*; i. e. a proſperous long life here is ordinarily the *meek* mans portion: which he that ſhall compare and obſerve the ordinary diſpenſations of God's Providence, ſhall find to be moſt remarkably true, eſpecially if compared with the contrary fate of turbulent ſeditious perſons. Although ſometimes God in his wiſdom permit it to be otherwiſe, for the puniſhing of a wicked nation (which can have no greater puniſhment than that of a Civil war, wherein the *meek* man oft ſuffers moſt, and is ſurvived by the turbulent) or for ſome other reaſon in his œconomy.

[g] Ὀργὴν νοσοῦσι θοὰν ἰᾶσθαι λόγοι. *Æſchyl. Prometh. vin.*

[h] *Amicos diligere omnium eſt, inimicos ſolorum Chriſtianorum.* Tertull.

[i] γῆ.

His aſſurance of future.

S. *But if this reward belong to the* meek *in this life, what aſſurance of future felicity can he have, there being no other promiſe to him, but that he ſhall* inherit the earth?

C. The temporal reward can no ways deprive him of the eternal; but as the temporal *Canaan* was to the *Jew* a type, and to them that obeyed a pledge, of the eternal; ſo is the earth here a real inheritance below, and a pawn of another above: and this is the meek man's advantage, (above many other duties;) a double *Canaan* is thought little enough for him, the ſame felicity in a manner attending him which we believe of *Adam*, if he had not fallen, a life in *Paradiſe*, and from thence a tranſplantation to Heaven. The like we read of them that part with any thing dear to them for Chriſt's ſake or in obedience to Chriſt's command, (which I conceive belongs eſpecially to the meek, patient endurer of Chriſt's Croſs, and to the liberal-minded man) he ſhall have *a hundred fold more in this life, and in the world to come everlaſting life*; and unleſs it be here to the meek (or to Godlineſs in general, 1 *Tim.* 4. 8.) we meet not with any other temporal promiſe in the New Teſtament. And therefore this place here may be reſolved very well to be parallel to that other, not only in the hundred fold, or inheritance in this life, but in that addition alſo of everlaſting life after this. Beſides, other places of Scripture there are that intimate the future reward of the meek, as where it is ſaid to be *in the ſight of God of great price*; and that, *if we learn of Chriſt to be meek, we ſhall find reſt to our ſouls*: and even here the bleſſedneſs in the front, noting preſent bleſſedneſs, cannot rightly do ſo, if there were no future reward alſo belonging to it, it being a curſe, no bleſſing, to have our good things, with *Dives*, or, with the Hypocrite, our reward in this life, and none to expect behind in another.

Of hungring and thirſting after righteouſneſs.

S. *What then is the fourth grace?*

C. Hungring and thirſting after Righteouſneſs.

S. *What*

S. *What is that? And* 1. *what is meant by* Righteousness?

C. It is of two sorts, 1. *Inherent*, and then *imputed*: the *inherent*, imperfect, proportioned to our state, consisting in the mortifying of sins and lusts, and in some degrees of holy new life; the *imputed* is Christ's righteousness accepted as ours, which is in plain words, the pardon of our sins, and acceptation of our persons in Christ.

S. *What is* hungring *and* thirsting?

C. You may join them both together, and make them one common appetite of both those kinds of Righteousness. Or, if you please, you may more distinctly set them thus, that *hungring* is an earnest appetite or desire of food, and here in a spiritual sence is apportioned to the first kind of Righteousness, that of God's sanctifying grace, which is as it were bread or food to the soul, to sustain it from perishing eternally; and so hungring after righteousness is an eager, impatient, unsatisfiable desire of grace, of sanctity to the soul; and that desire attended with prayer and importunity to God for the obtaining of it.

S. *What is* thirsting after righteousness?

C. Thirsting is a desire of some moisture to refresh, and is here apportioned to that second kind of righteousness consisting in pardon of sin, which is the refreshing of the panting soul mortally wounded, and so like the Hart in the Psalmist, *longing after the water brooks*, to allay the feaver consequent to that wound, to quench the flame of a scorching conscience; and so, *Thirsting after righteousness* is a most earnest desire of pardon, and petitioning for it from God in Christ, and never giving over that importunity, until he be inclined to have mercy.

S. *What present felicity can there be in this* Hunger *and* Thirst?

C. As appetite or stomach to meat is a sign of health in the body, so is this hunger in the soul a vital quality, evidence of some life of grace in the heart, and in that respect matter of present felicity: whereas on the other side, the decay of appetite, the no manner of stomach, is a pitious consumptive symptom, and most desperate prognostick; and not caring for grace or pardon, for sanctification or justification, the most mortal desperate condition in the world. The present felicity of such.

S. *What assurance of future happiness attends this* Hungring?

C. As much as God's promise of filling can afford. Nay, proportionably to the two parts of the appetite, the state of glory is full matter of satisfaction to each; there is there perfect holiness without mixture of infirmity or carnality, answerable to the hungring after inherent righteousness; and there is there perfect final pardon and acquittance from all the guilt and debt of sin, and so the thirst of imputed righteousness is satisfied also. So that he that hath no other hunger or thirst but these, shall be sure to find satisfaction; which they that set their hearts upon carnal wordly objects, hungring after wealth and secular greatness, lusts, *&c.* shall never be able to arrive to, either here or hereafter: such acquisitions being here, if attained to, very unsatisfying, the more we have of them, the more we desire to have; and in another world there is no expectation of ought that shall be agreeable to such desires. The future.

S. *What is* Mercifulness?

C. Abundance of charity, or goodness, or benignity: there being in the Scripture style * two words near kin to one another, justice and mercifulness ordinarily going together; but the latter a much higher degree than the former: the first signifying that legal charity, that both the law of Nature and *Moses* require to be performed to our brethren; but the second an abundance or supereminent degree of it: expressions of both which we have, *Rom.* 5. 7. under the titles of the *righteous man* and the *good man*. *Of Mercifulness.* * צדקה and חסד, δικαιοσύνη and ἐλεημοσύνη.

S. *Wherein doth this* Mercifulness *express it self?*

C. In two sorts of things especially; 1. *Giving.* 2. *Forgiving.*

S. *In* giving *of what?*

C. Of all sorts of things that our abilities and others wants may propose to us: such are, relief to those that are in distress, ease to those in pain, alms to poor house-keepers, vindication of honest mens reputation when they are slandered; but above all to mens souls, good counsel, seasonable reproofs, encouragement in performing of duty when they are tempted to the contrary, comfort in time of worldly afflictions, but especially of temptation, strengthening in the ways of God, and whatsoever may tend to the good of any man. In giving.

S. *What mean you by* forgiving?

C. The not avenging of injuries or contumelies, not suffering their trespasses against men, nay, nor sins against God, to cool or lessen my charity and mercy to them, but loving and compassionating, and shewing all effects of true Christian mercy (such especially as may do them most good) as well to enemies and sinners, as to friends. In forgiving.

S. *What is the* present *felicity that attends this grace?*

C. The present delight of having made another man happy, of rescuing a poor soul wrestling with want, *&c.* from that pressure, of reprieving him that was, as it were, appointed to die; this is certainly the most ingenuous pleasure in the world. 2. The gloriousness of so doing; a kind of God-like act; one of the † two things which a heathen could say were common to us with God; especially if it be an act of ghostly mercy, an alms, a dole, a charity to the soul: to rescue a poor sinner dropping into the pit, reeling into hell, by conference, advice, examples of heavenly life, not only to save my life, but others also; this is in a manner to partake of that incommunicable title of Christ, that of *Saviour*; such a thing to which (saith ‖ *Aristotle*) as to an heroick quality belongs *not praise, but pronouncing blessed*; according to that of Saint *Paul* from our *Saviour*, *It is more blessed to give than to receive*: which supposes that it is a blessed thing to give. The present felicity of the Merciful. † ἀληθεύειν καὶ εὐεργετεῖν, *Pythag.* ‖ οὐκ ἐπαινῶ, ἀλλὰ μακαρίζω.

S. *What assurance is there of* future *blessedness to such?*

C. The greatest in the world, from this Promise annext, [*they shall obtain mercy.*] *God's punishments* are mostly answerable to our sins, he thinks good to give us a sight of our transgressions by the manner of his inflictions, and so he is also pleased to apportion his rewards to our graces, mercy to the merciful most peculiarly; by Mercy meaning, 1. Acts of bounty, liberality from God, to wit, temporal The future.

abundance (the common portion of the Almes-giver) and ſpiritual abundance of grace; of ſtrength in time of temptation. 2. Mercy in forgiving, pardoning, not imputing our ſins. Upon which ground it is, that in the form of prayer which he hath himſelf preſcribed us, he annexeth the *forgiving of all treſpaſſes againſt us* to our prayer for *forgiveneſs to our ſelves*, as the condition without which we may not hope for ſuch forgiveneſs.

S. *What is* purity in heart?

Of purity of heart. C. The heart ſignifies the inner man, and eſpecially the practical part, or principle of action. Two ſorts of it. And the purity of that is of two ſorts: the firſt, that which is contrary to pollution; the ſecond, that which is contrary to mixture; as you know, Water is ſaid to be pure when it is clean, and not mudded and defiled, and Wine is ſaid to be pure when it is * not mixt. In the firſt reſpect it excludes Carnality, in the ſecond Hypocriſie.

* Ἄκρατον.

S. *When may I be ſaid* pure in heart *in the firſt ſence?*

The firſt C. When not only in the members or inſtruments of action, but even in the heart, all parts of carnality or worldlineſs are mortified. As when we neither are guilty of actual uncleanneſs, nor yet conſent to unclean deſires; nay, feed not ſo much as the eye with unlawful objects, or the heart with filthy thoughts: and becauſe there be other pieces of carnality beſides, as ſtrife, faction, ſedition, *&c.* yea and pride, and the conſequents of that; all theſe muſt be wrought out of the heart, or elſe we have not attained to this *Purity*, but are in the Apoſtle's phraſe, 1 *Cor.* 3. 3. ſtill *carnal*. And ſo for worldlineſs (for earth you know will pollute alſo) when I not only keep my ſelf from acts of injuſtice and violence, but from deſigns of oppreſſion, nay from coveting that which is another's; and ſo likewiſe for Satanical injections, when I give them no manner of entertainment, but reject them, ſuffer them not to ſtay upon the Soul, and ſo to defile it.

S. *When may I be ſaid* pure in heart *in the ſecond ſence?*

The ſecond. C. When I attain to ſincerity; when I favour not my ſelf in any known ſin, double not with God, divide not between him and my own luſt, own ends, own intereſts, between God and Mammon, God and the praiſe of men, *&c.* For this is ſure a main part of the damning ſin of hypocriſie, againſt which there are ſo many woes denounced, (not the appearing to others leſs ſinful than we are, for that is not more unpardonable, but leſs damning than open, profeſt, avowed, ſcandalous ſinning: but) the *halting between God and Baal*, the not loving and ſerving God with all our heart, the admitting other rivals with him into our hearts.

S. *But is no man to be thought a good Chriſtian that hath either carnality or Hypocriſie in him?*

C. None that is either carnal or hypocrite. But the truth is, as long as we live here, and carry this fleſh about us, ſomewhat of carnality there will remain to be daily purged out, and ſo alſo ſome doublings, ſome reliques of hypocriſie; ſomewhat of my ſelf, my own credit, my own intereſt ſtill ſecretly interpoſing in my godlieſt actions. But theſe (ſo they be not ſuffered to reign, to be the chief maſters in me, to carry the main of my actions after them) may be reconcileable with a good eſtate; as humane frailties, not waſting ſins.

S. *What is the preſent felicity that belongs to ſuch?*

The preſent felicity of the pure. C. To the firſt ſort of purity belongs, 1. that contentment that reſults from having overcome and kept under that unruly beaſt, the carnal part, and brought it into ſome terms of obedience to the ſpirit. 2. The quiet and reſt that proceeds from purity of heart, contrary to the diſquiets and burnings that ariſe from unmaſtered luſts. 3. The eaſe of not ſerving and tending the fleſh, to obey *it in the luſts thereof*. 4. The quiet of Conſcience, abſence from thoſe pangs and gripings that conſtantly attend the commiſſion of carnal ſins. The ſame may in ſome meaſure be affirmed of all the other branches of the firſt kind of purity. And for the ſecond, as it is oppoſite to mixture or hypocriſie, the conſcience of that is matter of great ſerenity of mind, of Chriſtian confidence and boldneſs towards God and man; when I have no intricacies, *Mæanders*, windings and doublings within me, when I need no diſguiſes or artifices of deceit, but can venture my ſelf naked and bare to Gods eye, with a, *Prove me, O Lord, and try me, ſearch out my reins and my heart*; and ſo to men, when I fear not the moſt cenſorious ſtrict ſurvey, have a treaſure of confidence, that I dread not the face of any man, have no pains, no agonies for fear of being deprehended, which the hypocrite is ſtill ſubject unto.

S. *What is the reward apportioned to purity hereafter?*

The future. C. The Viſion of God, which 1. none but the pure are capable of, and 2. which hath no matter of felicity in it but to ſuch.

S. *Why are only the pure capable of the ſight of God?*

C. Becauſe God is a Spirit, and cannot be ſeen by carnal eyes, till they be cleanſed and purged, and in a manner ſpiritualized; which though it be not done thorowly till another life, yet purity here, ſuch as this life is capable of, is a moſt proper preparative to it: and therefore is ſaid to be that *without which no man ſhall ſee the Lord*; which you know is affirmed of holineſs, *Heb.* 12. 14. which word in that place ſignifies the very purity here ſpoken of.

S. *Why hath the Viſion of God no felicity in it but to the pure?*

C. Becauſe a carnal faculty is not pleaſed with a ſpiritual object; there muſt be ſome agreeableneſs, before pleaſure is to be had, and that pleaſure is neceſſary to felicity.

S. *What is meant by* Peace-making?

Of Peace-making. C. The word Peace-makers ſignifies no more than peaceable-minded men. The notion of *making* in Scripture phraſe belonging to the bent of the Soul; as to make a lie, is, to be given to lying, to practiſe that ſin, to be ſet upon it. So, *to do* (which is in the Greek, *to make*) *righteouſneſs and ſin*, 1 John 2. 29. and 3. 4. notes the full bent and inclination of the ſoul to either of them. So to *make peace*, both here, and *Jam.* 3. 18. is to have ſtrong hearty affections to peace.

S *Wherein doth this peaceable affection expreſs it ſelf?*

Many degrees of it. C. In many degrees: ſome in order to private, ſome to publick peace; ſome to preſerve it where it is, ſome to reduce it where it is loſt.

S. *What degrees of it, in order to* private peace?

C. A

C. A command and victory over ones Paſſions, eſpecially Anger and Covetouſneſs; the former being moſt apt to diſquiet Families, the latter Neighbourhoods. The angry man will have no peace with his ſervants, children, nay wife and parents, any that are within the reach of his ordinary converſation: and the covetous man will contend with any near him, that have any thing that he covets. 2. A charitable or favourable opinion of all men, and actions that are capable of candid interpretation; Jealouſies in the leaſt ſocieties being the moſt fatal enemies to peace, and ſuch as foment the leaſt diſcontents into the mortalleſt feuds and hatreds. 3. An apertneſs and clearneſs of mind, in a friendly debate (with friends or neighbours) of any actions which have paſt, ſubject to miſconſtruction, without all concealing of grounds of quarrel, not ſuffering them to boil within, but diſcreetly requiring an accompt of all ſuch dubious accidents of thoſe who are concerned in them. 4. The reſolving againſt contentions and litigations in law as much as is poſſible, being rather content to ſuffer any ordinary loſs, than to be engaged in ſuch ways of vindication, or righting our ſelves; and in greater matters referring it to arbitrement of honeſt neighbours, rather than to bring it to ſuit. 5. Expreſſing a diſlike to flatterers, whiſperers, and back-biters, and never ſuffering our affections to be altered by any ſuch. By theſe you will gheſs of other degrees alſo. *In order to private peace.*

S. *What, in order to* publick peace?

C. 1. Contentment in our preſent ſtation, and never faſtning our ambition and covetiſe on any thing which will not eaſily be attained without ſome publick change or innovation. 2. Willing Obedience to the preſent Government of Church or State. 3. Patience of the Croſs, or preparation for that Patience, and reſolving never to move a State, to get my ſelf from under any preſſure. 4. Reſolving on the truth of that ſacred dictate, that the *faults and infirmities of Governours are by God permitted for the puniſhment of the people*; and that conſequently they are to be looked on not in a direct line, only (or chiefly) to cenſure them; but in order to reflexion on our ſelves, to obſerve what in our ſelves hath ſo provoked God to puniſh us. 5. The not thinking our own opinions in Religion (ſuch as are not of faith) of ſuch importance, as either to deny Salvation or Communion to any that differ from us. 6. Modeſty and Calmneſs in diſputing. 7. Not affixing holineſs to opinions, or thinking them the beſt men that are moſt of our perſwaſions. 8. The not defining too many things in Religion. And many others you will judge of by theſe. *to publick.*

S. *What to preſerve it where it is?*

C. 1. Valuing of it according to its true eſtimation, as that which is in the eyes of men very amiable, and in the ſight of God of great price, and as that which is to every particular man the ſame thing in many reſpects (of his eſtate, his reputation, his bodily conveniencies, and oft life it ſelf) which bodily health is in one of thoſe reſpects only. 2. Conſidering how inſenſibly it may be loſt, and with how great difficulty recovered again, and how near to a Hell this life is without it. 3. Prudent watching over it, and over thoſe that are enemies to peace. 4. Not being eaſily provoked, but overcoming ſtrife with mildneſs, or kindneſs, *the ſoft anſwer*, &c. and *overcoming evil with good*. 5. Praying conſtantly to God the Author of Peace for the continuance of this beloved creature of his among us. *to Preſerving it where it is.*

S. *What to recover it when it is loſt?*

C. 1. Humbling our ſouls, amending our lives, ſearching out thoſe peculiar reigning ſins that have made this bleſſing too good for us to enjoy, and ſo making our peace with God firſt. 2. Examining (every man ſingle) what I have contributed toward the removing of it, whom I have ſlandered, *&c.* and repairing what I have thus done by Confeſſion and Satisfaction. 3. By inceſſant prayer to God fetching it back again. *to Recovering it when 'tis loſt.*

S. *What is the preſent felicity that belongs to ſuch?*

C. 1. The preſent reſt and peace, the greateſt of all worldly pleaſures, and which is (as I ſaid) as health in the body, the foundation of all other ſuperſtructions of temporal joy. 2. The Conſcience of the charitable offices done to all others by this means. 3. The honour of being like God in it, who is the God of Peace; and like Chriſt, who came on this errand to this earth of ours, to make peace between the greateſt enemies, his Father and the poor ſinner's ſoul. *The preſent felicity of the Peace-maker.*

S. *What is the reward appointed to Peaceableneſs hereafter?*

C. 1. God's acknowledgment of us as of thoſe that are like him. 2. Pardon of ſins, and eternal reſt and peace hereafter. *The future.*

S. *To whom doth the laſt* Beatitude *belong?*

C. To thoſe 1. that are *perſecuted for righteouſneſs ſake*, 2. that are *reviled falſly for Chriſt's ſake.* *Of Perſecution for righteouſneſs ſake.*

S. *How do theſe differ one from the other?*

C. Only as a more general word and a more ſpecial. * *Perſecution* ſignifies properly and ſtrictly, being purſued, and driven, and hunted, as noxious beaſts are wont; but in common uſe noteth whatever calamity or affliction the malice or tyranny of others can lay on us: and *Reviling* is one ſpecial kind of it, which is moſt frequently the true Chriſtians lot, becauſe 1. thoſe that have no ſtrength or power to inflict other injuries, have yet theſe weapons of their malice always in readineſs. 2. Becauſe they who are not good Chriſtians themſelves, do in their own defence think themſelves obliged to defame thoſe that are; their good actions, when they are ſilent, ſeeming ſo reproachful to them, made to reprove their thoughts, *Wiſd.* 2. 14. And ſo they endeavour by their tongues to revenge themſelves upon them, to redeem their reputation by that means. * διωγμός. Reviling.

S. *But what is meant by the phraſes,* [for righteouſneſs ſake] *and* [falſly for my ſake?]

C. Thoſe words contain a reſtraint or limitation of the ſubject to this purpoſe: that the *Beatitude* belongs not to thoſe indefinitely that are perſecuted and reviled (for many may thus juſtly *ſuffer as thieves, as murtherers, evil doers, buſie-bodies*, 1 Pet. 4. 15. and receive little joy or bleſſedneſs in that) but to thoſe peculiarly that are true Chriſtians. And that either 1. for ſome good action wherein their Chriſtianity and the teſtimony of a good Conſcience is concerned; as when men are reviled and perſecuted, becauſe they will not either totally forſake and Apoſtatize from Chriſt, or in any particular occurrent offend againſt him (or when ſome ſuch Chriſtian performance brings this conſequent perſecution *Falſely for Chriſt's ſake.*

perſecution or reproach upon them.) Or 2. for ſome indifferent ſinleſs action, which though it be not done in neceſſary obedience to Chriſt, yet bringing unjuſt perſecution or reviling falſly upon them, may (though in an inferiour degree) belong to this matter: and in that caſe the perſecution that ſo falls on them will be thought to be permitted by our wiſe and good God, and diſpoſed or ordered by him for our *Beatitude*, *i. e.* for the benefit of us as Chriſtians; either as a Chaſtiſement of our other ſins, that we may not be condemned with the world; or as a means of tryal whether we will bear it patiently and Chriſtianly.

The preſent felicity of the perſecuted.

S. *Wherein doth the preſent felicity of ſuch conſiſt?*

C. 1. In having their evil things in this life, that ſo all their good things, their reward, may remain on arrear, unpaid till another life. 2. In the honour and dignity of ſuffering for Chriſt's ſake. 3. In conformity with the ancient *Prophets* and *Champions* of God in all Ages. 4. In the comfort that proceeds from this evidence and demonſtration of our being true Chriſtians; for that is the meaning of [*yours is the Kingdom of Heaven*] *i. e.* the ſtate of Chriſtians, or the true Chriſtian ſtate. It being a Chriſtian Aphoriſm, that God *chaſtens every Son*, Heb. 12. 7. and that the good things that are made good to Chriſtians here, ſhall be *with perſecution*, Mar. 10. 30. 5. In this pledge of God's favour to us, in that we are *thought worthy to ſuffer ſhame for his name.* 6. In the aſſurance of a greater *Reward* hereafter, proportioned to our ſufferings here.

The future.

S. *What is the reward hereafter, apportioned to this?*

C. A greater degree of glory in Heaven.

S. *You told me, at your entring on the* Beatitudes, *that I was no farther to believe my ſelf a Chriſtian, than I ſhould find all and every of theſe Graces in me to which theſe* Beatitudes *are prefixt: This I can without difficulty acknowledge for all the former, (and reſolve I am no farther a Chriſtian, than I am* poor in ſpirit, mourning, meek, hungring and thirſting after righteouſneſs, merciful, pure in heart, *and* peaceable;) *but the laſt ſticks with me, and I cannot ſo eaſily aſſent to that, that I cannot be a Chriſtian, unleſs* I be perſecuted and reviled; *I pray clear that difficulty to me.*

How this a token of a true Chriſtian.

C. I ſhall, by ſaying theſe four things to you. 1. That though to be perſecuted is no duty of ours; yet, 1. to bear it patiently, and 2. to rejoice in it, when it befalls us, and 3. that it be *for righteouſneſs ſake*, (when it lights upon us) is our duty, required of all Chriſtians. 2. The very being perſecuted, though it be not a duty again, is yet a mark and character of a Chriſtian; and the Scripture doth ſeem to affirm, that no good Chriſtian ſhall ever be without his part in it, *Heb.* 12. 6, *&c.* And it will be hard for any to find out one holy man that hath paſſed through his whole life without this portion. 3. If it ſhall not be ſo general a rule, but it be reſolved capable of ſome exception, *i. e.* if ſome good Chriſtians be found which are not perſecuted, yet ſtill the Preparation of mind for this indurance is neceſſary to every Chriſtian. 4. The being perſecuted ſhall contribute much to the encreaſe of our glory, and ſo may ſtill be ſaid neceſſary reſpectively (though it ſhould not be affirmed abſolutely) to the attaining of that degree of glory: and therefore this is placed after all the reſt, as a means of perfecting and conſummating the Chriſtian, that as the former ſeven are neceſſary to the attaining a crown at all, ſo this to the having ſo rich a crown, or ſo many gems in it.

Of the Order of theſe Beatitudes.

S. *Is there any thing now which from the order of theſe* Beatitudes *you would think fit to teach me?*

C. Yes, eſpecially two things. 1. That the Grace firſt named is a general principal Grace, which is the foundation of all the reſt. Where that is once ſeated and planted, all the reſt will more eaſily and more happily follow. *Humility* is the ſeed-plot of all, and from thence it is moſt proper to proceed, 1. to *mourning*, or ſorrow for ſin; (the *humble* heart is a melting heart) 2. to *meekneſs* and quietneſs of ſpirit; (the *humble* heart is the next degree to that already) 3. to *hungring and thirſting after righteouſneſs*; (the *humble* heart will moſt impatiently deſire both pardon of ſin, (that firſt kind of righteouſneſs) and grace to ſanctifie, (that ſecond kind of righteouſneſs) 4. to *mercifulneſs*; (the *humble* heart will be moſt ready to give and forgive) 5. to *purity of heart*; the *humble* heart is moſt unreconcileable with all *filthineſs both of the fleſh and ſpirit*, but eſpecially the latter, of which, pride, a chief particular is the direct contrary to Humility) 6. to *peaceableneſs*; (contention being generally the effect of pride) 7. to *perſecution and reviling*; (Humility 1. being apt to tempt the proud worldling to revile and perſecute: 2. being ſure to work patience of them in the Chriſtian.)

S. *What is the ſecond thing that from the Order you obſerve?*

C. The interchangeable mixture of theſe Graces; one toward God, and another toward man, thus interweaved, that the firſt reſpects God, the next man, the next God again, and ſo forward till it comes to the laſt, which reſpects God again. For having told you that the firſt is a general *Fundamental Grace*, as the head to all the reſt; it follows that the ſecond, that of *mourning*, muſt be the firſt particular, which being faſtened particularly on ſin, reſpecteth God, againſt whom we have ſinned; then next to that, *meekneſs* reſpecteth our Neighbour eſpecially; and 3. *hungring* and *thirſting after righteouſneſs*, (which is all to be had from God) reſpecteth God; *Mercifulneſs* again reſpecteth man; *Purity in heart*, God; *Peaceableneſs*, man; and laſtly, *Perſecution for righteouſneſs ſake*, and patience of it, as coming from a conſideration and belief of God's provident diſpoſal of all things, reſpecteth God again. So that you ſee the firſt and the laſt reſpecteth our duty toward God; (who is *Alpha* and *Omega*, the *firſt* and the *laſt*) and thoſe between, divided between our Neighbour and God. That ſo we may reſolve, that to God belongs the chief, and firſt, and laſt of our Love and Obedience; yet ſo as not to exclude, but require alſo in its ſubordination our care of duty and love toward man alſo; one intermixing lovingly and friendly with the other, and neither performed as it ought, if the other be neglected.

S. *I conceive you have now concluded the explication of the firſt part of this Sermon, God give me grace to lay all the ſeverals to heart.*

Sect. II. *Chriſtians muſt be exemplary.*

What is the ſumme of the ſecond branch or Section in it?

C. It conſiſts of the four next verſes, to wit, *ver.* 13, 14, 15, 16. and the ſumme of them is, the neceſſity that the graces and vertues of Diſciples, or Chriſtians, ſhould be evident and exemplary to others alſo, *i. e.* to all Heathens and ſinners, and all indefinitely which may be attracted by ſuch example.

ample. This is enforced by four reſemblances: 1. of *Salt*, which as long as it is ſalt, hath a quality of ſeaſoning of other things to which it is applied; 2. of the *Sun*, that is apt to illuminate the dark world; 3. of *a City on a Hill*, which is conſpicuous; 4. of a *Candle ſet in a Candleſtick*, which *giveth light to all that are in the houſe*. By all which he expreſſes, that thoſe graces are not to be accounted Chriſtian, which either, 1. do not bring forth fruits, (and ſo remain but dull habits, uſeleſs poſſeſſions) or 2. which are not made exemplary to others.

S. *But ſure all this belongs to Miniſters and men in eminent place only* (*They are the* ſalt of the earth, *and* light of the world) *not to every private Chriſtian.*

C. Yes to every private Chriſtian; for ſuch are the Diſciples to which Chriſt here ſpeaks, the ſame auditors continuing to every part of the Sermon, and ſo the duty of exemplary lives is in ſome meaſure required of every of them, who before were bound to be meek, or peaceable, *&c. i. e.* (as 'tis apparent, *ver.* 1.) of all thoſe that are entred into the School of Chriſt: not only Apoſtles, (whoſe Succeſſors the Governours of the Church now are) for as yet there were none ſuch, (the Apoſtleſhip or ſolemn miſſion, the inſtating that authority on his Diſciples, which was to continue in their ſucceſſors, being not yet begun at the time of Chriſt's ſpeaking theſe words, nor till after his Reſurrection, *John* 20. 21. or rather his *aſcenſion*, Acts 2. 4.) but, I ſay, all Diſciples, *i. e.* all Chriſtians that undertake to follow Chriſt, and expect any good by him.

S. *What then is the meaning of this neceſſity that the Chriſtian's graces muſt be evident and exemplary?*

C. 'Tis this: 1. That a Chriſtian muſt not content himſelf in doing what Chriſt commands, but muſt alſo diſpoſe his actions ſo as may moſt tend to God's honour, which conſiſts in bringing in many Diſciples unto him, and which ought to be as precious to a Chriſtian as the ſalvation of his ſoul. Moſt contrary to which are the practices of thoſe which profeſſing Religion, commit thoſe things which even nature it ſelf and ſober Heathen reaſon abhors (ſuch are circumventing of other men, rebellion, ſedition, and many times unclean ſins, not to be named, alſo) and ſo bring up an evil report upon Chriſtian Religion, defame it in the opinions of men. 2. That he ought to labour the converſion of others, (in charity to them) the extending, not incloſing God's Kingdom.

S. *This doctrine is clear, and therefore I will detain you no longer on this Section.*

S. *What is the ſumme of the next Section, which conſiſts of four verſes more,* 17, 18, 19, 20?

Sect. III. *Chriſt did not aboliſh.*

C. It is in brief the atteſtation of two great Chriſtian truths.

S. *What is the firſt of them?*

C. That Chriſtianity is not contrary to the laws by which mankind had formerly been obliged, is not deſtructive of them; Chriſt now commands nothing that the natural or moral law had forbidden, and likewiſe forbids nothing that that had commanded: this is affirmed in three forms in this Section. Firſt, *ver.* 17. *He came not to deſtroy the Law and the Prophets, i. e.* the doctrine deſigned and taught by them; and it would be a very dangerous errour, very noxious to practice, to think he did, *Think not*, &c. Secondly, *ver.* 18. he affirms with an aſſeveration, that the leaſt letter or *tittle of the Law* ſhall not be deſtroyed, *i. e.* loſe its obligingneſs, (*till all be fulfilled*, we read; it is) * *till all things be done*, i. e. till the world be at an end, or (which is the ſame at the beginning of the Verſe, though in other words) *till Heaven and earth*, i. e. this preſent world, *paſs away*, or is diſſolved. Thirdly, *verſ.* 19. He pronounces clearly, that he that affirms any the leaſt commandment of the Law to be now out-dated, (that not only breaks them himſelf, but teaches others that they are not obliged to keep them) he ſhall be called the *leaſt in the Kingdom of Heaven*, i. e. ſhall not be accounted a Chriſtian; for ſo the *Kingdom of Heaven* frequently ſignifies in the Scripture, and (to *be the leaſt in it*) is a phraſe that ſignifies being utterly excluded from it.

* ἕως ἂν πάντα γένηται.

S. *What is the ſecond thing?*

But perfect the Law, and ſet it higher.

C. That Chriſt hath perfected the Law, and ſet it higher than any the moſt ſtudied Doctor did think himſelf obliged by it formerly. And this is affirmed here alſo by two phraſes. Firſt, verſe 17. *I came not to deſtroy the Law, but to perfect it.* The Greek word which we render [[a] to *perfect*] is anſwerable to an Hebrew which ſignifies not only [b] to *perform*, but to [c] *perfect*, to *fill up*, as well as to *fulfil*; and ſo is rendred ſometimes by one, ſometimes by th'other. And the Greek it ſelf is ſo uſed in like manner. When it refers to a word or a prophecy, then it is to *perform*, to *fulfil*, 2 Chron. 36. 22. 1 Mac. 2. 55. In other caſes it is to *fill up*, to *compleat*, to *perfect*, Eccleſ. 33. 16. and 39. 12. and 2 Chron. 24. 10. And that it is ſo in this place, may appear by the ancient Greek Fathers, which expreſs it by two ſimilitudes. 1. Of a *veſſel* that had ſome water in it before, but now is filled up to the brim. 2. Of a *picture* that is firſt [d] drawn rudely, the limbs only and lineaments, with a coal or the like; but when the hand of the Painter comes to draw it in colours [e] to the life, then it is ſaid to be filled up. 2. That *except your righteouſneſs*, i. e. Chriſtian actions and performances, *exceed the righteouſneſs of the Scribes and Phariſees*, i. e. go higher than that ſtricteſt ſect of the Jews and the Doctors among them thought themſelves obliged to, or taught others that they were obliged, they ſhall not paſs for Chriſtians here, or prove Saints hereafter. In which word ſure he doth not pitch on the name of *Scribes* and *Phariſees*, peculiarly as thoſe that were the greateſt evacuators of the Law by their own hypocritical practices or falſe gloſſes in ſome particulars; but the *Phariſees* as the moſt exact ſect among the *Jews*, Acts 26. 5. and the *Scribes* as the Doctors of the Law, and thoſe that knew better what belonged to it than other men; and both together as thoſe *that ſate in Moſes chair*, i. e. taught there truly (though they practiſed not [*they ſay, but do not*]) the doctrine of the *Moſaical* Law in that manner as others were obliged to perform it, *Matth.* 23. 2. This ſame truth is alſo farther proved in the remainder of this Chapter, by induction of ſeveral particulars of the Law, firſt barely ſet down by Chriſt, and then with Chriſt's improvement added to them, in this form of ſpeech, *but I ſay unto you.* And though this be no new doctrine, but affirmed diſtinctly by moſt of the [f] Ancient (eſpecially the Greek) writers, before Saint *Auſtin*'s time, and thus far acknowledged by all parts, that Chriſt required more of his Diſciples, *i. e.* of Chriſtians now, than the *Jews* by any clear revelation had been convinced to be neceſſary before, (which is in effect as much as I ſhall deſire to have granted:) yet I have thought good to confirm it yet further to you, (becauſe it is the foundation of

[a] πληρῶσαι.
[b] כלה
[b] τελεῖν.
[c] τελειοῦν.
Proofs of that.

[d] Ζωγραφία.
[e] ζωγράφημα.

[f] Thus *Origen* againſt *Celſus*, l. 5. p. 259. faith of Chriſt's laws, that they are χριστοῦ

& διαθήκαι, Peter and divi- ner than all former laws.

of a great weighty ſuperſtructure) by two things; 1. by one other remarkable place of Scripture; 2. by ſome reaſons which the Fathers have given for the doing of it.

Juſtin Martyr, τὸ καθ' ἑνὸν ἑκάστῳ ἀνθρώπῳ πιστευθέντος δεῖ, To live according to nature is the part of one that hath not yet believed. *Irenæus* l. 4. c. 27. *Dominus naturalia legis non diſſolvit, ſed extendit, ſed & implevit.* Chriſt did not diſſolve thoſe parts of the law which were from the law of nature, but extended them, and alſo filled them up. Where to fill up is more than to extend, and in that notion is ſet oppoſite to Chriſts words of deſtroying the law, *Matth.* 5. So again, *ſed plenitudinem & extenſionem*, his Law is the plenitude and extenſion of the former. Again, *Superextendi decreta, & augeri ſubjectionem.* The Laws under Chriſt are extended above what they were, and our ſubjection encreaſt. And again, *adimplentis, extendentis, dilatantis*, that Chriſt doth fill up, extend, and dilate the Law: and that whole Chapter is wholly ſpent on that purpoſe, ſhewing abundantly what Chriſt meant by πληρῶσαι, not fulfilling, as that ſignifies in our ordinary phraſe performing the former Laws, (though Chriſt did that alſo) but filling it up, encreaſing it, adding to it: So *Clemens Alex. Strom.* 3. hath a great deal of Chriſts renewing the Law being grown old, καὶ ὅτι συγχωρεῖτο, not permitting thoſe things any longer which had been before permitted, but leading his Diſciples ἀπὸ τῆς προχειροτέρας, from that preluſory life of nature to thoſe higher Myſteries. So *Athenagoras* in his Embaſſie or meſſage to *Antoninus* and *Commodus*, oppoſes againſt all the precepts of the Lawyers and Philoſophers of all former ages, this one *dogma* or precept of Chriſt, ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς, love your enemies, challenging them all to compare with Chriſt in that one piece of Chriſtianity. So Saint *Baſil* on the 15 Pſalm: As, ſaith he, the old Law ſaith, *Thou ſhalt not kill*, ſo the Lord (Chriſt) τελειότερος νομοθετῶν, giving more perfect laws, ſaith, *Thou ſhalt not be angry*, &c. So the Author of thoſe Conſtitutions which go under *Clemens Romanus*'s name, and are acknowledged to be very ancient, in his 6 Book *c.* 23. *vide loc.* So *Conſtantine* the Emperour in *Zoſim. l.* 2. calls Chriſt's Law νέαν παιδαγωγίαν the new diſcipline; *Macarius*, νόμον πνευματικὸν, a ſpiritual law, oppoſed to the natural, *hom.* 37. *p.* 442. But moſt clearly Saint *Chryſoſtome*, who calls the Sermon on the Mount, ἄκρον τῆς φιλοσοφίας, the top of Philoſophy, καὶ ὁ ὢν καινὴ νόμοι μέλειοι καὶ περὶ πολλῶν μειζόνων, in the new Teſtament, ſaith he, there are a many laws, and of many higher or greater matters. *Edit. Savil. T.* 3. *p.* 93. To which he applies that of Chriſt *John* 15. 22. *If I had not come, and ſpoken to them, they had had no ſin*; whence 'tis clear, that 'twas his opinion that ſome things were prohibited by Chriſt's coming and ſpeaking, which he that practiſed before, either had no ſin, or was not in ſo great meaſure guilty of it. So again, that Chriſt's giving of Laws was πλήρωσις καὶ ἐπίτασις, a filling up and extending of the old, and that this was the reaſon why Chriſt medled not with all the precepts of the Decalogue, becauſe, ſaith he, he reſolved not πάντας αὐξῆσαι to encreaſe all. Again, on *Matt. p.* 112. he ſaith, that it was now μειζόνων ἐντολῶν καιρὸς a ſeaſon of greater precepts. So *T.* 3. *p.* 91. ὑ τὰ αὐτὰ κεῖται παλαιοῖς καὶ ἡμῖν σκάμματα, the antients and we have not the ſame goals propoſed to us: and ſo on, in a moſt clear place, for it be intirely tranſcribed, or (inſtead of that) conſulted in the Father. So *Theophylact* compares Chriſt with the *Law*, as the ζωγράφους τελεία the painting to life, to the σκιαγραφία, or drawing in black and white, or firſt lineaments, *p.* 28. *in Eu.* and that Chriſt did not καταλύειν σκιαγραφίαν, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον ἀναπληροῦν, not deſtroy the firſt draught, but rather fill it up. So again, To love friends, ſaith he, ἀτελὲς ἐστι, is an imperfect thing; τέλειον ἡ πάντας ἀγαπᾶν, but to love all is perfect, or an high degree of perfection. Again, that the precepts of the Law are ſuch as θηλάζουσι καὶ παιδίοις ἁρμόζει, are agreeable to ſucklings and children, which ἀνδράσιν αἰσχύνη, it will be a reproach to men not to have exceeded. So *Oecumenius, T.* 1. *p.* 286. ὑ τὰ αὐτὰ ἐν νέᾳ ὄντα τιθέμεθα ἅπερ οἱ πάλαι ἐν νόμῳ, we have not now the ſame precepts in the New which we had in the Old Teſtament, but καινὰ καὶ νέα προσῆλθματα καὶ φιλοσοφώτερα, new commands and more philoſophical, *i. e.* of deeper and higher importance for the regulating of mens lives. For, ſaith he, killing was forbidden of old, anger alſo is forbidden us; and ſo of ſwearing, diſtinctly, ὐκ ἦν πονηρὸν τότε, μετὰ ἡ Χριστὸν δεῖ πονηρὸν, it was not then (univerſally) unlawful, but now after Chriſt it is; μὴ ὅλως ὀμνύειν, for Chriſt hath ſaid, But I ſay unto you, ſwear not at all. The ſame is affirmed by Saint *Baſil* in the fore-cited place, ἐπορκία συγχωρεῖται, ſwearing truly is permitted under the Law; ἐν ἡ τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ παντελῶς ἀπηγόρευται, but under the Goſpel it is univerſally forbidden, *i. e.* ſome kind of oaths, which are there permitted, are here univerſally prohibited; as for example, ſwearing by others beſide God. And ſo both Saint *Chryſoſtome* and *Theophylact* alſo. So among the Latines, *Tertullian l.* 3. *contra Marcion. c.* 16. *Chriſti legem ſupplementa neceſſaria eſſe diſciplinæ Creatoris*, that Chriſts Law is an addition of neceſſary ſupplements to the Law of the Creator. Again, *l. de patientia*; *Ampliandæ adimplendæque legi adjutricem Chriſtus præfecit patientiam*, Chriſt added his rules of Patience for an help to enlarge and fill up the Law; *quod ad juſtitiæ doctrinam retrò deſuiſſet*, becauſe that had formerly been wanting to the doctrine of righteouſneſs: *nondum enim patientia in terris, quia nec fides*, for patience was not as yet on the earth, becauſe faith was not, *i. e.* Chriſtianity brought that high pitch into the world with it. And after a great deal more he comforts the Law of *Moſes* for the loſs of its ceremonies, *&c.* and tells it that it hath found more in Chriſt than it loſt. So again, ad *Scap. p.* 91. *Hæc eſt perfecta & propria bonitas noſtra*, This is a goodneſs perfect and proper to us Chriſtians; *Amicos enim diligere omnium eſt, inimicos ſolorum Chriſtianorum*, 'Tis every mans part to love friends, only the Chriſtians to love enemies. Again, 4 *contr. Marc. p.* 524. *(Paml. ed.) Chriſtus Dei Creatoris præcepta ſupplendo & conſervavit & auxit*, Chriſt preſerved and encreaſed the Laws of God the Creator by filling them up. So again, *l. de pudicitia*; *Legem ſiſtimus, ſcilicet in his quæ & nunc Novo Teſtamento introducto etiam cumulatiore præcepto prohibentur*; *pro Non mœchaberis, Qui viderit*, &c. Some things in the New Teſtament are prohibited by an higher precept, in ſtead of [*Thou ſhalt not commit adultery*] [*He that looketh*, &c.] So Saint *Jerome* on *Matth.* concerning oaths; *Hoc quaſi parvulis conceſſum*, This was allowed before, or permitted to the *Jews*, as to little ones; *Evangelica autem veritas non recipit*, The Goſpel-truth doth not permit it. So Saint *Auſtin T.* 4. *p.* 1109. *de Serm. in monte l.* 1. Where having propoſed a double fence of fulfilling the Law, he inſiſts only on the latter, *viz.* that Chriſt fulfilled the Law by adding *quod minus habet*, what was deficient, *& ſic perficiendo confirmaverit*, and ſo by perfecting confirmed it: *dum enim fiunt quæ adduntur, multo magis fiunt illa quæ permiſſa ſunt ad inchoationem*, for while thoſe things are done which are added, thoſe things are much more done which were permitted for their initial ſtate. Then upon that Verſe, [*Unleſs your righteouſneſs exceed*, &c.] he explains it thus, *Niſi non ſolùm ea quæ inchoant homines impleveritis, ſed etiam iſta quæ à me adduntur, qui non veni ſolvere, ſed adimplere*, Unleſs you fulfil not only thoſe things which men perform in that initial ſtate, but alſo thoſe which are added by me, who came not to looſe but to fulfil, you ſhall not enter into the Kingdom of Heaven. And again on that paſſage [*He that ſhall do, and teach theſe leaſt Commandments, ſhall be called great*] 'tis not, ſaith he, to be underſtood *ſecundum illa minima, ſed ſecundum ea quæ dicturus ſum*, according to thoſe leaſt things under the Law, but to the leaſt of thoſe precepts which Chriſt meant to deliver them. *Quæ ſunt autem iſta?* and what are they? ſaith he, and anſwers, *ut abundet juſtitia*, that your righteouſneſs exceed, *&c.* Theſe few may ſuffice to give ſome ſight of the ſence of antiquity in this point.

S. *What is that remarkable place of Scripture?*

C. In the firſt Epiſtle of Saint *John*, chap. 1. v. 5. prefaced and brought in with more magnificent ceremony than any other paſſage of Scripture, *That which was in the beginning, &c.* Ver. 1. *That which we have ſeen and heard, &c.* Ver. 3. and, *Theſe things write we*, Ver. 4. *This then is the meſſage*, Ver. 5. All which are remarkable characters ſet upon that which follows, ſhewing it to be the ſumme of the whole Goſpel, or doctrine of Chriſt; and it is this, [*That God is light, and in him there is no darkneſs at all,*] Ver. 5. which words ſo uſhered in, you will eaſily believe have ſomewhat more in them than at the firſt ſound, taken alone, they would ſeem to have, and this ſure it is; That now under the Goſpel, Chriſt, this light, appears without any mixture of darkneſs. Light is the ſtate and doctrine of Chriſtianity; darkneſs, of ſin and imperfection, and ſuch as was before among *Jews* and *Heathens*, (which is referred to by the phraſe, *If we walk in darkneſs*, ver. 6. *i. e.* live like *Jews* or *Heathens*:) and therefore to be light without all mixture of darkneſs, is to be perfect without all mixture either of ſin or of imperfection; which you will not think fit to affirm of God, (or Chriſt under the Goſpel) in reſpect to himſelf; (for that were to conceive that he had not been ſo before) but in reſpect of his Law and Commandments, the rules of mens lives, that they had before ſome indulgence for ſome ſins, and where they had not ſo, yet that they had ſome mixture of imperfection, but now they have none; they had before ſome vacuities in them, which now are filled up by Chriſt.

S. *What reaſons do the Fathers give for this?*

Grounds of it.

C. Theſe eſpecially: Becauſe 1. Chriſt under the Goſpel gives either higher or plainer Promiſes than he did before; the Promiſes of eternal life are now as clear as thoſe of a temporal *Canaan* had been

been before to the *Jews*. 2. Becauſe he gives more grace now to perform them than before he had done. The Law given by *Moſes* was a carnal law, *i. e.* weak, not accompanied with ſtrength to perform what it requires; but the Goſpel of Chriſt is the *adminiſtration of the ſpirit*, i. e. a means to adminiſter the ſpirit to our hearts, to enable us to do what he commands us to do: and then, as the Father ſaid, *Lord, give me ſtrength to do what thou commandeſt, and command what thou liſteſt*; if ſo Chriſt ſtrengthens me, I am ſurely able to do all things, having that ſufficiency from God.

S. *If this be true, that* Chriſt *now requires more than under Nature or* Moſes *had been formerly required, at leaſt fully revealed to be required; how then is our Chriſtian* burthen lighter *than the Jewiſh formerly was? In theſe things it is heavier rather.*

C. It is made lighter by Chriſt in taking off that unprofitable burthen of Ceremonies, that had nothing good in them, and yet were formerly laid on the *Jews:* lighter again in reſpect of the greater *Revelations*, and effuſion of *Grace*, now under Chriſt, than was allowed before; the encreaſing of which above the proportion of the burthen, is conſequently (in effect) the leſſening of the burthen. Which two things being ſuppoſed, the adding of theſe *Perfections* to the Law (which are all of things gainful and profitable, and before (even by thoſe that either were not, or thought not themſelves obliged by them) acknowledged to be more excellent and more honourable than the other) will not in any reaſon be counted the encreaſe of a burthen, (for no man will be thought oppreſſed by that he gains by) but the gainful yoke will be a light one, though it be a *yoke*, Mat. 11. 30. And 2. as long as he gives ſtrength, his *Commandments*, what ever they are, cannot be *grievous*. Wherein the lightneſs of the Chriſtians burthen conſiſts.

S. *But ſure it were not difficult to find in the Old Teſtament, the ſame or equivalent Commands to every of thoſe that follow here; How then can Chriſt be ſaid to have improved them?*

C. Some glimmerings perhaps of this light there were before, as *Goſpel* under the *Law:* but theſe either 1. not univerſally commanded to all under threat of eternal puniſhment, but only recommended to them that will do that which is beſt, and ſo *ſee good days*, &c. or 2. not ſo expreſly revealed to them as that they might know themſelves thus obliged. And yet if any will contend, and ſhew as univerſal plain obliging Precepts there as here, I ſhall be glad to ſee them, and not contend with him, ſo he will bring the *Jews* up to us, and not us down to the *Jews*; for that is the only danger, which I have all this while uſed all this diligence to prevent. The glimmerings of this light in the Old Teſtament.

S. *One queſtion more I ſhall trouble you with in this matter, Whether theſe ſuperadditions of Chriſt in the reſt of the chapter may not be reſolved to be only* Counſels of perfection, *which to do, is to do better; and not* Commands, *which not to do, is a ſin.*

C. The following ſuperadditions are all Commands, and not Counſels onely; Chriſt delivering theſe now in the ſame manner as *Moſes* did thoſe other before; Chriſt in a Mount, as he in a Mount; his ſaying [*I ſay unto you*] a form of Command, as that phraſe [*God ſpake theſe words and ſaid*] a form of it, *Exodus* 20. and the breach of theſe new ſayings threatned with judgment and hell fire, and impriſonment irreverſible, and caſting into hell, *&c.* in the enſuing words. All which ſignifie them ſins which muſt be accounted for ſadly by a Chriſtian, and not only failings, or falling ſhort of perfection. Chriſt's ſuperadditions are commands all.

S. *How many ſorts of theſe new Commandments are there in this enſuing Chapter?*

C. Six; 1. Concerning Killing, 2. Adultery, 3. Divorce, 4. Perjury, 5. Retaliation, 6. Loving of Neighbours. In each of which Chriſt, to ſhew that he *came not to deſtroy, but to fill up*, or perfect, *the Law*, firſt rehearſes the *old Law*, and thereby confirms it, and then annexeth his *new law* to it. Six ſorts of them.

S. *That we may with underſtanding proceed to this matter, I muſt firſt deſire you to tell me what is meant by this phraſe in the front of the firſt of theſe,* [Ye have heard that it was ſaid by them of old time. Sect. IV.

C. [*Ye have heard*] ſignifies you have been taught, and that out of the Word of God, or Books of *Moſes:* [*ſaid by them of old time*] ſeems to be ill tranſlated, and therefore is mended in the margents of our Bibles [*to them*] *i. e.* to the *Jews* your Anceſtors. And that this is a denotation of the Law of the Decalogue given to them, *Exod.* 20. you will have little reaſon to doubt, if you obſerve that the three ſeverals to which theſe words are prefixt, (being omitted in the reſt, in ſome part) are three diſtinct Commandments of the Decalogue, *Thou ſhalt not kill, Thou ſhalt not commit adultery, Thou ſhalt not forſwear thy ſelf, or take God's name in vain*, (as anon you ſhall ſee.) As for the other three, of *Divorce*, of *Retaliation*, of *Loving neighbours*, and *Hating enemies*, which have not that entire form or phraſe prefixt, but ſome other different from it, they are not Commands of the Moſaical Law, but Permiſſions or indulgences allowed the Jews, but now recalled, and denied Chriſtians. The ſtile of the old Commandments.

S. *The firſt of theſe being the ſixth of the Law, I muſt firſt deſire you to explain unto me, and tell me what was forbidden by it under the Law.* Sect. V. *Of Killing.*

C. The firſt and principal thing is the ſhedding of man's blood, by way of killing, or taking away his life; God only, who gave us life, having power to take it away again.

S. *What then is to be thought of the Magiſtrates taking away the life of a capital offender? Is not that forbidden by that Law?*

C. God having ſole power over the life of man, may without doubt take it away by what way he pleaſeth, either immediately by himſelf, or by any man whom he appoints to execute his will. Thus you know might *Abraham* kill his Son, when God bid him; becauſe though *Abraham* had not power over his Son's life, yet God had: and this bidding *Abraham* kill him, is not any thing contrary to this Law, which only forbids man to do it, but doth not forbid God. In the like manner, God having, *Gen.* 9. 6. commanded the *murtherers blood to be ſhed by man*, and thereby enſtated the power of the Sword on the Magiſtrate, (who, by whomſoever he ſhould be ſuppoſed to be choſen to be Magiſtrate, by God, or the People, hath that power of the Sword given him immediately from God, the People having not ſingly this power over their own lives, and therefore not able to give it any other) not only permits him and makes it lawful for him thus to puniſh malefactors, but alſo commands and requires him ſo to do, as his *Miniſters to execute wrath*, Rom. 13. And ſo the word [*Thou*] in the Commandment muſt here be reſolved to ſignifie the man of himſelf, without Power or Commiſſion from God; Of the power of the ſword.

which

which yet he that hath it muſt exerciſe juſtly, according to the laws of God and man, or elſe he breaks the Commandment alſo: this Commiſſion being not given to him abſolutely and arbitrarily to uſe as he liſt, but according to defined rules in the Scripture [*He that ſheds man's blood*, &c.] (which was given not to the Jews, but to all the ſons of *Noah*) and according to the laws of every nation, which being made by the ſupreme Power (who by the Ordinance of God *bears the ſword*, Rom. 13.4.) may afterwards be juſtly executed by ſuch ſubordinate Magiſtrates as are *ſent by him for the puniſhment of evil doers, and the praiſe of them that do well*, 1 Pet. 2. 14.

Of ſelf-murther.

S. *May not a man in any caſe kill himſelf?*

C. He may not, having no more power over his own life than any other mans; and how gainful ſoever death may ſeem to any, yet is he to ſubmit to God's Providence, and to wait, though it be in the moſt miſerable, painful, wearieſome life, till God pleaſe to give him manumiſſion and deliverance out of it.

S. *What is to be ſaid of* Sampſon, *who killed ſo many by pulling away the pillars, and involved himſelf in the ſame deſtruction?*

In *Sampſon.*

C. He was a Judge in *Iſrael*; and ſuch in thoſe days (and particularly him) did God ordinarily move by his Spirit to do ſome extraordinary things: and it is to be imagined, that God incited him to do this; or, if he did not, he were not to be excuſed in it.

S. *What is to be ſaid of thoſe that rather than they would offer to Idols in the Primitive Church, did kill themſelves, and remain ſtill upon record for* Martyrs?

In ſome Primitive Chriſtians.

C. If the ſame could be affirmed of them which was conceived of *Sampſon*, that God incited them to do this, they ſhould by this be juſtified alſo: but having under the Goſpel no authority to juſtifie ſuch pretence of divine incitation, it will be ſafeſt to affirm, that this was a fault in them, which their love of God, and fear that they ſhould be polluted by Idols, was the cauſe of; and ſo though it might as a frailty be pardoned by God's mercy in Chriſt, yet ſure this *killing* themſelves was not it that made them Martyrs, but that great love of God, and reſolving againſt idolatrous worſhip, which teſtified it ſelf in that *killing* themſelves for that cauſe. This it was that made them paſs for Martyrs, and that other incident fault of theirs was not in that caſe thought ſo great, as to deveſt or rob them of that honour.

S. *What is meant by that which follows the mention of the old Commandment in this place* [whoſoever ſhall kill, ſhall be in danger of the judgment?]

The puniſhment of murther.

C. The word rendred [*the judgment*] ſignifies a Court of Judicature, or Aſſiſes of Judges, who ſate in the gates of every City, and had cognizance of all *greater cauſes*, Deut. 16. 18. and particularly of that of *Homicides*, Exod. 21. 12. Levit. 24. 17. Deut. 19. 11, 12. The number of theſe Judges was ordinarily twenty three: and ſo though it be not annext, *Exod.* 20. to that Commandment, yet from the body of the Moſaick Law, Chriſt concludes, that againſt *killing* the ſentence of death by the ſword (for that was the puniſhment peculiar to that Court) was to be expected.

S. *But was nothing elſe forbidden in the Law by that Commandment but killing?*

C. That was the prime eſpecial matter of it, but by way of reduction other things which are preparatory to this, or offences of this nature, but of a lower degree. As 1. Mutilating or maiming any mans body. 2. Wounding him, which may poſſibly endanger his life. 3. Entring into, or accepting, or offering of *Duels*, wherein I may kill, or be killed; in which caſe, which ſoever it prove, I am guilty of murther. Nay, if by the equality of fortune both come ſafely off, yet the voluntary putting my ſelf on that hazard, is guilt enough for a whole ages repentance and humiliation; to conſider what had become of me, if without repentance I had thus fallen a murtherer of my ſelf, and my fellow-Chriſtian alſo.

Of Duels.

S. *May no injury or affront be accounted ſufficient to provoke me to offer (or challenge to) a Duel?*

The utter unlawfulneſs thereof.

C. None imaginable: for that injury whatever it is, if it be a real one, of a conſiderable nature, will be capable of legal ſatisfaction, and that muſt content me; private revenge being wholly prohibited by Chriſt. Or, if it be ſuch that the Law allows no ſatisfaction for, that is an argument that it is light and unconſiderable; and then ſure the life of another man, and the danger of my own, will be an unproportionable ſatisfaction for it.

S. *Well, but if another ſend me a challenge, may not I accept of it? eſpecially when I ſhall be defamed for a Coward if I do not?*

C. Certainly I may not; the Law againſt *killing* reſtrains me. And for that excuſe of Honour, 1. It is moſt unreaſonable that the *Obedience* to God's commands ſhould be an infamous thing. And then 2. if ſo impious a cuſtom hath prevailed, I muſt yet reſolve to part with Reputation, or any thing, rather than with my *Obedience* to God. Nay 3. you may obſerve that there are two ſorts of Cowardice, much differing the one from another; the one proceeding from fear of being beaten or killed, the ſecond from fear of hurting or killing another. The moſt valiant deſpiſer of dangers may be allowed to have a great deal of the ſecond of theſe, and will certainly have as much of it as he hath either of good Nature or Religion; and that will reſtrain *Duels* as much as the other. And might this but paſs, as ſure it deſerves, for an honourable and creditable thing, the fear of the other kind of diſcredit would work little upon us. For the world is now generally grown ſo wiſe, that a man may without any diſhonour fear being killed or hurt; and even to run away from ſuch dangers, being very imminent, is creditable enough. The unluckineſs of it is, that the other honeſt kind of fear, that of hurting, or killing another, is become the only infamous thing, the only cowardice that is counted of. For the removing of which, you may obſerve, 4. That in a reaſonable eſtimation of things, he that for the preſerving of his Reputation ſhall venture to diſobey God, is ſure the greateſt Coward in the world; he is more fearful of diſgrace and ignorance in this world, than any pious man is of violating the laws of natural reaſon, of offending God, or incurring the flames of eternal Hell.

S. *But what am I to do in caſe a challenge be ſent or offered to me?*

C. I am, firſt, in Conſcience toward God, to deny it, whatever the conſequents may be: ſecondly,

condly, to offer a full Satisfaction for any either real or ſuppoſed injury done by me, which hath firſt provoked the challenger: thirdly, as prudently as I can, to ſignifie (and by my actions teſtifie the truth of that) that it is not the fear of dying but of killing, not cowardice but duty, which reſtrains me from this forbidden way of ſatisfying his deſire.

S. *But what if all this will not ſatisfie him: but he will ſtill thirſt my blood, and accept of no other ſatisfaction, but aſſault me, and force me either to deliver up my own life, or try the uncertainty of a Duel?*

C. The utmoſt that in this extreme caſe can be lawful, I ſhall define to you by ſetting before you an example which I have met with. Two perſons of Quality meeting in a publick place, the one paſſed an *affront* upon the other; the other bare it patiently in that preſence, but after ſent him a Challenge: he ſent him a meek return of acknowledgment of his fault, and readineſs to give him any other ſatisfaction that ſhould be thought on to wipe off the injury: the other will not accept any other: he keeps his Chamber, and for a long time uſeth all care not to meet him in any place which would be ſeaſonable for fighting, and ſtill offers tender of ſatisfaction. At length it falls out that they meet in a place where this could not be avoided. The Challenger ſets upon him: the other draws in his own defence, wounds him lightly; having done ſo, deſires again that this may end the quarrel, or offers any other ſatisfaction: the Challenger will not conſent, aſſaults again, is killed; and ſo the *Tragedy* concluded with loſs of the chief *Actor*'s life. That the ſurviver did any thing (except the firſt *affront*) unlawful in all this (all circumſtances conſidered) I cannot affirm; no man being bound to ſpare that other man's life, which he cannot ſpare without parting with his own. I conceive this may ſatisfie the utmoſt of your ſcruples in this matter, if I tell you, that this caſe taken with all the circumſtances is the only one I can give you wherein one of the two *Duellers* may be Innocent. And you will be apt to deceive your ſelf, if you ſeek to find out other caſes, and think to juſtifie them by this. The utmoſt that can be lawful in this matter.

S. *But is there nothing elſe reducible to the prohibition of murther?*

C. Yes, fourthly, *Oppreſſion* of the poor, and not giving relief to thoſe that are in extreme diſtreſs, according to that of the ſon of *Sirach*, *The poor man's bread* either that which he hath, or that which in extreme want he craves of thee) *is his life, and he that deprives him of it is a murtherer*. Fifthly, the beginnings of this ſin in the heart, not yet breaking forth into action, as *malice*, *hatred*, meditating of *revenge*, wiſhing miſchief, curſing, *&c.* All theſe are reducible to this Commandment, as it was given in the Law. Oppreſſion.

S. *Is there any thing yet elſe thus reducible?*

C. One thing more there is, and that is *War*, the conſideration of which is full of great difficulties. For though all unjuſt War be ſimply forbidden under this ſixth Command of the Law, and it be evident enough that ſome wars are unjuſt, as that of Subjects ſeditiouſly raiſed againſt the Supreme power in any State, that of one Prince or Nation invading another for the enlarging of their Dominion or Territories, *&c.* and though indeed there be but few wars but ſin againſt this Commandment, and in thoſe few that do not, yet there be many actors in them, auxiliaries, ſtipendiaries, *&c.* which have no lawful calling to take part in that trade of killing men, (for ſo only have they that do it in obedience to their lawful Magiſtrate:) yet ſtill it is apparent that ſome war is lawful; as that which hath had God's expreſs command, and that which is for the repreſſing of Seditions and Rebellions, and betwixt Nation and Nation for the juſt defence of themſelves, and the repelling of violence. But this laſt head of wars being that wherein the greateſt difficulties lie, will not be ſo proper for this place as for another which we ſhall meet with, that of *not reſiſting of evil*, v. 39. And therefore to that place we ſhall refer it; as alſo that of Private war, or fighting in caſe of aſſault. Of War. Some lawful.

S. *I ſhall then count off that debt, and not require payment till that time cometh, but proceed to demand,*

What Chriſt hath added to this letter of the Moſaick *Law thus explained.*

C. It is clearly anſwered in theſe words, [*But I ſay unto you, that whoſoever is angry with his brother without a cauſe*, &c.] to the end of that verſe. Wherein there be three things forbidden by Chriſt. Firſt, Cauſeleſs or immoderate anger, going no farther than the Breaſt. Secondly, The breaking out of this anger into the Tongue, but ſomewhat moderately: [*Whoſoever ſhall ſay*, Racha.] Thirdly, A more violent railing, or aſſaulting him with that ſword of the tongue that anger hath unſheathed: [*Whoſoever ſhall ſay*, Thou Fool.] Of cauſleſs or immoderate anger.

S. *What do you mean by the firſt of theſe?*

C. That Anger which is either without any, or upon light cauſe, or, being upon any the juſteſt and weightieſt cauſe, exceeds the degree and proportion due to it: and this again in either kind aggravated by the duration and continuance of it. And the Greek word here uſed is a denotation of every of theſe. In the Breaſt.

S. *For the underſtanding of this, I deſire firſt to know, whether any* anger *be juſt or no in reſpect of the cauſe; and if ſo, what?*

C. Saint *Paul*'s advice of being *angry and not ſinning*, though it refer there peculiarly to the not continuing or laſting of wrath, [*Let not the Sun go down on thy wrath*] doth yet imply, that ſome wrath may be lawful in reſpect of the cauſe; for otherwiſe, the Non-continuance of it would not juſtifie it from ſin. The moſt juſtifiable cauſes of Anger are, 1. When it proceeds from ſorrow that God is provoked; anger conceived for God's ſake, *Mark* 3. 5. without reflexion on our ſelves. 2. When it is conceived for vertue's ſake, to ſee that neglected, deſpiſed, and the rules of it violated. 3. When for other men's ſake; ſtill without reflexion on our ſelves or any intereſt of ours. And each of theſe not in light trivial matters neither, but in matters of weight: and ſo the cauſleſs anger is that which ariſes upon ſlight, or no cauſes, or thoſe wherein our own intereſts are concerned: which though they may be cauſes, are not juſtifiable cauſes of anger in us. Cauſes of anger.

S. *Having this direction from you to underſtand cauſeleſs* anger, *I ſhall eaſily anſwer my ſelf for the*

Immoderate. *other two circumstances which make it fit for Christ to prohibit it: As first, When it is immoderate and exceeds the degree and proportion due to it, which I confess may be done even when the cause is just; and se-*

Lasting anger. *condly, When it continues beyond the length of a transient passion; when, as the Apostle saith, the* Sun *is permitted to* go down upon our wrath. *But I pray, What is meant by that phrase which is by Christ here*

In danger of judgment. *repeated, and again applyed to this causeless* anger, *as before to killing,* [shall be in danger of the judgment?] *Sure it is not that he thinks it fit that every Christian that thus offends should be by the Magistrate put to death, as even now you interpreted those words.*

C. The meaning is, that the wrathful man in another world shall be subject to punishment as the murtherer is here: *i. e.* that wrathfulness being so contrary to that meekness, patience, humility, re-

Prov. 21. 24. quired now by Christ, and being as *Solomon* intimates an effect of pride and haughtiness, is to be accounted of as an unchristian sin; which unless it be mortified here by the grace of Christ, will cost us dear in another world; though not so dear as the second and third mentioned in this verse. The punishment of that Court of Judicature being the sword or beheading; which though it be heavy enough, is not yet so great as the two other which are afternamed.

S. *This of causless* anger *being thus clearly forbidden by Christ, and yet that that even good Christians are so subject to fall into; what means will you direct me to, to mortifie or subdue it?*

Means to subdue anger. *C.* First, a Conviction of the danger and sin of it; not flattering our selves that either it is no sin, or such as with our ordinary frailties shall have its pardon of course. But 1. such as lieth here under an heavy penalty particularly denounced against it by Christ. And 2. that which is most directly opposite to those graces of humility, meekness, patience, peaceableness, bearing with one another, and forgiving one another, *&c.* which is required most strictly by Christ of his Disciples, *i. e.* of all Christian followers of him. Secondly, a consideration of the unreasonableness of that sin, which is, 1. very unjust, being causless or immoderate; 2. very much against what I would have done to me either by my brother, (it being a very painful, uneasie thing to be under another's wrath, especially when ill words or blows are joined with it, and that which no body would be under, if he could help it) or by God himself (whom I so oft displease, and would be sorry if he should be wroth with me, even when justly he might.) Thirdly, the labouring against that bitter root of pride in my heart, of which this is so necessary and infallible an attendant. Fourthly, the reflexion upon my self, if it were possible in time of that passion, or else immediately after, when I come to my self again out of that drunkenness of soul, and considering how ill-favor'd a hateful thing it is, how like a Tiger, a Bear, or any the furiousest Beast, rather than a man, it makes me; what a deforming of me it is, putting me out of all that posture of civility that in time of sobriety I chuse to appear in; yea, and what a painful agony it was when I was under it. Fifthly, the considering how at such time we are out of our own power, and so apt to fall into those oaths, acts of fury, indiscretions, revealing of secrets, disadvantageous expressions, *&c.* in a few such minutes, which a whole age of repentance will not repair again. Sixthly, a sober vow or resolution never to permit my self to fall into so inconvenient and dangerous a sin; that when I find it a coming upon me, I may restrain it by remembring that this was it that I thought fit to vow against. Seventhly, a watching over my self continually, that I be not taken unawares. Eightly, abstaining carefully from the least indulgence to any beginnings of it; it being easier to keep from any first degree of it, than yielding to that, to restrain the farther and higher degrees. Ninthly, avoiding temptations and provocations as much as I can, and so the company of those who are subject to that sin, or the employments and conversations which encline me to it. Tenthly, labouring with God in prayer for grace to mortifie this in me. Eleventhly, diverting (in time of temptation) with some particular repeated ejaculations to God to suppress at that time any such exorbitant affection in me. Many other conducible means you will be able to suggest to your self.

S. *What is the second thing here forbidden?*

In the tongue, saying *Racha.* * Thus *Minerva* in *Homer. Il. a.* when she forbids *Achilles* striking *Agamemnon.* (ἀλλ' ἄγε λῆγ' ἔριδος, μηδὲ ξίφεϊ φῶο ἔλκεο χερεὶ) gives him leave to reproach him and give him contumelious words: Ἀλλ' ἤτοι ἔπεσιν μὲν ὀνείδισον. Which shews the pitch of Christ's divine precepts here, above that of the Heathen Goddess.

C. Saying *to his brother,* Racha,] *i. e.* when anger breaks into * contumelious speeches; such are the calling him empty, despicable, witless fellow; for the word *Racha* is an Hebrew word, and signifies *vain* or *empty.* This, though not the highest kind of contumely, is yet greater than the former, and therefore is here expresst by the punishment apportioned to it, greater than the former, as much as stoning is a sorer death than beheading; for that is the meaning of [*he shall be in danger of the council:*] the Council signifying the *Sanhedrin,* or the supreme and great Senate, where the ordinary punishment was stoning. And so the meaning is, this is a greater sin, and so to expect a greater punishment than the former.

S. *What is the third thing forbidden here?*

Thou Fool. *C.* Saying, *Thou Fool*] *i. e.* when wrath breaks out into most virulent railings, all sorts of which are here intimated by this one word; and this being a greater sin or aggravation of causless anger than the former, is here described by the third kind of punishment: Which though it were not in any legal Court of Judicature, was yet well enough known among the Jews: not under the name of *Hell fire,* (as we render it by a mistake, because those torments in *Hell* are in other places described by

Hell fire. גי הנם these) but of the *valley* of *Hinnom.* The meaning of which is this; Without the City of *Jerusalem,* in the *valley* of *Hinnom,* there was a place where the Jews sometime, in imitation of the *Phœnicians,* used a most cruel, barbarous kind of rites, burnt children alive, putting them in hollow brazen vessels, and so by little and little scalding them to death; where because the children could not chuse but howl hideously, they had *Timbrels* perpetually sounding to drown that cry, and therefore it was

תפתי called *Tophet,* (from a word signifying *Timbrels*) and is described by the Prophets of the Old Testa-

Isai. 30. 33. ment. This punishment taking denomination from the place, that *valley* of *Hinnom,* is called here in Greek by a word little differing in sound from the Hebrew, and that word in the New Testament,

γέεννα. and ordinarily in sacred Writers, Greek and Latin, yea, in the ancient Hebrew writings, is set to

גי הנם signifie *Hell fire*; because this was the best image or expression of those *torments* conceived there, that their knowledge or experience could represent to them. And so is here fitly made use of to express

the

the greateſt ſin in this kind, by the greateſt puniſhment that they could underſtand. For indeed above the Sword and Stoning, there was no puniſhment in uſe in the Jewiſh Courts of Judicature, (the burning among them being not that which is in uſe among us ſometimes, of *burning alive*, but the thruſting of an *Iron red hot* into their bowels, which made a quick diſpatch of them) and therefore to aſcend to the deſcription of a third ſuperlative degree of ſin, our Saviour thinks fit to uſe that mention of the puniſhments in the *valley* of *Hinnom*.

S. *You have by this plenteous diſcourſe on this word prevented my doubt, which would have been, whether the laſt only of theſe ſins, and not the two former, make a Chriſtian liable to Hell fire: for now I perceive the thing meant by that word is that torture in the valley of* Hinnom. *And that uſed to expreſs a third greater degree of puniſhment in another world anſwerable to that third degree of ſin; and that nothing elſe is to be collected from it.*

I ſhall only trouble you with one ſcruple in this matter, and that is, whether all kind of calling Racha, *or* Fool, *i. e. all contumelious ſpeaking, of a greater or leſſer degree, be ſuch a ſin, puniſhable in a Chriſtian in another world?* Of contumelious ſpeaking.

C. I ſhall anſwer you, 1. By interpoſing one *Caution* obſervable in theſe words: It is not all uſing of thoſe or the like words which here is ſet down under that ſad Character, but that which is the effect and improvement of cauſleſs immoderate anger; for you ſee they are here ſet as higher degrees of that. And therefore ſecondly, thoſe ſpeeches that proceed from any thing elſe, particularly when they are ſpoken by thoſe to whom the *Office* and duty of Chaſtiſing others belongs, as Maſters, Teachers, Superiours, in any kind, (nay, perhaps equals too, who in Charity are obliged to reprove their Neighbour, and *not to ſuffer ſin on him*) and by them are firſt, done to that purpoſe, that they may by theſe Goads wake them out of a lethargy of ſin; and again, ſecondly, are done ſeaſonably, ſo as they are in prudence moſt likely to work a good effect; and thirdly, upon great and weighty cauſes; and fourthly, without ſeeking any thing to themſelves, either the venting of inordinate Paſſion, or the ambition and vanity of ſeeming ſeverer than others, or ſo much better than thoſe whom they thus reproach; theſe all this while are not ſubject to this cenſure or danger. And of this nature you may ſee in the New Teſtament theſe ſeverals, Jam. 2. 20. *O vain man, i. e.* literally *Racha:* Matth. 23. 17. *Ye fools and blind*, ſpoken by Chriſt; and again, Verſe 19. and *Luke* 24. 25. *Ye fools*, &c. and *Gal.* 3. 1. *O fooliſh Galatians*; and Verſ. 3. *Are ye ſo fooliſh?* Which is directly the other expreſſion [*Thou fool*] which now you will ſee and diſcern eaſily (if you conſider the affection of the Speakers) to be out of Love, not cauſleſs inordinate Paſſion, and ſo not liable to the cenſure in this Text. But then thirdly, there is little doubt but that all Detraction, Cenſoriouſneſs, Backbiting, Whiſpering, (that ſo ordinary entertainment of the world to buſie our ſelves when we meet together, in ſpeaking all the evil we know, or perhaps know not, of other men) is a very great ſin here condemned by our Saviour, and upon his Advertiſement timely to be turned out of our Communication, as being moſt conſtantly againſt the Rule *of doing as I would be done to*; no man living being pleaſed to be ſo uſed as the *Detractor* uſeth others.

S. *I beſeech God to lay this to my heart, that by his aſſiſtance I may be inabled to ſuppreſs and mortifie this inordinate paſſion, that my nature hath ſuch inclinations unto: to that end, to plant that Meekneſs, and Patience, and Humility, and Charity in my heart, that may turn out this unruly creature; to arm me with that continual vigilance over my ſelf, that it may not ſteal upon me unawares; but eſpecially to give me that power over my tongue, that I may not fall into that greater condemnation.*

But I ſee you have not yet done with this Theme; for before our Saviour proceeds to any other Commandment, I perceive he buildeth ſomewhat elſe on this foundation in the four next Verſes, [Therefore if thou bring thy gift to the Altar, *&c.*] *Be pleaſed then to tell me,* 1. *How that belongs to this matter; and* 2. *What is the duty there preſcribed?*

C. For the dependence of that on the former, or how it belongs to it, you will eaſily diſcern, if you remember that old ſaying, That * *Repentance is the only plank to reſcue him that is caſt away in the ſhipwrack.* Our Saviour had mentioned the danger of raſh anger and contumelies, *&c.* And becauſe through humane infirmity he ſuppoſes it poſſible that Diſciples or Chriſtians may thus miſcarry, he therefore adds the neceſſity of immediate Repentance and ſatisfaction after it.

* *Pœnitentia unica eſt poſt naufragium tabula.* Tert.

S. *What is the duty there preſcribed?*

C. It is this. 1. Being *reconciled* with the Brother, Verſ. 24. and *agreeing with the adverſary*, Verſ. 25. *i. e.* uſing all means to make my peace with him whom I have thus injured. For the word [*be reconciled*] ſignifies not here [*to be pacified towards him*] for he is not here ſuppoſed to have injured thee, for if he had, the anger would not be cauſleſs: but [*to pacifie him*] to regain his favour, (and thus the word is uſed in the Scripture-dialect in other places) confeſſing my raſh anger and intemperate language, and offering any way of ſatisfaction, that he may be moved to forgive me, and be reconciled to me; which till he do, I am his *Debtor*, in his danger to attach me, as it were, to bring *me before the Judge*, and he to *deliver me to the Baily or Sergeant*, and he to *caſt me into priſon*, &c. *i. e.* This ſin of mine unretracted by Repentance will lie very heavy upon my ſcore; and without Satisfaction to the injured perſon, will not be capable of mercy or pardon from Chriſt: Which danger is ſet to enforce the duty. The ſecond part of the duty is, that the making this our *Peace* is to be preferred before many other things, which paſs for more ſpecious works among us; as particularly before voluntary Oblations, which are here meant by the *gift brought to the Altar*, ſuch as thoſe of which the Law is given, *Lev.* 1. 2. Not that the performance of this duty is to be preferred (being a duty to my Neighbour) before Piety, or the duties of true Religion toward God; but before the obſervation of outward worſhip, ſacrifices, oblations, *&c. Mercy before ſacrifice*, Matth. 9. 13. and 12. 7. And that thoſe offerings that are brought to God with a heart full of wrath, and hatred, will never be acceptable to him. Our *Prayer*, expreſt 1 *Tim.* 2. 8. by [*lifting up of holy and clean hands*] muſt be *without wrath*; or elſe (like the *Faſt*, Iſai. 58. 4. [*Ye faſt for ſtrife and for debate*] and the *long prayers*, Iſai. 1. [when the *hands were full of blood*]) it will be but a *vain oblation* in God's account, like *Cain*'s, when he reſolved to kill his Brother. Of Reconciliation. καταλλάγηθι.

S. *Is there any thing elſe you will commend to me out of theſe words, before we part with them?*

Of the time of calling our selves to account for trespasses.

C. Yes, 1. That the time immediate before the performing of any holy duty, of Prayer, of Oblation, of Fasting, of receiving the Sacrament, *&c.* is the fittest and propereſt time to call our selves to account for all the trespasses and injuries we are guilty of toward God and men, [*If thou bring thy gift, and there remembrest*, Ver. 23.] That, it seems, is a season of remembring. 2. That though the not having made my *peace* with those whom I have offended make me unfit for any such Christian performance, (and so require me to defer that till this be done) yet can it not give me any excuse to leave that Christian performance undone, but rather hasten my performance of the other, that I may perform this also. He that is not yet reconciled, must not carry away his *gift*, but *leave it at the altar*, Vers. 24. and *go and be reconciled*, and then *come back, and offer his gift*. He that is not in Charity (or the like) and so unfit to receive the Sacrament, must not think it fit or lawful for him to omit or neglect that *Receiving*, on that pretence, (or if he do, it will be a double guilt) but must hasten to recover himself to such a Capacity, that he may with *clean hands* and *heart* thus come to God's Table, whensoever he is thus called to it. 3. That a *Penitent* reconciled sinner may have as good confidence in his approaches to God, as any, [*Then come*, Verse 24.] 4. That the putting off or deferring of such businesses as these of *Reconciliation, satisfaction*, &c.) first, is very dangerous; and secondly, the danger of it past reversing, when it cometh upon us. And 5. that there is no way to prevent this, but in time of life and health, quickly, instantly to do it, the next hour may possibly be too late. *Agree quickly while thou art in the way.* Vers. 25. 6. That the punishment that expects such sinners is endless, indeterminable: the [*till thou hast paid*] Vers. 26. is not a limitation of time, after which thou shalt come out, (any more than [*she had no children till she died*] is a mark or intimation of her having children after death) but a proposal of a sad payment which would never be finished and discharged; the paying of it would be a doing for ever.

S. I thank you for these supernumerary Meditations. I hope they shall not be cast away upon me.

Sect. VI. *Of Adultery.*

I shall detain you no longer here, but call upon you to proceed to the next Period, which I see to begin in like manner with a Commandment of the old Law, Thou shalt not commit Adultery; *and the same introduction to it which was to the former,* Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time] *which, by what I before learnt of you, I conclude should be* [to them of old time] *or to the ancient Jews,* Exod. 20. 14. *I shall propose no more scruples in this matter, but only crave your Directions for the main, what you conceive forbidden here in that old Commandment.*

The severals forbidden under that head.

[a] Θυμός.
[b] ἐπιθυμία.
μοιχεία, πορνία.

C. As in the former, God by *Moses* restrained all the accursed issues of [a] one kind of sensuality, that of *anger*; so in this place of the [b] other, this of *lust*. And naming the chief breach of this kind, that of *Adultery*, i. e. lying carnally with a married woman, he forbids also all other acts of uncleanness which are not conjugal. Thus have some of the Jews themselves interpreted the word which is used in the Decalogue, and so in the Scripture and good Authors, and in common use, *Adultery* and *Fornication* are taken promiscuously to signifie all manner of uncleanness, of what kind, or in what manner soever committed: Of which though some kinds seem to have been permitted the Jews, yet this Permission is not to be conceived to extend any farther than the benefit of legal impunity, (not that they were lawful or without turpitude.) And, that some other kinds of them which tended not to the multiplying of that people (as *Polygamy* did) were by their Law severely punished, you shall see *Deut.* 22. but more severely by God himself, as *Numb.* 25. So that under the letter of that old Commandment are contained not only the known sins of *Adultery* and *Fornication*, but all other kinds of filthiness, mentioned, *Rom.* 1. 24, 26, 27, 29. where there are four words that seem to contain all sorts of it under them; [c] *Fornication*, [d] *Villany*, [e] *Immoderate desire*, [f] *Naughtiness*: and so again, 2 *Cor.* 12. 21. *Uncleanness, fornication, lasciviousness*; and Gal. 5. 19. *Adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness*, and *idolatry*. Which last word in that and other places seems a word meant on purpose to contain all such kind of unclean sins under it, because they were so ordinary in the idolatrous mysteries of the Heathens; most of the rites and secrets of their Religion being the practice of these filthy sins. So *Eph.* 4. 19. and 5. 3. In both which places, as also before *Rom.* 1. 29. and *Col.* 3. 5. the word there rendred [g] *Covetousness* in the three latter, and *greediness* in the first, signifies that irregular desire, and so those Heathenish sins which (here also *Col.* 3. 5.) are called [h] *idolatry*. I would not give you any more particular account of these sins, which *are not to be named*, but desire God to fortifie you with all care and vigilance against them, grounded in a sense and hatred and detestation of them, as of the greatest reproach to your nature, grievance to the Spirit of God, defamation of Christianity, (where-ever they are to be found) and as sins of such a nature, that as they have had the fiercest of God's judgments revealed against them, (many Cities and Nations remarkably destroyed for them) so when they are once in any kind indulged to, they are apt to break out into all baseness and vileness, and are therefore called by St. *Peter*, *abominable idolatry*, 1 Pet. 4. 3.

[c] πορνεία.
[d] πονηρία.
[e] πλεονεξία.
[f] κακία.
[g] πλεονεξία.
[h] See [k] Tract of Idolatry.

S. The good Lord of all purity, by the power of his sanctifying grace, preserve me from all such taints, to be a Temple of the Holy Ghost. But what else is reducible to this Commandment of the Law?

Reducible to it.

C. 1. All desires of these sins consented to, although they break not out into Act. 2. All morose thoughts, *i. e.* delaying, dwelling or insisting on such thoughts, phansying of such unclean matters with delectation. 3. The feeding my lust with luxurious diet, inflaming Wines, *&c.* or other such fewel and accentives of it, *&c.*

S. What now hath Christ added to this old Prohibition?

Of looking on a woman to lust.

C. You have it in these words, That *whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her, hath committed adultery with her already in his heart.*

S. What is the meaning of that?

[i] *Adultera mens est,—Intus adulter erit,* Ovid.

C. That he that so *looks*, &c. First, signifies his [i] heart to be adulterous, though himself be not, through want of opportunity, *&c.* Secondly, that he shall by Christ be censurable as the adulterer under the Law.

S. But what is the full importance of looking on a woman to lust?

C. It is not only [*to look to that end that I may lust*] (as some are willing to interpret here, by this means making *looking* to be sinful only in order to that end (that *lusting*) without designing of which they conceive the looking it self will be no fault) but either [to look so long till I lust] or else

[to

[to satisfie my lust (though not with the yielding to the corporal pollution, yet) so far as to feed my eye, to gaze, to dwell on the beauty of other women.] As in the Law, the fastning the eyes on the Idol, considering the beauty of it, is, saith *Maimonides*, forbidden, *Levit.* 19. 4. and not only the worship of it. I shall give it you in the language of the Fathers who have thus interpreted it. [k] *He that stands and looks earnestly*; Theoph. *He that makes it a business to look earnestly upon gallant bodies and beautiful faces, that hunts after them, and feeds his mind with the spectacle, that nails his eyes to handsome faces*; *Saint* Chrysost. And again, *Not he that desires that he may commit folly, but looks that he may desire.* And again, *God hath given thee eyes, that seeing the creature, thou maist glorifie him and admire him.* And the use of employing them any other ways than thus, is an abuse. An example of this we have in the two wicked Elders, *Susan. vers.* 32. who being denied the farther enjoying of their lusts, command to *uncover her face*, that they may be *filled with her beauty*. And there is mention of the like in another Apocryphal Author, 1 *Esdr.* 4. 19. *gape*, and even *with open mouth fix their eyes fast on her*; and *Ecclus.* 9. 5. and 8. *Gaze not on a maid*, the Greeks read it, [l] *Look not on her*, as if thou wert a *learning her, lest thou be ensnared by her complexion*, or colour, or beauty in her cheeks; for so I suppose the [m] right reading imports. So again, *Ecclus.* 41. 21, 22. *gazing upon* (the Greek signifies [n] *contemplation*) *another man's wife*, and a *curious earnest beholding his maid*; for so the word there rendred [being [o] *overbusie with her*] seems rather to signifie, and is used by the Fathers to expresse the very thing we now speak of: and so it is 1 *Tim.* 5. 13. and *Ecclus.* 42. 12. [p] *Look not earnestly on any man for beauty.* As therefore there was an [q] *immoderation* and fault in anger, so in looking. *If* (saith *Chrysostom*) *thou wilt look and be delighted, look upon thine own wife, and love her continually; but if thou lookest after* [r] *other beauties, thou dost both wrong her (letting thy eyes rove other where) and thou wrongest her whom thou lookest on, medling with her illegally; for thou touchest her not with thy hand, yet with thy eyes thou dost.* To this St. *Peter* refers, 2 *Pet.* 2. 14. *Eyes full of adultery*; there being an adulterous look as well as an adulterous embrace; the former forbidden by Christ as well as the latter by *Moses.*

[k] ὁ βλέπων, or, as *Chrys.* reads it, ὁ ἐμβλέπων γυναῖκα.

[l] μὴ καλαμίζου αὐτήν.

[m] ἐμμανῶς not σπιλιμίως.

[n] καλαύνης.

[o] περιεργάζῃ.

[p] ἐρωτικοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς μὴ βλέπε τὸ κάλλος περιεργάζου, *Niceph. Basil. Orat.* β. of one that was in love with her father, and durst not let it be known, of whom he saith, δεῖ ψυχῆς ἐθαλαμεύσαι τὸν ἔρωτα, *she bedded her love in her heart, it being very dangerous to let it out*: the very thing which is called the committing adultery in the heart. [q] πικῶ. [r] ἀλλότριον κάλλος. *Eccl.* 9. 8. so v. 9. μὴ καθίσῃς παρὰ γυναικὶ μὴ κάθου σύνολον, *Sit not at all with a woman that hath an husband.*

S. *I had not thought this prohibition of* Christ *had been so severe, but seeing it is the opinion of the ancient Fathers, that the words are thus to be interpreted, and that the feeding of the eye, yielding to satisfie that with unlawful objects, (the beauty of any but our own wives) and the stirring up of fire within (which is apt to be kindled by that means) is here forbidden, I shall no longer doubt of it, but resolve (and with* Job *make a Covenant with my eyes) that I will not behold a maid, i. e. please my self with the contemplation of her beauty! much less indulge my self the liberty of any farther degrees of this kind, any of those dalliances that are so ordinary among men or women, and are either effects of lusts already inflamed, or else provokers and inflamers of it: and the Lord give me grace to make good this resolution. But then, if it be a fault thus to behold, will it not be so also in the woman that is thus beheld, (as the patient in adultery sins as well as the agent) especially if she take as great pleasure in that, and deck and set her self out to that end that she may be thus looke on?*

C. S. *Chrysostom* answers that Question also, That it is a great fault, and a kind of Adultery in that woman that thus not only exposes and prostitutes her self to the eyes of men, but *so dresses and sets her self out, and calls to her the eyes of all men; if she strike not, wound not others, she shall yet be punished, for she hath mixt the potion; prepared the poison, though she hath not given the cup to drink: yes, and hath done that too, though none be found that will drink of it.* It seems, a piece of Christian chastity there is required of women in this kind, that is not generally thought of.

S. *I shall trouble you no longer with this matter, only I desire to know, what the two other verses in this period, of the* eye and hand offending thee, *have to do in this place.* Of the eye and hand offending.

C. They are the preventing of an objection, after this manner: Upon the giving of that severe prohibition, men will be apt to object, O, but it is hard not to love that which is beautiful, and not to behold what is loved. To this foreseen objection he answers before-hand; It is hard and unpleasant indeed, but more unpleasant sure to be a frying in Hell. It were better to pluck the very eye out of the head, to cut off the hand, even that which were most useful and honourable, than to be cast into Hell. Much more when that is not required, to cut off, or pull out those members, but only to turn away the eye from the alluring object, to keep the hand from immodest touches and dalliances: *Nay*, (saith *Chrysostom*) *This is a most milde and soft precept; it would have been much more hard, if he had given command to converse with, and look curiously on women, and then to abstain from farther commissions of uncleanness with them.*

S. *But, what hath the hand to do with that business of* looking?

C. The mention of it is by way of analogy or reduction to that former precept, and doth imply that that former prohibition of *looking* is to be extended to all other things of the like nature; all libidinous touches, *&c.* And whosoever abstains from the grosser act, and yet indulgeth himself such pleasures as these with any but his own wife, sins also against this Law of Christ.

S. *Shall we now hasten to the third Law here mentioned? It is about* Divorce. *What was the state of this business under the Law?* Sect. VII. *Of Divorce.*

C. The Ten Commandments mention nothing of it, and therefore you see the præmial form is changed; not as before [*ye have heard that it hath been said to them of old*] (the character of the Commandments) but only, [*It hath been said:*] which notes that there is somewhat in *Moses*'s writings about it, though not in the Ten Commandments. And what that is, you will see, *Deut.* 24. 1. to the fifth, to this purpose, *That he that hath married a wife, and likes her not for some uncleanness which he hath found in her, he is permitted to give her a bill of divorce, and send her out of his house; and in that case she may marry again: and though her second husband do so too, or die; yet the former husband is not permitted to take her again for his wife.* To which that Christ referred, and not to any interpretation of the *Pharisees*, appeareth, *Matth.* 19. and *Mark* 10. where the *Pharisees* cite *Moses* for a testimony to authorize their opinion; and Christ denies not that, but tells them, that *for the hardness* The permission under *Moses.*

of

of their heart it was given them, and reduces them to the first institution of marriage, as that which though it brought not with it then the obligation of a command, yet shewed what was always best, and most acceptable to God; which now Christ by his New Law commands distinctly, though it were not so required of the Jews before in that more imperfect state of obedience, because *of the hardness of their hearts*, *i. e.* because they were such an unruly stubborn people, that if they should have been inhibited or restrained from putting away a wife which they liked not, they would have been likely to have killed those hated wives, that so they might have married again: (which is intimated in that speech by way of reply to Christ's Law, *Matth.* 19. 10. where the very Disciples of Christ express their opinion, that *it were better never to marry at all*, than thus to be bound to a wife; and Christ answers them, not by denying such inconvenience possibly to follow, but by asserting the necessity of marriage to some men, which must make them content to bear with some inconveniences, Vers. 11.) So again *Mark* 10. 4, 5. though that which is said by *Moses* in point of divorce be called a precept, Vers. 5. yet it is but a sufferance, Vers. 4. *i. e.* a precept of permission, or not holding them up to that high pitch of the first institution of marriage: not a commanding, or so much as advising them to put away their wives (in such other cases besides that of *fornication*) not indeed wholly freeing the practice from some turpitude; but yet a tolerating or permitting, or not forbidding them to do so for some time, till the season of more perfect commands should come; and withal a commanding, that when a Jew (contrary to the first institution of marriage, and to that which was always best) shall put away his wife, or refuse to live with her, he shall then give her a bill of divorcement in her hand, which was done in favour to the hated wife, who was free to marry another in this case. This is the brief state of this matter under the Old Testament, nothing in the whole business precept, but only permission, or toleration of such divorces for that time of their more imperfect state, somewhat agreeable also to the peculiarity of Gods œconomy among that people; for the multiplying of whom it is certain that *polygamy*, or the having more wives than one, was allowed them by God, and practised by the holy men of that Nation, and that allowance so continued till the coming of Christ, who, it seems here, reduced all to the first institution of marriage, that the man and the wife *shall be one flesh*, Matth. 19. 5. Under which (it seems by St. *Paul*, 1 *Cor.* 7. 2, 3, 4.) is contained and intimated the womans *having power of the husband's body*, as before the man had over the womans. This design of multiplying this people exceedingly might perhaps have some influence on the matter of divorces also, because, supposing the husband to have such a vehement dislike to the wife, that he would not be brought to live conjugally with her, it would from thence follow, through the prohibition of the womans marrying more husbands (which was never permitted any, though the husband might marry more wives, and so would be the more likely to abstain from the loathed wife, when he might have others freely) it would, I say, follow from hence, That unless it were lawful for the husband to give a bill of divorce in this case, the hated wife would be kept from ever having of children by any as long as that husband lived: Whereupon it is commanded that in this case, when the husband doth thus vehemently dislike the wife, and cannot or will not bring himself to love or live conjugally with her, he *shall give her a bill of divorce*; which law indeed is particularly in favour of the unfortunate wife, and gives her power to be married to any other except to that former husband, *Deut.* 24. 4. (and to the Priest, *Levit.* 21. 7.) and so is thus far in order to that great end of multiplying that people, which would much be hindred, if every hated wife should be denied this liberty to marry again, and propagate by some other man; which had it not been for that Law, she might not have done, but must in this case have remained childless as long as that unkind husband lived: This, I say, makes this Law of permitting divorces, and marriages after such divorces, seem to be given by *Moses* in order to multiplying or propagation. And accordingly is that of *Mal.* 2. 16. to be rendred, *If thou hatest her, put her away*: In case of vehement dislike, dismis her by bill of divorce, that so she may marry some other that will be more kind to her.

Retrenched by Christ.

S. *What doth Christ now in his new Law, in this matter of divorce?*

C. He repealeth that whole Commandment, *Deut.* 24. 1. and imposeth a stricter yoke on his Disciples. For coming now to give more grace than the Law brought with it to the Jews, he thinks not fit to yield so much to any considerations, particularly to the hardness of mens hearts, as to allow Christians that liberty, so contrary to the first institution of wedlock, but raiseth them higher to that pitch, which, when it was not commanded, was yet most excellent, and principally approved by God and all good men, and now becomes necessary by being commanded by him. And therefore now he clearly affirms of all such divorces, that whosoever thus puts away his wife, as the Jews frequently did, causeth *her to commit adultery*, *and he that marrieth her committeth adultery*; and if after such divorcement he himself marry again, *he committeth adultery*, and is in that respect sadly liable, *Matth.* 19. 3. That is, in brief, that the bond of wedlock now under Christ is so indissoluble, that it is not the husbands dislikes which can excuse him for *putting away his wife*, nor his giving her a *bill of divorce* which can make it lawful for her to marry any other, nor for any other to marry her, who is, for all this bill, still indissolubly another man's wife.

Christ's Law concerning divorces.

S. *But what, is no kind of Divorce now lawful under Christ?*

C. Yes clearly, that which is here named, in *case of fornication*, *i. e.* If the wife prove false to the husbands bed, and take in any other man, it will then be lawful by Christs Law for the husband to give her a Bill of divorce, *i. e.* legally to sue it out, and so put her away. The reason being because of the great inconveniences and mischiefs that such falseness brings into the family; children of anothers body to inherit with (or perhaps before) his own, *&c.* Which sort of reasons it is, together with the dominion of the husband over the wife, that this matter of divorce (now under Christ) is chiefly built on, (and not only, as might be imagined, that of the conjugal contract; for that being mutual, would as well make it lawful for the wife to put away the husband, which is no where permitted in the Old or New Testament) this liberty being peculiar to the husband against the wife, and not common to the wife against her husband; because, I say, those family-inconveniences do not follow the falseness of the husband as they do that of the wife; and because the wife hath

Interdicting them in all cases but that one of Fornication.

by

by promise of obedience made her self a subject, and owned him as Lord, and so hath none of that authority over him (an act of which putting away seemeth to be) which he by being Lord hath over her.

S. *Is there no other cause of divorce now pleadable or justifiable among Christians, but that in case of Fornication?*

C. I cannot define any, because Christ hath named no other.

S. *But methinks there is a place in St.* Paul, 1 Cor. 7. 12. *from whence I might conclude that* Christ *hath named some other. For when Saint* Paul *saith that the brother*, i. e. *believer*, having an unbelieving, i. e. *heathen*, wife, if she be willing to live with him, he must not put her away, *he prefaceth it in this manner*, To the rest speak I, not the Lord. *Whence I infer that in Saint* Paul's *opinion* Christ *had not then said that* unbelief *was not a lawful cause of* Divorce, *and consequently I conclude that* Christ *had left place for some other cause beside fornication: and therefore I should ghess that the naming of* fornication *there was not exclusive to all other causes, but only to those that were inferiour to it, (and that would make it contrary enough to what was by* Moses *permitted, to wit,* [for every cause] *Matth. 19. 13.) and that if there should be found any other cause as great as that, it might be conceived, comprehended under that example (named) of* fornication: *and then I shall be bold to interpose my opinion, that sure, if the wife should attempt to poison or otherwise take away the life of the husband, this would be as insupportable an injury as adultery, and so as fit a cause of a divorce as that.* 1 Cor. 7. 12.

C. You have proposed an objection of some difficulty. I must apply answer to it, by dividing it into parts, and making my returns severally. 1. That in that place, 1 *Cor.* 7. if the words [*speak I, not the Lord*] did belong to the words immediately following, to wit, those which you name, and if those were to be understood of *Divorce*, your collection from thence would be reasonable. But I conceive that they belong not to the case of *Divorce*, but of *malicious desertion*, either more generally, when one will not live with the other; and then it may be truly affirmed, that Christ spake not of that particular, and that the Apostle doth strictly forbid such *desertions*: or else that they belong to the 15. verse precisely, and so to that particular case of Desertion, when the *unbeliever will not live with the believer*, the Heathen particularly with the Christian; and then Saint *Paul*'s determination is, That *upon her or his departure, the believer, man or woman, shall not be in bondage, (i. e.* so far inslaved, or subjected, that he or she should do acts prejudicial to their *Religion*, for that end that she may continue with her husband, or he with his wife) and of this it may also truly be said, that Christ had said nothing; and so [*this speak I, not the Lord.*] If either of these interpretations be acknowledged, then the ground of the whole Objection is taken away. And if it be objected again, that by that liberty of Saint *Paul*'s, the woman-believer, being put away by the Infidel-husband, is permitted to live continually from him, which seems contrary to Christ's saying, *That he that putteth her away, except in case of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery*, (for if by that absence from him she be caused to commit Adultery, how can it be lawful for her to live from him?) To this I answer also, 1. That if all this were granted, it would yet be nothing to the present purpose: for it would conclude only against Saint *Paul*'s judgment that he did contrary to Christ's in giving this liberty; not that Christ had said this, which Saint *Paul* said he had not said, which is the only thing that this objection was designed to prove. But then 2. that the case here spoken of by Saint *Paul*, being, as was said, the case of malicious desertion, differs from that other of Divorce for other causes besides Fornication. 3. Though that which Saint *Paul* here saith, be somewhat which Christ hath not said before, and so an example of (*I, not the Lord*] yet it is not opposite or contrary to what Christ had said: for though Christ say, that he that divorces (not for *Fornication*) *causeth his wife to commit adultery*; yet sure his meaning is only, that, *as much as in him lies*, he causeth her, by putting her to some ill exigents, which may perhaps tempt her to harlotry, but not that he forceth her to this infallibly, or irresistibly; for sure it is possible one who is so divorced may *live chaste*, yea, and single ever after. And that this is the meaning of that phrase, [*causeth her to commit adultery*] you may be assured by this, that Christ mentions it only as an aggravation of the man's fault, who by this puts her on that *hazard*, of which he is nowhit less guilty, though she resists that temptation, and escape that danger. But then still this is a distinct case from that of the Infidels deserting of his believing wife, for that being Saint *Paul*'s case only, was not spoken to by Christ. Thus you see the place to the *Corinthians* cleared: I shall only (by the way) add, that *v.* 12. the understanding those words [*to the rest*] as if they were opposed to the [*married*] *ver.* 20. (as though he spake now to the *rest*, *i. e.* those that are unmarried) is a mistake, caused either by not marking that in the prohibition of Christ, mentioned immediately before, the exception of Adultery must be supposed (for that being supposed, the sence will run thus, *But to the rest*, *i. e.* to those married persons to whom Christ spake not particularly, *i. e.* to the married that divorce not for Adultery, but maliciously desert one the other) or else perhaps by the sound of the Greek word, which would then be better rendred, *for the rest*, or [*to the rest*] referring not to *persons*, but things, [*concerning the rest*, &c.]

Interpreted of malicious desertion.

λοιποῖς.

Having answered now the first part of your Objection, I proceed to the second, and answer, That there were again some reason in the inference, if first Saint *Paul* had thus affirmed the former, (which we have shewed he did not,) and secondly, if there could be produced any cause so justifiable for Divorce as Fornication, (in the latitude of the signification) or Adultery is. But of this I am perswaded that there can none be produced, because in all considerations none is so great and irreparable an injury as this, none that Repentance can so little set right again, (the possibility of which is one great reason why other injuries are not thought fit by Christ to be matter of Divorce.) For though it be possible some other sins may be as great or greater than Adultery, (as Idolatry, Heathenism, for example) yet because this is not so contrary to and destructive of the Conjugal state, therefore it is not thought fit by St. *Paul* to cause Divorce, (nor, as appears, by Christ neither:) though to cause damnation (which is far greater punishment than Divorce) it be abundantly sufficient. As for the having attempted the life of the Husband, which leads me to answer the last part of the Objection) I shall make no doubt to say, This is not equal to the having committed Adultery. For first, it appears that though it was attempted, yet it was not acted, (for if it had, that would have made a real

The case of the wives attempting the husbands life.

real Divorce indeed) and the attempt, 1. is not so punishable as the act; and 2. it may by Repentance be repaired again, and the rest of the life be the more happy and comfortable with such a Penitent wife; and this very possibility is considerable. And that which was the reason why the believing husband is advised not to put away the unbelieving wife, [for *he knows not whether he may not* convert and *save the heathen wife* by living with her] hath place here also. To this purpose I will tell you a story of a Master and Servant, which you may accommodate to Husband and Wife. *Les Digueirs* (after Constable of *France*) had learned that his man that served him in his Chamber was corrupted to kill him: Being in his Chamber with him, and none else, he gives him a *Sword* and *Dagger* in his hand, and takes another himself, then speaks thus to him; You have been my Servant long, and a Gallant fellow, why would you be so base as to undertake to kill me cowardly? Here be weapons, let it be done like a man; and so offered to fight with him. The Servant fell at his feet, confessed his vile intention, begged pardon, promised unfeigned Reformation. His Master pardoneth him, continues him in place of daily trust in his Chamber; he never hath treacherous thought against him after. So you see this crime may be repaired again, and no danger in not Divorcing. But then secondly, If there were danger of being killed still, yet may the inconvenience of living with one who hath been false to the bed be beyond that. *Love is strong as death, jealousie cruel as the grave; the coals thereof are coals of fire, which hath a most vehement flame*, saith *Solomon*. And if that continual Jealousie be thus caused, what a Hell is that man's life? and that is far worse than Death, especially than the mere danger of it: and beside, if she also have repented of her Fornication, and the husband be satisfied that she hath so, yet the disgrace of having been so used, and perhaps the continual presence of a base Brat in the family, will be yet more unsupportable than that possible danger of losing a life. For you see how ordinary it is for men to contemn their lives, to endanger, nay oft actually to lose them, rather than part with Reputation, or any such trifling comfort of life, on this maxim of the natural mans, That it is better to die, than to live miserably or infamously. And though Christianity curb that gallantry of the world, yet still it commands us to contemn life when it cometh in competition with obedience to Christ; which here it doth, or may do, if Christ command (as his words affirm he doth) this not-divorcing for any kind of cause but Fornication. The same might be said in divers other things, where we are apt to interpose the excuse of extreme necessity (*i. e.* danger of losing our lives) when through any passion or interest we are not inclined to do what God bids us do: Where 1. if we did thus die, it were Martyrdom, and that the greatest preferment of a Christian. 2. Seeing it is but danger, and not certain death, we may well intrust our lives in God's hands (much more our estates, which are not so near to us) by doing what he bids us; and think them there safest, when so ventured. And so I have satisfied your scruples.

Vide in the life of *Les Digueirs.*

Not equal to that of adultery.

S. *Other scruples in this matter of Divorce I think I could make to you; but I hope neither you, nor I, by the blessing of God, shall ever have occasion to make use of the knowledge of such niceties.*

Sect. VIII. *Of Swearing.*

I shall hasten you to that next Period, which contains a Prohibition so necessary to be instilled into young men, lest the sin get in fashion, and that root so deep in them, that it will not suddenly be weeded out; and that is, of Swearing. *Be pleased therefore after Christ's method in delivering, and yours formerly in expounding, to tell me the meaning of the old Commandment, which by the style of the Preface,* [Ye have heard that it hath been said to them of old time] *I collect to be the third of the Ten Commandments.*

The third Commandment against Perjury.

C. The first part of it, [*Thou shalt not forswear thy self,*] is clearly the third Commandment; but the latter part [*But shalt perform to the Lord thine oaths,*] is taken out of other places of the Law, to explain the meaning of the former, and to express it to be, as literally it sounds, against Perjury, and (under that head) particularly the non-performance of promissory oaths.

S. *But the third Commandment is in Exodus,* [Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain:] *Is that no more than* [Thou shalt not forswear thy self?]

C. No more undoubtedly in the primary intention of the phrase, if either Christ may judge, who here saith so, or if the importance of the words in the Original be observed. For to *take* or *lift up the name of God*, is an Hebrew form or phrase signifying *to swear*; and the word [*vain*] and [*false*] is all one; as 1. the Hebrew Writers generally acknowledge, 2. that of [[a] *idle word*] enforceth, *Matth.* 12. 36. being there applied to that not only *vain* but false speech, verse 24. [*He casts out devils by the Prince of devils:*] 3. because the very word that *Exod.* 27. is rendred [b] *vain* in the third Commandment, is used *Deut.* 5. 20. in the ninth Commandment, for (and is so rendred by us) *false witness*; and so *Psalm* 24. 4. *lifting up the soul unto vanity* (that phrase of *lifting up the soul* referring to that form of *swearing* by the *life*) is expresst in the next words, *sworn deceitfully*. By all which it is clear, that [*to take God's name in vain*] is [*to forswear one's self.*] And consequently, that to that sin of *Perjury* is assigned not only a terrible portion in God's future, flow, but sure retributions, (so great, that among the Heathens the torments of Hell were thought peculiarly to belong to *perjured* persons, and the very word which signifies [c] *an oath*, is by them turned into the [d] name of that place which avenges the sins of this life) but even the remarkable strokes of God's hand even in this world, strange open riots and invasions, and ruins on mens estates oft-times, but more often secret strokes of his hand, and blasts of his mouth, cursing, and poisoning, and wasting the estates of those that are guilty of that sin. This is the importance of that peculiar Character set upon that sin in the close of that Commandment [*the Lord will not hold him guiltless*;] all God's plagues attend, and will infallibly overtake him. You will see it *Zach.* 5. 4. in the Emblem of the *flying roll*, *that entreth into the house of the thief, and into the house of him that sweareth falsely by God's name; and it shall remain in the midst of his house, and shall consume it with the timber thereof, and the stones thereof.* This *remaining* and *consuming* the whole house with the *timber* and *stones*, is no single curse, but that which extends to the blasting and extirpation of whole families; and the *flying roll* is an intimation of the Indiscernibleness, Swiftness, Fiercens, and Unavoidableness of this judgment. And perhaps it would be worth your while to observe this sin abroad in the world, how it is haunted by Divine vengeance, and particularly one special part of it, Sacrilege, (which is punctually the sin in *Zachary*, stealing and perjury together, and that heightned by being an invasion of God himself) a sin clearly against

Punishment of Perjury.

Of Sacrilege.

[a] ἀργὸν ῥῆμα.

[b] שוא.

[c] Ὅρκος.

[d] *Orcus*: see *Hesi. Theog.* Ὅρκον θ' ὃς ἐπιάλησιν ὀπιχθονίοις ἀνθρώποισιν, ὅτε κέν τις ἑκὼν ἐπίορκον ὀμόσσῃ.

againſt the firſt Table, (as may appear by St. *Paul*'s joining it with Idolatry, as ſtealing with ſtealing, adultery with adultery, *Rom.* 2. 22) and reductively, if not principally, againſt this of Perjury; of which it is a branch. First, By not paying or performing of vows, which is here ſaid to be commanded by that Law by which Perjury was forbidden, and is broken not only by *Ananias* his detaining what he himſelf had vowed to God, but by purloyning, or invading, or alienating whatever is by others conſecrated to God: Secondly, Becauſe the Jewiſh cuſtom being to adjure men, as it is ours to impoſe an oath; and that adjuration forcing men to ſpeak, and ſo to ſwear to any thing ſo propoſed, (as appears by Chriſt and the high Prieſt, *Matth.* 26. 63, 64.) and ſo the anſwering falſly upon ſuch an adjuration being as direct perjury as if one had voluntarily taken an oath and violated it; and moreover the conſecration of Lands, Revenues, Goods moveable and immoveable to God, for the uſe of thoſe that wait on his ſervice, being ordinarily done * with a curſe (ſuch as that in *Zacharies* Roll, or the Pſalmiſt's Prophetick imprecations of *Judas*) on the ſacrilegious invader, and that curſe a mixture of an imprecation and an adjuration; the conſequence is clear, That this ſin is very properly reduced to this Commandment: and though in reſpect of many other aggravations of it, it be a breach alſo of many other Commandments, and particularly a contemning of God, a thinking him ſo tame as not to revenge ſuch violations that immediately touch his own property; yet in the main part of it, it is a taking of God's Name in vain. And then I ſhould be too troubleſom to you to ſhew you the fearful judgments that in this word have attended it, in many hundred illuſtrious examples, ſuch as would be ſufficient to mortifie the moſt ravenous appetite, (which alone ſets the covetous vulture upon it) by aſſuring him that every coal thus fetcht from the altar will not fail to burn the whole neſt; that every prey thus ventured on will curſe and conſume the whole heap of treaſure, and undo him that meant ſo to have enriched and raiſed himſelf by it. I ſhall leave you to make up this obſervation to your ſelf.

That ſin a branch of Perjury.

* *Cum anathemate.*

S. *But is nothing elſe reducible to this old Commandment?*

C. Though Swearing, ſimply taken, be not reducible, (for, beſides that the expreſs words of *Moſes* plainly permit it, [*Thou ſhalt ſwear by his name*] *Deut.* 6. 13. and 10. 20. the † Fathers ſay plainly, That to ſwear under *Moſes* was lawful;) yet idle, fooliſh, wanton, (ſure, prophane, blaſphemous) uſing of God's name may be reſolved to be there forbidden by reduction.

† *Oecumenius*, &c.

S. *What then hath* Chriſt *ſuperadded to the old Commandment?*

C. A total univerſal prohibition of ſwearing it ſelf, making that as unlawful now as perjury was before.

S. *Are no kind of oaths now lawful to a Chriſtian?*

C. That you may diſcern this matter clearly and diſtinctly, you muſt mark two circumſtances in our Saviour's ſpeech. 1. That phraſe, verſe 37. [but *let your communication*, &c.] from whence one univerſal rule you may take, That to ſwear in ordinary communication, or diſcourſe, or converſation, is utterly unlawful. 2. You muſt apply our Saviour's prohibition to the particular matter of *Moſes* his Law forementioned, and that was peculiarly of promiſſory (not aſſertory) oaths; and then adding to that the importance of the word [*ſwear*] as it differs from adjuration, or being ſworn, (taking an oath adminiſtred by thoſe who are in authority) you have then a ſecond rule, That all voluntary, but eſpecially promiſſory, oaths, are utterly unlawful now for a Chriſtian.

Chriſt's interdict of all ſwearing,

in Communication.

All voluntary oaths.

S. *What do you mean by* voluntary *oaths?*

C. Thoſe that no other impellent but my ſelf, or my own worldly gain or intereſt, extort from me: For of theſe you muſt reſolve, that if my oath be not either for the glory of God, (as Saint *Paul*'s oath, *Rom.* 1. 9. *Gal.* 1. 20, &c. which were to ſtand upon record to poſterity, and to confirm the truth of God being in his Epiſtles, whereas in all the ſtory of his converſation in the *Acts*, we never find that he did ſwear) or for the good of my Neighbour, (wherein generally I as a private man am not to be Judge, but to ſubmit to the judgment of the Magiſtrate legally calling me to teſtifie my conſcience, or to enter into ſome oath for the good and peace of the Publick) or ſome ſuch publick conſideration, but only for my own intereſt, *&c.* it is utterly unlawful.

S. *Why do you add, but eſpecially* promiſſory *oaths?*

C. Becauſe thoſe are moſt clearly here forbidden, both by the aſpect theſe words have on the precedent, *Thou ſhalt perform thy oaths*; and by the Precept of St. *James* in that matter, Chap. 5. 12. *Let your yea be yea, and your nay, nay, i. e.* Let your promiſes and performances be all one, (the firſt *yea* referring to the promiſe, the ſecond to performance) which he there mentions as a means to make all promiſſory oaths unneceſſary: for he that is ſo juſt in performing his word, there will be no need of his oath; and he that doth uſe oaths in that matter may be in danger to fall into lying or falſe ſpeaking, which is the meaning of thoſe words which we there render [‖ *Leſt you fall into condemnation.*]

‖ μὴ εἰς ὑπόκρισιν πίπτητε *i. e.* ψευδολογίαν.

S. *What is the meaning of thoſe ſeverals that follow,* Neither by * Heaven, *&c. May it not be, that I muſt not ſwear by them, but only by God? or not ſwear falſly, ſo much as by them?*

C. No, but clearly this, that thoſe leſſer oaths taken in by ſome in civility to God, whom they would not invoke in ſmall matters, but yet would uſe this liberty of ſwearing by other inferiour things, are now utterly unlawful; a Chriſtian muſt not uſe any of thoſe. Becauſe every of theſe are creatures of God (whoſe whole Being conſiſts in reference to him) and not to be ſubjected to his luſt to be toſt and defamed by his unneceſſary oaths.

* ὄμνυμι δ' ἱερὸν αἰθέρ', ὄικησιν Διός. *Soph. Menalippe.*

Swearing by all inferiour things.

S. *What is meant by the poſitive precept in the cloſe* [but let your communication be yea, yea, nay, nay?] *Is it as you expounded St.* James [Let your yea be yea, *&c.*] *i. e. Let your promiſes and performances be anſwerable to one another.*

C. No, there is difference betwixt the Phraſes: [*Let your yea be yea*] ſignifies that, (as on the other ſide, *yea* and *nay* ſignifies levity, 2 *Cor.* 1. 19.) But [*Let your communication be yea, yea,*] is this; In ordinary diſcourſe you may uſe an affirmation (that is, one *yea*,) and if occaſion require an aſſeveration (that is, another *yea*;) and ſo again a negation, and a phraſe of ſome vehemence (as a redoubling) to confirm it (that is, *nay, nay*;) and this will ſerve as a good uſeful means to prevent the uſe of ſwearing, by aſſigning to that purpoſe ſome ſuch aſſeveration which will ſerve as well; and

Nothing allowed but Affirmations and Aſſeverations.

therefore Christ doth not only forbid any more than this, but in a manner direct to the use of this, or that which will help us to perform his precept.

S. *There is yet one thing behind, the reason that this is backed with, for* [whatsoever is more than this, cometh of evil:] *What is meant by that?*

C. Either that it *cometh from the evil one, Satan,* who makes men unapt to believe without oaths, that so he may make the free use of them the more necessary; or *from evil, i. e.* that great kind of evil among men, * the breaking of promises, from whence this custom of adding oaths proceeds, because they cannot be believed without them. By which is also intimated, that oaths are here by Christ forbidden, not as things in themselves evil, but as things which are not to be used but in affairs of special moment, a reverence being due to them, which are therefore not to be made too cheap by us.

* So *Joseph.* l. 2. *de Bel. Jud.* c. 12. of a special sort of *Jews,* who, saith he, *avoided all swearing and counted it worst than perjury,* ἤδη γὰρ ἤδη καταγνῶσθαι φασι τὸν ἀπιστούμενον δίχα θεοῦ, *He is already condemned that is not believed without swearing.*

Sect. IX. *Of Revenge, or retaliating evil.*

S. *Be pleased then to advance to the next period, and the foundation of that laid as formerly in the words of the Law,* [An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth:] *which I see again by the variation of the Preface from that which was prefixt to the Commands of the Decalogue, not to be of that number; and yet is the phrase also varied from that which was prefixt to that of Divorce: There only* [it hath been said] *but here* [ye have heard that it hath been said.] *What is the reason of that?*

C. It signifies, that, as it is less than a Commandment of the Law, (*i. e.* is no precept, that every one should thus require an eye of him who had put out his;) so it is more than a bare immunity from earthly punishment to him that should so require, (which, I told you, was all that was allowed in that of divorce.) The truth is, this was by the Law of Nature and *Moses* freely permitted (and no sin then chargeable on him that did so) that he that had lost any member of his body, might by way of revenge or retaliation, legally or judicially require the like member (of him who had thus injured him) to be taken from him, *Deut.* 19. 21. though among the *Jews,* and so, I suppose, the *Gentiles* also, private men were not to do this on their own heads, but might by legal process go to the Judges and require this due from them.

S. *What hath* Christ *appointed in this matter?*

Christ's prohibition of it.

C. It is set down in these words, [*But I say unto you,* † *that you resist not evil.*] Where the word which we render [*evil*] signifies not a thing, but a person, the injurious man, or him that hath done the injury; and the word rendred [‖ *resist*] notes not that which our English commonly signifies, but peculiarly to retaliate, *to return evil for evil*; by which interpretation it is directly answerable to what went before [*eye for eye,* &c.] and so is a denying to Christians that liberty that before was allowed the *Jews,* that of revenge, retaliation, returning those mischiefs to others which we have received from them.

† τῷ πονηρῷ μὴ ἀντιστῆναι.

‖ *Ut præpositio* ἀντὶ *non oppositionem, sed retributionem notet, ut in voce* ἀνταπόδοσις & ἀντιμισθοῦν & ἀντιποιεῖν, and as in *Sophoc. Oedip.* Ἀντιλέξαι is to speak back again, to be allowed *vices loquendi,* which, saith *Oedipus* there, is his priviledge to a King; and so ἀνταυχεῖν (presently) to hear the respondent speak. Αὖ τι μοι ἐφεπόμενον τοῦ ἀντάκουσον.

S. *What plain places of Scripture be there which prohibit this, so that I may be induced, by the analogy of them, to believe this forbidden here?*

C. One plain place there is, which seems to me to be a direct interpretation of this, *Rom.* 12. 17. [*Rendring to no man evil for evil*;] so again, *v.* 19. [*Avenging not your selves,*] *i. e.* not thus [*Rendring evil to evil:*] which is farther explained by the following words, [*but give place unto wrath*] i. e. leave it to God's revenge, as it follows [*Vengeance is mine, I will repay it, saith the Lord.*]

S. *But how far doth this precept of not revenging extend? To publick Magistrates, or only to private persons one toward another?*

In private persons, not in Magistrates.

C. To this I shall answer by these several degrees. 1. That it doth not interpose in the Magistrate's office, so as to forbid him to punish by way of retaliation, if the Laws of the Land so direct him; for his office being to preserve the Kingdom in peace, Christ forbids not the use of any lawful means to that end, nor particularly of this, but rather by the Apostle confirms it in his hand, by saying, [*He beareth not the sword in vain*] adding, [*He is God's Minister, an avenger for wrath, to him that doth ill.*] By which is intimated that that sword for vengeance, or punishment of offenders, which naturally belongs to God only, is, as far as respects this life, put into the hands of the lawful Magistrate, with commission to use it as the constitution of the Kingdom shall best direct, either by way of retaliation or otherwise: and what is done thus by him, is to be counted God's vengeance executed by him; and so no more contrary to the prohibition of private revenge, than God's own retributions would be; which yet are mentioned by the Apostle as an argument to prove the unlawfulness of ours, *Rom.* 12. 19. *Avenge not your selves, but rather give place unto wrath,* leave all punishment to God, *for it is written, Vengeance is mine.* By which connexion you may note by the way, that the motive why we should not avenge our selves is (not that which some revengeful minds would be best pleased with, because by our patience our enemies shall be damned the deeper, as some would collect from *Rom.* 12. 20. but) because the priviledge of punishing offenders, *i. e.* of vengeance, belongs peculiarly to God, and to none but those to whom, for things of this life, he is pleased to communicate it. Which I conceive to be the reason why upon this ground of vengeance belonging to God only, set down in the end of *Rom.* 12. the thirteenth to the *Romans* begins with *Obedience to the higher powers, and their being ordained by God,* &c. This being thus set, it will follow secondly, That Christ's prohibition belongs only to those who have received the injuries considered (whatsoever they are) under the notion of private sufferers: And those are forbid two things, 1. Taking into their own hands the avenging of themselves: 2. (which is the special thing in this place, the former being not by the Law permitted to the Jews themselves, though among the Heathen it was generally thought lawful to hurt them who had injured us) Desiring and thirsting, seeking and requiring revenge, (even that which the Law of man affords,) with this reflexion on themselves, for the satisfying their revengeful humour. This might Christ very reasonably prohibit, it being before not commanded,

commanded, but only permitted by *Moſes*'s Law; though forbid the Magiſtrates thus to puniſh offenders he could not without deſtroying the Law, and giving the worſt of men advantage over the beſt, which indeed to have done would not yet be thought reaſonable for Chriſt, the greateſt part of the world being ſo far from being Chriſtians even now in times of Chriſtianity. It is not therefore made utterly unlawful by Chriſt to proſecute any who hath wronged me, and bring him to legal puniſhment; for that the Law of man, authoriſed and not contradicted by Chriſt, may and oft doth require of me; and there is great difference between revenge and puniſhment: nor is it unlawful to require reparations for an injury done me, when the matter is capable of it; nor again to do the ſame for the good that may accrue to my Brethren by the inflicting ſuch exemplary puniſhment on offenders. But that which our Saviour interpoſeth, is, That to require this for the ſatisfying of my own revengeful humour, beſides or without reparation of the damage received by me, (as generally it is when I require an eye for an eye; for in that caſe the pulling out of his eye will contribute nothing toward the helping me to mine again) or again to require it in contemplation of the further inconvenience that may poſſibly befal me another time, if this paſs unpuniſhed, is thought fit to be interdicted us Chriſtians, who are bound, firſt, by gratitude for what Chriſt hath done to us in pardoning of injuries, to go and do likewiſe, *i. e.* to pardon and not revenge injuries; ſecondly, by the Law of Faith, to vanquiſh ſuch fears, and depend on God's providence, to defend us for the future; and not to be ſo haſty and ſolicitous in uſing all poſſible means, however unlawful, for the future ſecuring of our ſelves. And all this ſeems to be the literal importance of that phraſe, *Rom.* 12. 19. [*Not avenging our ſelves*:] Whatever avenging is lawful, that is not which reflecteth upon our ſelves, and our own immoderate paſſions; whether that of anger, or that other of deſire, a branch of which is this worldly carking or ſolicitous fear, that any patience of ours will bring more ſuffering upon us.

Not againſt legal proſecutions.

From theſe two thus ſet, it will appear, thirdly, what is to be ſaid of wars between one Kingdom and another, which are of a middle nature between the revenge of the Magiſtrate upon the offender within his juriſdiction, and the revenge of one private man upon another (this being between equals, and ſo not of the firſt kind; and yet between publick perſons or bodies, and ſo not of the ſecond) which conſequently will be only ſo far lawful as they agree with the firſt; and unlawful, as with the ſecond.

Of Wars.

S. *In what reſpect may War be lawful? Or, is it at all ſo?*

C. That it is not abſolutely unlawful, appears, 1. By the *Baptiſt*'s anſwer to the Souldiers, when they came to his Baptiſm, *Luke* 3. 14. where he forbids them not that calling as unlawful: 2. By Chriſt's commending the *Centurion*'s faith, who was then a Souldier: 3. By *Paul's* uſing a band of Souldiers againſt the Treachery of the *Jews*: 4. By S. *Peter*'s baptizing of *Cornelius* without his giving over the military employment. Now in what reſpect War may be lawful, will appear, if we obſerve the cauſes of it. If it be for the ſuppreſſing of a ſedition or rebellion at home, it is clearly lawful for the lawful Magiſtrate (as having the power of the ſword,) firſt, to preſerve the peace of the Land; and ſecondly, to puniſh and ſuppreſs the diſturbers of it. In which caſe it is impoſſible any ſuch war ſhould be lawful on both ſides; there being but one ſupreme power in any Kingdom, (whether that conſiſt of one, or of more perſons) and to that belonging the power of the ſword, which whoſoever elſe taketh into his hand in any caſe, uſurpeth it, and therefore ought to periſh by the ſword. 2. If it be betwixt one Kingdom and another, then the War may be lawful again, in caſe one Kingdom doth attempt the doing an eminent injury to another, which by a War may poſſibly be averted from thoſe whom the Magiſtrates office binds him to protect. An eminent injury, I ſay, and that which is more hurtful than War or taking up of arms; and that again, when there is no arbitration, or other means of debating ſuch controverſies, or averting ſuch injuries, to be had. And with theſe Cautions, *To hurt no peaceable man*, as near as may be; *To ſhed as little blood as is poſſible*; *Not to protract it, out of deſire of revenge or gain*; *Not to uſe cruelty on captives, or thoſe that yield themſelves and deſire quarter*; *on women, children, husbandmen*, &c. *To give over War when any reaſonable terms of peace may be had*; *To take away nothing from the conquered but the power of hurting.* In theſe caſes and with theſe cautions, as it is lawful to the higher Powers to uſe arms, ſo it is alſo to others their Subjects that have commiſſion from them, (if they be ſatisfied of the juſtice of the cauſe) it being not imaginable that any Magiſtrate ſhould by his own perſonal ſtrength protect his Subjects, without the aſſiſtance of others with him.

They are not abſolutely unlawful.

S. *But is it lawful for a private man for the repelling of any the greateſt injury from himſelf to kill another? Or, if it be not, how can this war againſt (not our Subjects and Rebels, but) thoſe who are out of our power, and over whom we have no juriſdiction, (and ſo we are but private men in reſpect of them) be accounted lawful, ſeeing it is ſure more ſinful to kill many than one?*

C. To the firſt part of your queſtion, I anſwer, that a private man may not, by the Law of Chriſt, take away anothers life, for the ſaving his own goods, or the repelling any ſuch kind of injury from himſelf, becauſe life is more than goods: but if his life be attempted alſo, and no probable means to ſave it but by taking away the others life, it may then be lawful to take away his life; Chriſt having interpoſed nothing to the contrary, (where yet he that to ſave anothers life, or rather than take it away, ſhould venture and loſe his own, may be thought to do better and more honourably, in imitating Chriſt who *laid down his life for his enemies.*) This then being granted, I ſay yet to the ſecond part of your queſtion, that the ſame rule cannot be extended to the making of war unlawful. 1. Becauſe the Supreme Power, who is ſuppoſed to manage the war, hath the ſword put into his hand by God, (which the private man hath not) and that not only to puniſh Subjects, but alſo to protect them. 2. Becauſe it is his duty ſo to do, which he may not (without ſin againſt them, and failing in diſcharge of truſt) neglect: whereas the private man having power of his own goods, may recede from that natural right of his, may deny himſelf, to follow Chriſt; and for his life it ſelf, may better thus part with it, by leaving it to God's tuition, than the Magiſtrate can another man's being entruſted by God to defend it, and by oath bound to perform that part of his duty. And for the number of thoſe whom a War endangers to kill, (if it be objected;) that will be countervailed with the

number of those whom it is intended to preserve, whose peace and quiet living, if it may be gotten, is more valuable to them than life it self deprived of that.

S. *Well then, supposing war to be lawful, and these two kinds of war to be such, What other kind of lawful wars are there? Or be there any more?*

C. It will be hard to name any other; and yet I shall not peremptorily say there is no other, because some other perhaps may be found which will bear proportion to one of these.

What wars are unlawful.

It will be easier to inform you in this matter by telling you what be the special sorts of Wars that are unlawful.

S. *What be they?*

C. When one Nation fighteth with another for no other reason but because that other is not of the true Religion, this is certainly unlawful: For 1. God hath not given any Nation this jurisdiction over another; and 2. It is against the nature of Religion to be planted by violence, or consequently by the sword: and therefore much more is this unlawful for Subjects to do against the Laws and Governours under which they are placed.

S. *But is not* Religion *the most precious thing of all? What then may we fight for, if not for that?*

For Religion.

C. It is the most precious thing indeed, and that to be preserved by all lawful, proper, proportionable means: but then War or unlawful resistance, being of all things most improper to defend, or secure, or plant this, and it being acknowledged unlawful for *Peter* to use the sword for the defence of Christ himself; to do it merely for Religion, must needs be very unlawful. Religion hath still been spread and propagated by suffering, and not by resisting: and indeed it being not in the power of force to constrain my soul, or change my Religion, or keep me from the profession of it, arms or resistance must needs be very improper for that purpose.

S. *What other war is unlawful?*

For enlarging Territories.

C. All manner of invasive War for the enlarging of our Territories, for the revenging of an affront, for the weakening of those that we see prosperous, and consequently suspect it possible for them to invade us for the future; or in any case, unless perhaps to get some reparation for some eminent injury done to our Nation, which the Nation cannot reasonably bear, nor yet hope for any other way of reparation.

S. *What is required to make it lawful for any private man to take arms?*

Commission necessary for each private man.

C. Commission from the Supreme power under which he lives, and to whom he is a subject, and who hath the power of the Sword in his hand: and therefore as in obedience to such, it is possible for a private man lawfully to take arms, even when the Governours do it unlawfully, supposing that he think the cause good upon the Supreme powers undertaking it; so he that takes up arms only for hire or hope of honour, *&c.* under one who is not his Magistrate, may, though the cause be just for which the General fights, commit sin in fighting under him.

S. *What is there more that you think fit to teach me from this precept of not retaliating, or not avenging the injurious?*

Christ's command of bearing light injuries.

C. It will be best given you by proceeding and observing what Christ adds on the back of this prohibition, *But whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also*, &c.

S. *What is generally observable from those additions?*

C. 1. The occasion of them. 2. The general nature of them, wherein they all agree and accord.

S. *What is the occasion of them?*

C. Christ's foresight of an objection, which, upon occasion of the prohibition precedent, men would be apt to make, thus; If when one doth me an injury, I may not revenge it on him my self, or require a legal revenge upon him, then by this easiness he will be taught to multiply those injuries, *to smite me on the other cheek*, when he sees me take that so patiently; *to take away my cloak also*, if I am so tame as to let him carry away my coat without any payment; to make me go a stage of two miles with him next time, if I take the first oppression so patiently. To this foreseen objection our Saviour answers, by commanding us to perform the former duty, and put this feared hazard to the venture, intimating that this is not sure to be the reward and consequent of such patience; or, to suppose the utmost, if it should be certainly so, yet we Christians must rather submit to this also than give the reins to our revenge on that consideration; we must venture that consequent with Christ, who hath commanded us this patience, and be armed for the worst that can befal us in his service. From whence you see what obligation it is that lies upon us toward the performing of those acts which are accounted so ridiculous among men: Not that we are presently *to turn our left cheek to him that strikes us on the right, to give the cloak to him that takes the coat*, &c. but to perform the precept of non-revenge, and not to be tempted from it by any foreseen inconvenience; yea, and ready to make that adventure, if I cannot perform that obedience without it, rather let him *take the cloak also*, than seek ways of revenge for such former trespasses. Which will be nothing unreasonable, if we consider, 1. That Christ can preserve us from farther injuries, if he think good, as well without as with our assistance; and indeed that patience is oft blest by him to be a more prosperous means of this, than self-revenge would be, it being Christ's tried rule, *to overcome evil with good.* 2. That if we should chance to suffer any thing by obeying him, he will be able to repair us in another world.

S. *What now is the general nature of these appendent precepts, wherein they all agree and accord?*

C. That they are all tolerable and supportable injuries, both in respect of what is done already, and what may be consequent to our bearing them. For thus the loss of the coat or cloak also is a moderate injury; the smiting on the cheek or cheeks, a very inconsiderable pain, and only valued for the contumely annext to it, which yet Christians had been before, *verse* 11. (and should after by the sufferings of Christ be) taught to support chearfully; and the going a mile or two a very tolerable injury to the body, or invasion on their liberty, and a very easy post (both among the Jews and the [a] Persians,

[a] *The Persian post or stage was a parasange, or thirty furlongs, of which the μιλιον or mile here was but a little above a fourth part, some seven or eight furlongs at most,* Agathias l. 2. p. 55.

ſians, from whom the Jews had that [b] cuſtom) being compared with the ordinary ſtages. And from thence appears, 1. The reaſonableneſs and agreeableneſs of Chriſt's commands to our ſtrength, that he provides us ſuch eaſie yokes and light burthens, even when we think he uſeth us moſt hardly: 2. The indulgence which he allows us in matters of greater concernment, where the damage or treſpaſs is not ſo ſupportable. He there intimates a liberty to uſe ſome means to ſave or repair our ſelves (where that may be extremely uſeful, if not neceſſary, to our temporal ſubſiſtence) though not to work revenge on the enemy for what is paſt, by exacting any puniſhment on his perſon, by endeavouring to trouble him who hath troubled us, (which cannot bring in any profit to us.)

[b] *'Twas the Cuſtom of the Perſian Tyrants to preſs the bodies of men (as among us teems of horſes) and force them to carry their burthens for a ſtage,* i. e. *a paraſange, and then to reſt (whence the ſtages were called* ἀναπαυλαι) ἑτέρων ἀμοιβαδὸν διαδεχομένων; *others ſucceeding them in their turns: See* Matth. 27. 32. *Mark* 15. 21. Luke 23. 26.

S. *What now is particularly obſervable from each of theſe, and* 1. *from the firſt?*

C. That for light injuries done to our bodies which leave no wound behind them, nor are the diſabling or weakning of our bodies, nor bring any conſiderable pain with them, we are not to ſeek any way of private, no nor ſo much as of legal revenge; no, though the injury were a contumely alſo, and the putting it up a reproach in the account of the world, and withal a poſſible (nay, a probable) means to bring more upon me of the ſame making. This thus ſet, is my Chriſtian duty, which I cannot omit without ſin; and which for us to perform, or Chriſt to command, is ſo far from unreaſonable, that the contrary, if we obſerve the experience of it, is much more unreaſonable; the ſeeking of revenge ordinarily ſubjecting us to greater inconveniences, to more and more dangerous blows (many times) if we become our own champions, and avenge our ſelves, and to more conſiderable trouble and charge, if we ſeek it from the Court of Judicature.

S. *What do you in particular obſerve from the ſecond?*

C. It offers me a fair occaſion to tell you ſomewhat of that great queſtion, concerning the lawfulneſs of going to Law.

S. *I ſhall moſt willingly make uſe of the occaſion, and deſire your judgment in that point.*

C. Going to Law, I conceive, is not ſimply unlawful, becauſe Chriſt finding [c] Courts of Judicature (for matter of Mine and Thine) in the world, did not take that power into his own hands, (*Who made me a Judge?*) or out of thoſe hands where he found it. In this whole Sermon of ſtrict Precepts upon the Mount, he gives no command in (lays no reſtraint on) this matter any further than what is contained in theſe words, *He that would implead thee, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak alſo*: The utmoſt of which can amount no farther againſt going to law than this. 1. That it is ſuch a thing that it may be abuſed to the moſt unjuſt oppreſſions, taking away the coat from ones back; and when ſo uſed, it is ſurely unlawful. 2. That I muſt not go to Law with any by way of [d] Retaliation, I mean, for no other cauſe but becauſe he by that means hath diſquieted or injured me; for the Precept of [*Let him have thy coat alſo*] (being thus interpreted, that I muſt do ſo, rather than go to Law with him) cannot juſtly be extended toward this ſence, any farther than the context will authorize the extending it, and that is only thus far, That *rather than retribute to him evil for evil, or retaliate*, verſe 38. *I muſt even let him take it, and not go to Law with him, i. e.* I muſt thus be quiet rather than bear him any malice, or do any thing that ſhall inflame me, or raiſe in me a deſire of revenge againſt him: For any of theſe will make that unlawful to me which indeed was not ſo. 3. That I muſt not go to Law only out of a providence, that the bearing of one injury patiently may poſſibly or probably bring a greater upon me; but think fit to truſt God with the preſerving me for the future, who will be more likely to bleſs and reward my patience and meekneſs with tranquility and proſperity in this life (according to that promiſe of the Pſalmiſt, [*The meek ſhall poſſeſs the earth*] where the Earth ſignifies the Land of *Canaan*, a moſt proſperous rich Land; which very words are repeated by Chriſt in this Sermon, *Chap.* 5. 5. and if there the earth be the *Land of the living* onely, there will be no great loſs in ſuch an exchange) than any contrary vice of contentiouſneſs or impatience. Or 4. That I muſt not go to Law to recover a coat when I have a cloak left, *i. e.* for a ſmall unconſiderable poſſeſſion, which is not neceſſary to me, which I may be without, and the recovering of which will not be proportionably gainful to the charge or trouble of going to Law for it. Theſe ſeverals contain the utmoſt that I can imagine that place of Chriſt can be juſtly extended to: All which notwithſtanding, theſe other caſes ſtill remain, which come not under that interdict in its largeſt extent. 1. That he that cannot by any arbitration get his own, nor yet conveniently live without it, may make uſe of the ſetled Judicature of the Land where God hath placed him, ſuppoſing that he fall not into any of the faults before ſpecified, and poſſibly incident to the waging or managing of the juſteſt action. 2. That any one being tenderly affected in conſcience, ſo as to deſire aſſurance that he enjoys nothing but what is juſt for him to enjoy, may lawfully in matter of any doubt or controverſie concerning propriety, uſe the Law to make that deciſion for him; ſuppoſing again that this be ſincerely his intention, and that he reſolve quietly to ſtand to what the Law ſhall ſo adjudge. 3. That he that by this means defends a Widow or Orphan, may very Chriſtianly uſe this means. 4. That he that may thus preſerve himſelf in a ſufficiency to provide for his family, and without it probably cannot, without either craving other mens alms, or expecting relief from God by extraordinary means, may uſe this means to do ſo. 5. That he that may by this means be enabled to relieve the poor, which otherwiſe he could not do ſo liberally, and doth it ſincerely in order to that end, and when he obtains his own, evidences that ſincerity by his performance, is ſtill free from any reſtraint ariſing from that precept of Chriſt: whereas on the other ſide, he that contends for trifles, goes to Law only that he may loſe nothing of his right, or not only to get legal reparations for his loſſes, (whereby that which is juſtly taken from the other that injured him is juſtly reſtored to him which was injured, the one being as well able to bear or ſupport this act of juſtice as the other that of injuſtice) but alſo to give ſatisfaction to his revengeful appetite, (a very carnal, importunate, deviliſh affection) to give the enemy ſome ſmart or pain, which brings in no real gain or eaſe or advantage to himſelf, ſave only that of ſatisfying his vindicative humour, can no way be juſtified or excuſed in ſuch a ſuit. So alſo the ſuing of thoſe which are not able to pay me, (and by my ſuit are but made more unable) when all that I can hope for, is not reparation of my ſelf, but puniſhing

Of going to Law.

[c] κριτήρια.

How unlawful.

[d] *Per modum Talionis.*

Terra viventium.

How lawful.

punishing of him by prison, or the like restraint on him, that brings in no advantage again to me; this is unlawful and unchristian still.

S. *But is there not an objection against going to Law in any case, producible from* 1 Cor. 6?

C. It will suffice to answer, That the Apostle's scope there, is only to reprehend going to Law before Heathen Tribunals: which when any men are guilty of, it must signifie either, that there is no Christian among them fit to be Judge betwixt contenders; or else that they would rather chuse an Heathen's arbitration than that Christian's: either of which being very culpable, that which arises from one of them must needs be so, but nothing else upon those grounds. This is agreeable to what Christ had before said, *Matth.* 18. *That if thy brother trespass against thee*, (do thee any such injury) and will not make thee amends, thou shalt *tell it to the Church*; who are there, surely, some tribunal of Christians, who have power to make thee amends, if he will stand to their judgment: and if he will not, Christ then goes farther, *Let him be to thee as an Heathen or Publican, i. e.* I conceive in that place, not only that he is fit for Excommunication, mention'd in the next verse, but also that thou hast liberty (let him be so to thee against whom he hath trespast) to implead him in any Gentile Tribunal (because he will not stand to the Christian's award) as thou wouldest, and maiest a Heathen or Publican which trades among them, and who is in the interpretation of the Jewish Law, though a Jew, yet a kind of Heathen, or by conversing with them equipollent to one.

ἔστω σοι.

S. *But may it not from that Chapter to the* Corinthians *be still prest, that* verse 7. *it is said,* [e] *There is utterly a fault among you, because you go to Law one with another.*

[e] ἤδη ὅλως ἥττημα, &c.

C. I answer, that the utmost that that infers is only this, That those particular [f] suits at Law that were then among the *Corinthians* were all unlawful, (which you will have reason to believe, when you find the same Apostle telling them, verse 9. that *they did injure and defraud one another*; and it is more than probable that their going to Law was used, as here in Christ's Sermon it is supposed, as a means to do so) but it is not concludible from thence, that all other mens suits are so, because possibly not of the same nature as theirs were. But then, secondly, there may be somewhat in the Apostle's using a special word in that place, not any of those more usual [g] words which are without doubt denotations of sin, but [h] another which signifies a *going-less*; and so may perhaps only conclude the thing which he speaks of, to be no more than comparatively evil, *i. e.* not so good as patient bearing of injuries and losses ought to be esteemed, which seems to be enforced by the words immediately following in the end of that seventh verse, *Why do you not rather suffer injury and defraudation?* which will infer, That patience of injuries is a greater vertue and more heroical excellence, a higher pitch of Christian Philosophy and contempt of the world, than going to Law implies, far more than that particular kind of going to Law was approved to be; but not, that going to Law is from that place made in all cases utterly unlawful. Just as losing my own life when I am assaulted by another (rather than I will take away his) is, as even now I shewed you, a high piece of imitation of Christ, who laid down his life for enemies; which notwithstanding, the killing of the invader in that case, when I cannot otherwise save or rescue my own life, is acknowledged to be no sin, because not forbidden by nature, or Christ, whose prohibition (not counsel nor example to the contrary) it is that makes any thing a sin; for *where there is no Law, there is no transgression.* This I conceive may give hints for the understanding this whole matter.

[f] κρίματα.

[g] ἁμάρτημα, παράπτωμα, &c.

[h] ἧττημα.

S. *I shall labour to make use of them; and, because this discourse hath a little led you out of the way, recal you into the rode again, and remember you where you left, by demanding what is to be learnt from the third particular, which Christ thought fit to superadd to the matter of retaliating.*

Invasion of our liberty.

C. It is this, That the same rule holds for my Liberty that did for my body and estate; that every diminution of it must not inrage me either to a private or legal revenge on the invader. The sum of all is, That small supportable injuries of any kind we Christians must bear without hurting again, or so much as prosecuting or impleading the injurious: in weightier and more considerable matters, though we may use means, first, to defend our selves, secondly, to get legal reparations for our losses; yet even in those, the giving any way to revengeful desires, or desiring to give him any smart or pain, that brings no real gain or ease or advantage to us, save only the satisfying our revengeful humour, is still utterly unlawful.

S. *But what is that that follows in the close of this period,* ver. 42. [Give to him that asketh thee, and from him that would borrow of thee, turn not thou away?] *And how comes it in, in this place?*

Liberality to all.

C. The substance of it is a command of universal, unlimited liberality (according to our power) to all that are in need, and a direction to one special kind of works of mercy, the lending (without all exaction of Use for the Loan) to those that are in present want, and may, by such present supplies for present exigences, be taught a way of thriving in the world, and getting out from those difficulties of fortune. In which case, the lending for a time, and after that time the requiring mine own again, may do some men as much, perhaps more good, by obliging them to industry and providence and fidelity, than giving to some others might have done.

S. *What connexion is there betwixt this precept of liberality, and the non-revenge immediately preceding?*

C. It is this, 1. That forgiving and giving, the two special works of our charity toward men, should always go together; one never doth so well as when t'other is joined with it. Revenge will blast our liberality; and the covetous illiberal heart will defame the most perfect patience. 2. That the practice of liberality will help us to think it reasonable not to meditate Revenge, and withal demonstrate our patience of injuries, *&c.* to be no pusillanimous cowardly act (because I dare not resist him) but only an act of obedience unto Christ, in doing as he hath done, both for patience and liberality; my Christian charity obliging me to one as well as t'other.

S. *What now is the ground-work of the next Period?*

Sect. X. *Of loving Enemies.*

C. The repetition of the Old-Law of *Loving Neighbours and hating Enemies.*

S. *Is there any such thing in the law of* Moses, *or* Nature, *that we should hate our Enemies, and love none but Neighbours?*

C. I

C. I ſhall tell you as clearly as I can, what both thoſe Laws have done in this matter.

S. What hath the Law of Moſes *done?*

C. For the loving of the Neighbour, *i. e.* the Fellow-Jew, it hath commanded to *love him as thy ſelf*, Levit. 19. 18. and not to avenge or bear any grudge againſt him; from which, though it were no excluſion of the like to men of other countries, yet it is very true that the Jews took occaſion of advantage to deny all kindneſs and exerciſe of offices of common humanity to all others, unleſs they became Proſelytes to them. Now this they did without any authority of their Law, which therefore Chriſt, by the Parable of the good Samaritan, ſhews to belong to the loving of (and ſhewing mercy to) others beſide their own country-men, and extendeth the meaning of the word [*Neighbour*] to all thoſe who are of the ſame common ſtock with us, and are men as well as our ſelves: though the truth is, God by preſcribing the Jew peculiar meats, and forbidding others that were familiarly uſed by the Nations, did conſequently interdict them any ſpecial familiarity of converſe with the Nations, by way of caution, leſt they ſhould be corrupted by them (who were at that time ſo extremely idolatrous and filthy in their practices;) which rule conſequently was to be accounted temporary, and to laſt no longer than the reaſon of it. But then, for the *hating of enemies*, it is not to be thought that there was any ſuch precept given them, of hating either all but their own countrey-men, or even all their very enemies. Thus much only toward it we find in the Law, that though the Jews were commanded to do courteſies to their enemies of their own country, to *bring back an enemies Ox going aſtray, and to help up his Aſs lying under a burthen*, Exod. 23. 4, 5. Deut. 22. 1, *&c.* yet they are forbid to enter any friendſhip, affinity, league with the ſeven Nations, *Hittites*, *Amorites*, &c. or to ſhew any mercy to them, but commanded to *deſtroy them utterly*, Deut. 7. 16. and 20. 16, 17. and accordingly it was practiſed *Joſh.* 10. 40. and the ſame, in ſome proportion, with other enemy-cities, *Deut.* 20. 13. *Thou ſhalt ſmite all the male with the edge of the ſword*; but this with ſome limitations, they were to offer them conditions of peace, and to permit them to redeem their lives, if they deſired it, by ſervitude, *ver.* 10, 11. The ground of this difference between the ſeven Nations and other enemies of the Iſraelites, is viſibly the nearneſs of the former, and the danger of the Iſraelites being corrupted by them: and ſo 1. this extreme ſeverity was not commanded toward enemies indefinitely, but only toward the ſeven nations, leſt, if any of them were preſerved, they ſhould ſeduce them to their abominable filthineſſes, *ver.* 18. whereas the proceeding was not ſo ſevere againſt other enemy-cities farther off, from whom there was not the like danger; and 2. it doth not appear that this belonged to any but of that age, in conſideration of the danger of ſeduction to their ſins; for *Solomon* doth not ſo, but only *levies a tribute of bond-ſervice* upon them, 1 *Kings* 9. 20, 21. After the ſame manner were they to deal with the *Amalekites*, *to have war with them for ever*, *Exod.* 17. 16. *Deut.* 25. 19. and with ſome difference with the *Moabites* and *Ammonites*. In all which, nothing can be obſerved contrary to the Law of Nature or Humanity; for the ſame power that the Magiſtrates on earth have over malefactors, the ſame ſure muſt be yielded God over Nations and Governours of them, to put them to death by what means he pleaſe. This execution he was pleaſed to commit to the people of the Jews after a long time of patience, when thoſe Nations *had filled up the meaſure of their Rebellion*, Levit. 18. 24, 25. So that this [*of hating enemies*] cannot be accounted of as any common general command, (for it held not generally againſt any but theſe forenamed Nations) but as a ſpecial, particular ſentence of God's, to be at that time executed on them. And although, the truth is, the Jews did generally reſolve it lawful to kill or ſpoil any that were ſtrangers from the Religion of the true God; yet by the limiting of God's command for ſuch execution to theſe forenamed, and that with this reaſon, becauſe they had *filled up the meaſure of their iniquities*, (which when it is, none but God can judge of) it is evident that this was an error in the Jews; and that the rather, becauſe at this time when Chriſt ſpake, they were ſubject to the *Romans*, and had no power of the ſword in their hands; in which caſe thoſe former commands of war with *Amalek*, (much more with other idolatrous Nations, againſt whom it was not appointed) became utterly out-dated, and the Law of Nature was to prevail, which commends love and charity to all men.

The Moſaical Law concerning it.

S. You promiſed alſo to ſhew me what the law of Nature *had done in this matter. I pray, what is it?*

C. We have no better way now to judge of that, than by the writings and ſayings of the wiſeſt natural men; the ſum of which is this, [i] That all men are to be loved and obliged by us; no man to be hurt or diſobliged, but he who hath firſt injured us: in which caſe the great [k] Philoſopher thinks it as [l] reprovable a thing to *love an enemy*, as to *hate a friend*. But withal, the moderateſt, and wiſeſt, and moſt elevated minds, though they would not command or oblige all men to love enemies, do yet commend it as moſt honourable ſo to do, and give many excellent reaſons for it, and conclude, That the *wiſe and good man hath no enemy*. So that from all this, the ſhort is, That the Jews taking ſome advantage from thoſe forementioned commands of *Moſes*, and miſtaking them, did think it lawful to hate others of different Religions, *i. e.* all other Nations, (and the ſame may be obſerved of the Grecians towards the reſt of the world under the title of Barbarians:) but in this did they both againſt the Law of *Moſes*, as hath been ſhewed, and againſt the Law of Nature, by which hating or hurting is avowed only in caſe of injuries done, and even then alſo the contrary commended: and ſo that which Chriſt hath here to do, is, partly to recal and reform the Jews to the Law of Nature, and to command that which that Law commended; partly to advance, and ſet it higher than the Law of the Jews had required of them before.

The Law of Nature.

[i] *Nemini nocere niſi prius laceſſitum injuriâ.* Cic Offic.

[k] Ariſt. *Top.* l. 2.

[l] Ὅταν ὑβρίζειν τοὺ ὑβριζοντας χρεών, Æſchyl. *Pr.* & Πάσχειν γ' κακῶς ἐχθρὸν ὄν' ἐχθρῶν ὑπὲρ δεικνές. *Ib.* & Παθὼν κακῶς κακοῖσιν ἀντημείβετο. Εur. Ὀδὶ δὴ δήβ. & Οὔτε σοῦ ἐχθρὸς, οὔθ' ὅταν θάνῃ, φίλος, *Soph. in Antig.* Πῶς ἐγὼ κακὸς ὡς σὶ φρονῶν φύσιν, Ὅστις παθὼν μὲν ἀντέδρων Ἐπραξαν, οὐδ' ἂν ὧδ' ἐγιγνόμην κακὸς, *Soph. in Oedip.* —— ὅταν γ' πολεμίους δρᾶσαι κακῶς Θέλῃ τις, οὐδὲν ἐμποδὼν κεῖται νόμος, *Eurip. Ion.* And again, Οὐ χρή με τοὺ κλείνους ἀπολλύναι; So another, Μισοῦντα μίσει, καὶ φιλοῦντ' ὀφείλει. And *Thucyd.* l. 1. p. 77. Ἀγαθῶν γ' ἀδικουμένους πολεμεῖν. And *Homer.* Λαῶν γὰρ τό δὲ γ' ὄζει, it is a reproachful thing not to revenge injuries. *Odyſſ.* l. 24. And *Heſiod.* l. 1. Τὸν φιλέοντ' ὀπὶ δεῖτε καλεῖν, τὸν δ' ἐχθρὸν ἐᾶσαι. So *Ariſtotle de mor. ad Nicom.* 4. 5. Λοιπὸν γὰρ ὐκ αἰσθάνεσθαι, ὐδὲ λυπεῖσθαι, μὴ ὀργιζόμενός τε ὐκ εἶ ἀνωμαλικός. τὸ γὰρ πεσπλακιζόμενον ἀνέχεσθαι ἀνδραποδώδες. And *Rhetor.* l. 1. c. 9. Δίκαιον γὰρ ἡ δικαιοσύνη καλὸν, καὶ τὸ τοὺ ἐχθρὺς τι μορῆσθαι μᾶλλον, καὶ μὴ καλλάττεσθαι· τὸ τε γὰρ ἀνταποδιδόναι δίκαιον, τὸ δὲ δίκαιον καλὸν, καὶ ἀνδρεῖον τὸ μὴ ἡττᾶσθαι. So *Seneca* 11. *Ep.* 82. *Hoc juſtitiæ convenit, ſuum cuique tribuere, beneficio gratiam, injuriæ talionem, aut certè malam gratiam.* So *Cicero*, *inter ea quæ ad jus naturæ pertinent ponit vindicationem, de Invent.* 2. *Et ad Atticum, Odi hominem & odero, utinam ulciſci poſſem. Et in Antonium, Sic ulciſcar facinora ſingula, quemadmodum à quibuſque ſum provocatus.*

S. *What*

S. *What then is now the Law of Christ in this matter?*

The Law of Christ.

C. It is set down vers. 44. *But I say unto you, Love your Enemies,* &c. to the end of this Chapter. The sum of which is that other mens faults or sins against us, nay, against God himself (for the Jews enemies, the people of the seven Nations, *Amorites,* &c. being most detestable sinners before God, are here referred to in this word, *Enemies*) give not us any dispensation for the non-payment of that great debt of our nature, *love to all our kind.* It is true indeed, the passions and affections that our nature is subject to, do encline us to revenge against our enemies; or if we can conquer that, yet we cannot chuse but make a distinction between friends and foes, and at least have a great coldness and indifference to those who have deserved so ill at our hands. But Christ is come to mortifie those affections of rage and revenge; and to lead us (higher than nature would bring us) to affections, and words, and actions of kindness and benignity to those that have expresst the contrary of every of these towards us.

S. *But is it not abundantly sufficient, if my affections and behaviour toward mine enemy be not like his to me, unkind, retaliating of injuries,* &c? *Is there any more required of me?*

C. Yes undoubtedly of a Christian; who is to transcribe that copy, that Christ's own dealing with us, when we were enemies, did set us. I must not only negatively, not hate, or curse, or pursue with injuries; but positively love, and bless, and do good, and pray for my greatest enemy.

Of loving.

S. *What is meant by* loving him?

C. That denotes the affection of charity and kindness and benignity toward him: 1. Wishing him all the good in the world, but that especially which he most wanteth, the good of his Soul, conviction of sin, reformation, *&c.* 2. Pitying and compassionating him, and that the more for being my enemy, because that implies a sin in him, which is of all things the most proper matter of compassion; 3. Being cordially affected toward him.

S. *What is meant by* blessing him?

* blessing, εὐλογίτε.

C. The word in * Greek, and the opposition to cursing, (*i. e.* evil or bitter speaking) noteth kindness and friendliness of language, giving them all friendly and courteous words, who have nothing but railing and evil speaking for us; commending in them whatever is capable of our praises, though they do nothing but defame and backbite us.

S. *What is meant by* doing good to them?

doing good to.

C. All outward real effects and actions of charity: Such are alms, if they be in want; feeding, giving to drink, clothing them, when they are hungry, thirsty, naked; comfort, if in any distress; counsel, if in any difficulty; rescuing their goods, *&c.* if we see them in danger; admonishing them in a friendly manner, and such as may be most likely to prevail with them, when we see them falling into any sin; reproving and correcting fatherly, when we see them fallen: In a word, contributing our utmost to the good of their bodies, estates, families, reputations, but especially their souls; and all this without any tincture of revenge or rage mixing with it.

Praying for enemies.

S. *What is meant by* praying for them?

C. Desiring of God for them whatsoever they want: 1. Grace for amendment of life; 2. Pardon of sin, with an expression of my free pardoning them; 3. All other blessings temporal and spiritual which they stand in need of. And because the practice of this is such a stranger to the world, I shall (at once to prove and exemplifie this duty) set you a copy of it, a very antient form transcribed from St. *Basil,* one of the holiest Champions of the Church of Christ, which from him you may not fear to use or imitate.

A Prayer

A Prayer of St. *Basil*'s translated out of a Greek Manuscript in the University-Library of *OXFORD*.

O Long-suffering and eternal King, that for the condemnation that came by the Tree, wert lifted up on the Tree, (and taken from this Earth by that shameful death) and hast shewed forth thy self to all that chuse to follow thy steps a pattern and copy of long-sufferance and patience, that offeredst up thy intercession to thy co-eternal Father, for those very fighters against God which crucified thee: Do thou, O Lord, thou the same lover of mankind, afford thy mercy and pardon to all that are enemies to us, which either by treachery, or reproach, or contumely, or envy, or by any other means, through the treachery or calumny of the Devil, that lover of hatred, have expreſt their malice or madneſs againſt us: Change their counſels from that miſchievous, to a ſweet Chriſtian temper of gentleneſs; infuſe into their hearts ſincere unfeigned love; bind them faſt to us in the inviolable bands of Spiritual friendſhip; and by what means thou knoweſt moſt fit, make them partakers of thy pure life. As for thoſe that love us, or for thy holy Names ſake do adminiſter to our bodily neceſſities, repay them with the riches and abundance of thy gifts, and vouchſafe them the lot and portion of faithful and wiſe Stewards; and for thoſe that out of good affection have remembred our infirmities, or have prayed for us, reward them with thy plenteous grace. To thoſe that have commanded us miſerable unworthy Creatures to pray for them, grant thoſe things that be profitable for them, and yield them thoſe requeſts of theirs which tend to their ſalvation, and ſend them from thy holy place thy rich mercies and bowels of compaſſion. And, O thou Father of Compaſſions, pity all thoſe that truſt in thee, draw all to the Divine love of thee: be thou preſident in all things, and aſſiſtant to all, together with us thy ſinful and unprofitable Servants, and make us all Heirs of thy Kingdom; for to thee it belongs to ſhew mercy, and to ſave us, O our God, for thine is the power for ever. Amen.

Ἀνέξικακε βασιλεῦ καὶ ἀΐδιε, ὁ διὰ τὴν ἐκ ξύλου κατάκρισιν ἐπὶ ξύλου ἀρθείς, καὶ τοῖς ἀκολουθοῦσί σοι τοῖς ἴχνεσιν ἀριστύποις μακροθυμίας σαυτὸν ὑποδείγμα παρεχόμενος, ὃς ὑπὲρ τῶν σαυρούντων σε θεομάχων ἐντεῦξιν παρεστήσω τῷ συναϊδίῳ πατρί· αὐτὸς, φιλάνθρωπε κύριε, καὶ οἷς δι' ἀπεχθείας ἐσμὲν, ἢ ἐπιβουλεύουσιν, ἢ λοιδοροῦσιν, ἢ ὑπερεπήρειαν, ἢ βασκαίνουσιν, ἢ καθ' οἱονδήτινα τρόπον ἐξ ἐπιβουλῆς καὶ ὑπερηφανίας τοῦ φιλαπεχθήμονος δαίμονος μισοῦσι καὶ ἀποστρεφομένοις, συγχώρησον τὸ τῆς ὑμᾶς παρανομίας πλημμέλημα· μετάβαλε τὰς γνώμας αὐτῶν ἐπὶ κακοηθείαν εἰς ἐπιείκειαν· ἔμβαλε ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν ἄδολον ἀγάπην καὶ ἀνυπόκριτον· σύμψυχον ἡμῖν αὐτοὺς ἐν ἀῤῥήκτοις δεσμοῖς ἀγάπης πνευματικῆς· καὶ ᾗ ἀπηξάτω σε ζωῆς, οἷς οἶδας λόγοις, κοινωνοὺς ἀπολέσον. τοὺς δὲ ἀγαπῶντας ἡμᾶς, ἢ καὶ εἰς τὰς σωματικὰς χρείας διὰ τὸ σὸν διακονοῦντας ἅγιον ὄνομα, ταῖς πλουσίαις σου δωρεαῖς ἀνάπλησον, καὶ τῆς λήξεως τῶν πιστῶν καὶ φρονίμων οἰκονόμων ἀξίωσον· καὶ τοῖς τὰ ἀδυνάτως ἡμῶν ἐν ἀγαθῇ διαθέσει μεμνημένοις ἢ καὶ ὑπὲρ εὐχομένοις, δωρεῶν τὴν χάριν σου ἐπιβράβευσον. τοῖς εὐλογιμένοις τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ παλαιπόρῳ ἀναξιότητι ὑπὲρ ἀνίων ἐυχαῖς, τὰ ὠφέλιμα χάρισαι, καὶ τὰ περὶ σωτηρίας αἰτήματα πλήρωσον, καὶ πλούσια τὰ ἐλέη σου καὶ τοὺς οἰκτιρμοὺς ἐυσπλάγχνου· πάντας, ἐυσπλαγχνε, τοὺς δὲ σοὶ πεποιθότας ἐλέησον, πάντας οἷς τὸν θεῖον σου ἀγάπησον ἔλκυσον· περίσκεψαι πάντων, καὶ ἀντιλαβοῦ, σὺν ἡμῖν τοῖς ἁμαρτωλοῖς καὶ ἀχρείοις δούλοις σου, καὶ τῆς σῆς βασιλείας κληρονόμους ἀπέργασαι. σὸν γάρ ἐστι τὸ ἐλεεῖν καὶ σώζειν ἡμᾶς, ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, ὅτι σοῦ ἐστι τὸ κράτος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. Ἀμήν.

S. *This is a duty of ſome difficulty: what help can you direct me to, to facilitate the performance of it?*

C. Many conſiderations there are which will tend to that end. Three there are here named. Conſiderations to facilitate this duty.

S. *Which be they?*

C. The firſt is the example of God, who ſheweth mercy to ſinners who are his enemies; and, in the outward diſpenſation of temporal bleſſings, giveth as liberal a portion many times to the wicked, unthankful provokers, as to his good ſervants; and for the common advantages of life, *Sun* and *Rain*, diſpenſeth them generally in an equality to all. And then for us to do the like is a God-like thing, the greateſt dignity that our nature is capable of. The firſt.

S. *What is the ſecond help?*

C. The conſideration of the Reward which God hath decreed for ſuch who do this, and that proportioned to their actions; *viz.* Retribution of good for evil, of mercy and happineſs, though we are ſinners and enemies. Whoſoever doth but think of that, how much the joys of Heaven for eternity are beyond the pleaſure of a little revenge for the preſent, will never think fit to make ſuch an unequal exchange, to loſe ſo rich a reward for ſo poor a pleaſure. The ſecond.

S. *What is the third help?*

C. The conſideration of what is done by all others, the vileſt and wickedeſt men in the world. For ſuch were the Publicans accounted, and yet they could think themſelves obliged to love their friends, and ſatisfie that obligation; they could uſe Civilities and courteous Compellations and Salutations to their Neighbours, *&c.* And if we, who are bound to exceed the Scribes, and Phariſees, the ſtricteſt Sect among the Jews, ſhall be but in the ſame rank with Publicans, (who are other-where put with Heathens and Harlots and Sinners) the vileſt and moſt abominable of all men, this will ſure be a great reproach to us Chriſtians. The third.

S. *What other Motives can you add in this matter, why I ſhould* love my enemies?

C. 1. That by this means I ſhall conquer my ſelf, my unruly paſſions, which is a moſt glorious heroical piece of Victory. 2. That by this I ſhall preſerve my ſelf in a great calmneſs and quiet of mind; which thoughts of revenge wholly deprive me of. 3. That this is of all other the moſt probable way of overcoming my enemy; Revenge being a means of exaſperating and inflaming him, Charity of melting him. Which if I do, I firſt get a Friend for an enemy; and ſecondly, have the honour and claim to the reward due to them *that convert ſinners from the error of their ways.* 4. That this is a way of excelling all other men in the world, none but Chriſtians thinking themſelves obliged to do this. 5. That this is the ſpecial way of Chriſtian Perfection, and is ſo called in the cloſe of this Chapter, *Be ye perfect, as your Father which is in Heaven is perfect.* In ſtead of which St. *Luke* reads, 6. 36. *Be ye merciful*, &c. noting this Mercy or Alms or Benignity to Enemies to be the higheſt degree of Chriſtian Perfection. Five Motives more.

S. *I beseech God by his renewing quickning Spirit to mortifie the contrary sin, and work this truly Christian grace in my heart. You have past through the fifth Chapter, and so* Christ's *Reformations of and Additions to the old Commandments: I will not question why* Christ *reformed or improved no more of them, it is sufficient to me that he hath not; which being an act of his wisdom, it is not for man to question, but acquiesce in.*

C. You judge aright; yet do I conceive that three other Commandments of the second Table Christ hath also improved in this Sermon. The eighth, that against *stealing*, he hath improved into *doing unto others all things which we desire should be done by them to us*, Chap. 7. 12. The ninth, that of not *bearing false witness*, he hath improved into *not judging*, Chap. 7. 1. The last of *not coveting*, into *taking no thought*, Chap. 6. 25, *&c.* And for those three you may have patience till you come to those places, and then you shall have them explained to you.

Sect. XI. *Of the fifth Commandment.*

As for the fifth (which is the only one of the second Table which will then be left out) there may be particular reason for it, because that *honour of Father* and *Mother*, obedience to Superiours, Magistrates, *&c.* was by the Jewish Law advanced so high, even to the prohibiting of thoughts of evil against such (which, say the Jews, is the only case wherein thoughts are prohibited) that there was no need, or almost possibility, of setting it higher in respect of the degree. And for any thing else in that matter, it will be worth your marking, that Christ medled not with it. Though he were, as God, the *King of all Kings*, and might have changed or disposed of their Dominions as he pleased; yet he was not pleased to make any alteration, but to continue and settle all in that course wherein it had formerly been placed by God himself, living in subjection to the known Laws, *paying tribute to Cæsar*, and not so much as accepting the judicial cognizance of an offence when he was put upon it: so that what he added to *Moses* in this matter was only greater reverence and awe to the Father, or Magistrate, or Civil power, not any retrenching of his former rights. In which he was so extremely careful, and tender above ordinary, that whereas *Moses* among the Egyptians, when he was but a private man, did take upon him to exercise an act of judicature on the Egyptian which wronged the Israelite, *Exod.* 2. 12. Christ would never do any such thing, but left the *woman taken in adultery*, and other offenders, to the ordinary legal course, and would not upon any importunity usurp or take upon him any thing in that matter. By which, if you please, you may discern how far from the practice and Gospel of Christ are those Doctrines of ambitious men, which have made Christian Religion a ground or excuse of moving and disquieting of States, and shaking if not dissolving, of Kingdoms.

Christ meddles not with Dominion among men.

S. *What Doctrines are those?*

Doctrines of Sedition.

C. I had rather you should be ignorant of them; yet those which are so famous, that you will hardly escape the knowing of them, I shall mention to you, that you may be careful to avoid them. 1. That

The Popes two Swords.

of some adorers of the Papacy, *viz.* That the pretended Vicar of Christ, as successor of St. *Peter*, hath two Swords given him by Christ, the Spiritual, and the Temporal; and that by that means he hath power to dispose of all the Kingdoms of the World, and in case of Heresie, to excommunicate Princes, and absolve all Subjects from their bands of Allegeance to them. A thing so ridiculous to be affirmed of the Pope as Christ's Vicar, (if it were supposed that he were so, beyond all other Bishops, when, as I have already shewed you, Christ himself absolutely disclaimed all such power, and, beside that he gave no *Sword*, but only *Keys*, to *Peter*, most sharply reprehended him for using the *Sword*, though against the apprehenders of Christ himself) that more considerate Papists discerning this, and yet unwilling to devest the Pope of that so long usurped power, have found it necessary to pretend another Tenure for him; and therefore style the Pope not the Vicar of Christ (for that would give him no power, so much as of a Civil Judge) but the * *Vicar of God*, whom he hath set up to be his *Vicegerent* over all the World: a doctrine too senseless to need, and not so much avowed as to expect, a confutation. Of which whole matter it is enough to observe, that it is set as a Character of Christ's greatest enemy, Antichrist himself, that he shall *exalt himself above all that is called God, i. e.* (as it is ordinarily interpreted) above all the Kings of the Earth. All that will be useful for you to learn is the unchristianness of those actions in Subjects which are built on such Antichristian principles as these, such as are Rebellion, Treason, Sedition, attempting the commotion of States, on colour of Religion; or any other title or priviledge from Christ (or any Vicar, or Officer, of his) to do so; defaming, *speaking evil of Dignities*, &c. 2. A second *Doctrine* of this nature is that which some speculators and nice wits have pitcht on, by mistaking of some Scriptures; and not fore-seeing the dangerous consequents of it, *viz.* That all † *Dominion* (whether of any private man over his own Possessions, or of a King over his Subjects) *is founded in Grace, i. e.* That no man hath right to rule others, or even to possess any part of his own inheritance, but he who is in the *favour of God*, a *gracious spiritual person.* A *Doctrine* absolutely destructive to all Government and to all Community; every man that thinks himself godly, (as when so much advantage is to be made of it, every ill man will either think, or, which is all one in effect, pretend himself to be) having by this *Doctrine* authority to rebel against any, to despoil any, whose power or wealth is an eye sore to him, there being no other Judge on Earth, but his own censorious, or mutinous, or covetous humor, to pronounce infallibly of any man; whether he be a *Child of God*, or no. As for the falseness of it, it were sufficient to say from Christ, That *God sends* his *rain on the unjust as well as the just*; and therefore the latter of them hath not the Inclosure of the good things of this world, whether *riches* or *power*: Or secondly, That we are forbidden to *judge before the time*; and therefore if it were granted that none but the just hath that title, yet were there noway of defining who is just in this life; nor consequently of disseising the wicked of his inheritance: And thirdly, That he that is not now within that Covenant of Grace may be within it to morrow; and therefore that that Doctrine would bring in all uncertainty and confusion. But I conceive there is a Chapter in the New Testament that is most of it set on purpose against this Doctrine, as against a branch of the Heresie of those that then called themselves Gnosticks; it is 1 *Tim.* 6. And if you please, because it is not readily understood, I will give you a *Paraphrase* of it, for the former part of it, which most specially concerns this purpose, 1 *Tim.* 6. 1. *Those Christians which are servants under yoke*, (*i. e.* Bondslaves to Heathens) must perform all that service and obedience to them which belongs to them by the Laws of servants among the Heathens, that the Profession and Doctrine of the

* *Vict-dum Papam vicarium immortalis Dei.* Rodericus Zamorensis in spec hum. vitæ. l. 2. c. 1.

† Dominion founded in Grace. *Dominium fundatur in Gratia.*

1 Tim. 6. 1, &c.

Gospel

Gospel or Christianity be not *evil spoken of* by those Heathens, as it will be, if they see men prove the worse servants for being Christians.

Vers. 2. And those Christians again that have Christians for their Masters, must not despise them, or detract any part of that obedience which is due to them, upon pretence, that by being Christians they are become their equals or brethren: but let them rather consider that their Christianity obliges them to perform most diligent service to them, because the Faith and love that constitutes men Christians, consists in [a] helping and assisting one another to do good, which is all wherein their service consists. And that this be the practice of all servants, do thou, who art to instruct them, take care by thy Doctrine and Exhortation.

[a] So ἀντιλαμβανόμενοι & ἐνεργεσίας signifies: ἀντιλαμβάνω is not to partake; (that is συλλαμβάνεσθαι) but to take up at the other end, (as in carrying a flasket) and so help to bear the burthen, or, (as ἀντὶ signifies *pro*) to take up and bear any weight in anothers stead, *i. e.* to help or assist, and particularly to take care of, as *Isai.* 26. 2. ἀντιλαμβανόμενοι ἀληθείας, that *take care of the truth*: and ἐνεργεία is in an active not passive sence, as *Acts* 4. 9. (the only place besides where it is used) it signifies *doing good*, not *receiving it.*

3. And for those Gnosticks (mentioned verse 20. with the same character there set upon them as here) which teach Libertinism instead of the Doctrine of Christianity and Piety;

4. This you may observe and mark of them, that they are puft up with an opinion of [b] knowledge (whence they take their name) whereas indeed they know nothing, and study nothing but [c] disputings, and verbal controversies, which have no matter of substance in them, and this studying is a kind of [d] disease in them, or distemper, at least an effect of it: and all that comes of it is, *envy, strife, railings, evil surmisings.*

[b] γνῶσις.
[c] So ζητήσεις & συζητήσεις signifie.
[d] νοσῶν.

5. Odd kind of [e] discourses of men that have their minds perverted, and have [f] lost the truth, and have taken up an opinion (which caused the Apostle's speaking of them at that time) that the [g] Christian Religion is a gainful trade, a means of helping one to secular advantages (as that a Servant shall be made free by that means, *&c.* which occasioned this discourse,) *From such teachers and doers as these, do thou separate thy self*; express thy dislike of them by some means, exercise some part of Ecclesiastical [h] censure by way of discipline upon them.

[e] Διατειδὴ, a discourse παρεδιατειδὴ, a discourse out of the way,
[f] So ἀποστερῆσθαι signifies.
[g] ἐυσέβεια.
[h] So ἀΐδιον noteth.

6. As for that opinion of theirs, That the Gospel or Christianity is a gainful calling, though it be not true in that sence wherein they use (or whereto they apply) it; yet in this other sence it is most Orthodox, That *Christianity with a competency is all the wealth in the world.*

7. For it teacheth us this, That *having brought no treasure with us into the world, it is certain that we shall carry none out*; and therefore,

8. If for the time that we live here, we have enough for the necessaries of life, *food and raiment*, (as any man that useth those means that Christianity directs to shall never fail of them (we shall in this be * sufficiently provided for.

* That is the meaning of

ἀρκεσθησόμεθα τούτοις, in these we shall have enough, or with these we shall be satisfied; nor as we render, [Let us therewith be content] for it is in the future tense, and in the Indicative, not the Subjunctive Mood, and, ἀρκῶσθαι is properly *to have enough*, and so αὐτάρκεια v. 6. *having enough of his own*, without inordinate means to get it. So the Syriack renders it [*wherefore meat and cloathing are sufficient for us*] ܟܦܝܢ from ܟܦ or ܫܦ both in sence and sound *sufficio*, differing from the Latin word, only in the Latin termination.

9. But they that will not be thus satisfied, but will be rich, lay up treasures in this world, (and so for power and authority) and make Religion a means to procure them, they do by this ingulf themselves into all the dangers and temptations in the world.

This place you see is directly confronted against that doctrine; and if you will consult 1 *Cor.* 7. 20. and explain those words, [*Let every man in that calling whereunto he is called, therein abide*] as the context will enforce; you will find this to be the result of them, not that it is unlawful for a Christian to improve his estate or condition in this world, (for *verse* 21. the Apostle advises slaves to obtain their freedom, if they can) but to shew us, that to think our selves free from any obligation of this world by virtue of our Christianity, is to make Christian liberty a pretence to the satisfying of our concupiscence or carnal desire, and so a thing most unchristian in those *Gnosticks*, which there also are spoken against by this Apostle.

By all this you see this Doctrine as punctually prevented, as if it had been by Prophecy foreseen so long before, it being indeed the Doctrine of the then present *Gnosticks*, (as will farther appear by what is said of them distinctly, 2 *Pet.* 2. 10. That they *despise dominion, and fear not to speak evil of dignities*: and so, *Jude* 8. [k] *they set at nought dominion*, evacuate, take it away;) then in latter times by the Schoolmen revived; and of late by others brought back into the world again. The observing this antidote against it will secure you from many hurtful practices, of which this last age hath been fruitful beyond all others. Some other Doctrines there are of this same making very fatal to Government, especially to Monarchy: but instead of insisting on them, I shall put you in mind of this great truth, that Christ and his Disciples were, of all the Doctors that ever were in the world, the most careful to preserve the Doctrine and practice of Allegeance, even when the Emperours were the greatest opposers of the Christian Religion: and if ever you mean to be accounted a follower of them, you must *go and do likewise.*

[k] ἀθετοῦσι κυριότητα.

S. *But I pray give me here leave to insert one question concerning those Emperors, which is thought to be of some difficulty, Whether Christ in acknowledging allegeance due to* Tiberius Cæsar, *whose predecessors had so lately changed the ancient Government of* Rome *by the Senate, did not by that act of his Example give Liberty to us, that we may lawfully yield our allegeance to any unjust prevailing power whatsoever it be.*

Christ's Example pretended for submission to the prevailing power.

C. The state of the Government of *Rome* at that time when Christ lived, must be considered distinctly what it was. It is true indeed, that *Julius Cæsar* had (not many years before) wrested the power out of the Senates hands, and changed the Government violently: but before this time of *Tiberius*, whereof now we speak, the business was so accorded between the Senate and the Emperors, that the Emperor now reigned unquestioned without any competition of the Senate: In him the power was quietly seated, the money superscribed with his Image, and Edicts sent out in his name, and he lookt upon by all (without any rival) as inferiour to God only. In which case of his acknowledged power, Christ being born in his dominions, thinks not fit to make a question of his right,

where there was none made by the Romans, or to diſpute *Cæſar*'s title (howſoever acquired by violence at firſt) when they from whom it was taken did acquieſce, and diſputed it not. Which caſe how diſtant it is from other forcible uſurpations, (where the Legal Sovereign doth ſtill claim his right to his Kingdoms, and to the Allegeance of his ſubjects, no way acquitting them from their Oaths, or laying down his pretenſions, though for the preſent he be over-powered) is eaſily diſcernible to any who hath the courage and fidelity to conſider it, and is not by his own intereſts bribed or frighted from the performance of his Chriſtian duty. It being withal moſt certain, That it belongs not to the Conveniences or Advantages of Subjects, to determine or prevail any thing in the buſineſs of Princes rights. I have briefly anſwered your ſcruple, and thus far inſiſted on this theme, though a little out of the way, becauſe the Fifth Commandment of the Law is the only one of the Second Table, that the following of Chriſt's method in this his Sermon doth not preſent to our conſideration, and yet was fit enough for you to learn ſomewhat of, above what you had in the Catechiſm of the Church.

Sect. XII. *Of the duties of the firſt Table.*

S. *But why is there nothing here added by Chriſt concerning the duties of the* Firſt Table, *which immediately reſpects God? For that I conceive is clear, that no one of them, ſave only the Third, that about* Swearing, *hath yet been touched by our Saviour in this Sermon.*

C. Beſide the Wiſdom of God, which even now you acknowledged ſufficient in this matter, many Reaſons might be farther rendred for this courſe of Chriſt's; eſpecially this, That the duties of the firſt Table were under *Moſes* ſet high (and explicated) enough already, and Chriſt needed not to repeat, ſave only what he meant to improve, or farther to illuſtrate and explain, and therefore repeated them not. Now for this a farther Reaſon may be rendred, taken from the different œconomy or adminiſtration of things under the Old and New Teſtament. Under the Old Teſtament God reſided among the Jews himſelf in his Divine Nature, (without taking upon him our fleſh) revealing himſelf to *Moſes* in the Mount, and in Viſions and illuſtrious Apparitions to him and other of the Patriarchs, and to the people continually in the Oracle, and ſo immediately diſpoſed of all things, that the Government of the Jews was by their Writers ſtyled the [1] *Government of God himſelf.* This Revelation of himſelf, and immediate reſidence among them, might make it fit and proper for him to give them Precepts for the Worſhip of God, (and for all kind of duties of that kind) as diſtinct and punctual, clear and high as could be: And ſo indeed it was an explicite elevated Law of Piety in general, *to love the Lord their God with all their heart, with all their ſoul, with all their mind, and with all their ſtrength.* And for the particulars of outward Performances, there were ſo many Cautions, ſo many Ceremonies, ſuch ſtrict performances of all kinds, that Chriſt did rather think fit to take off from the weights of thoſe burthens, than to add to them: And it is a common obſervation, That the Ceremonial part of the Old Teſtament Law, and all that which was Typical and preſignificative of ſomewhat to come under Chriſt's Kingdom, was then (as all poſitive Laws) obligatory only to them to whom it was given, *i. e.* to the Jews, but not to the reſt of the (then) Gentile or (now) Chriſtian world, no not to the very Proſelytes under the Old Teſtament, that came and lived among the Jews, but only to the Natives, and to thoſe that would be Proſelytes of Juſtice, *i. e.* would be in their Obedience as perfect Jews as they. But the ſtate of the Goſpel being of another œconomy, God the Son pitching his Tent in our nature, taking our very humane fleſh and ſoul upon him, and becoming very man among us, it was now moſt reaſonable that he ſhould heighten our obligations of duty (to that Nature which he had thus heightned and elevated to an higher pitch of dignity, by aſſuming it) and by giving us in our fleſh ſuch ſublime, viſible, elevated copies of charity toward all mankind, require us readily to tranſcribe them; eſpecially when he had alſo taken off ſo much of the former burthen of Ceremonies from our ſhoulders, and ſo leſſened our weight, and yet given more grace, than before was allowed under the Law, to ſuſtain it.

[1] Θεοκρατία. *Joſeph.*

ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν, Jo. 1.

S. *This is a very reaſonable account of this matter; but why then is one of the four Precepts concerning God (that of Perjury) mentioned and improved by him, and none elſe?*

Perjury reſpects men as well as God.

C. The reaſon is clear, becauſe though that Commandment concern God, by calling him to witneſs whenſoever we ſwear, and by calling him to witneſs a lie, (which is a great vilifying of God) if we ſwear falſly; yet ordinarily it reſpecteth men alſo, and that more principally, becauſe they are wronged by my perjury, the promiſſory oath being indeed a means of ſecuring my Brother of any thing which I promiſe him, and the breaking of that, the betraying of this fortreſs which was to have ſecured him: and therefore it is obſervable in Saint *James*'s prohibition of ſwearing, that he adds to the negative precept, this as the affirmative command, *Let your yea be yea, and your nay, nay,* &c. *i. e.* Let your word be as good as an oath, be you moſt ſtrict in making good or performing your promiſes. And that I conceive to be the pitch to which Chriſt deſired to raiſe us in this matter, that we ſhould be ſo punctual in performing our promiſes to men, that they might not need an oath from us, to believe us in any thing; and ſo that we ſhould never ſwear at all, or, if we did, never have excuſe or pretence to do ſo. And to conclude this particular, you may mark that Chriſt having taken our fleſh upon him, the generality of all his Sermons and Precepts do chiefly reſpect our Brethren, (meekneſs, obedience, peaceableneſs, mercifulneſs;) and even for the other ſort of precepts, that concern God, he is content they ſhould ſometimes give way to theſe duties to our fellow-Chriſtians; *I will have mercy,* ſaith he, *and not ſacrifice,* Mat. 9. 13. and in the buſineſs of the Sabbath again, *I will have mercy and not ſacrifice,* Mat. 12. 17. *i.e.* When both cannot be performed, he prefers the work of charity, or mercy to our brethren, before the outward duties toward God himſelf.

Of the firſt Commandment.

S. *I muſt now intreat but one favour more,* (*and it is from your own example in that former of* honouring the Parents) *that having not elſewhere as yet explained theſe three Commandments of the Firſt Table to me, you will now pleaſe to do it, (with what brevity you pleaſe, (as you did even now the Fifth Commandment) becauſe they be not directly in your way in this place) and then I ſhall hope to put all together, and ſhall conceive my ſelf to have received ſufficient light for the underſtanding of the whole Decalogue. I ſhall ſuppoſe my requeſt granted, and beſeech you to begin with the firſt,* [Thou ſhalt have no other God's but me, *or* before me] *What is the general importance of that Precept?*

C. That

C. That we must acknowledge the God of Israel to be God, and as firmly resolve that there is no other God before, or beside him.

S. What is it to acknowledge him to be God?

C. To perform to him those several parts of duty which belong from a creature to his God.

S. Which be they?

C. I shall need but to name them, because they have most of them been formerly (and will hereafter on peculiar occasions be) explained to you. Such are *Faith*, *Hope*, *Love*, *Fear*, *Trust*, *Honour*, *Worship*, and *Prayer* to him, and that in all the parts of *Prayer*, both in imploring his mercy, and the grateful acknowledgment of what hath been received from him; which is proportionable to Sacrifice, which always among Jews and Gentiles was resolved to be God's peculiar. And you may observe that there is such a sympathy and concent betwixt the first Article in the Creed (and the first Petitions in the Lord's Prayer) and this first Commandment, that the due explication of them, (which hereafter I shall give you) will be a Comment upon this Commandment. Duties to God.

S. I will then expect till those seasons, and proceed to the second Commandment; What is the prime importance of that? *Of the second Commandment.*

C. It is the arming and fortifying our hearts against all other rivals that may possibly interpose to divert that honour and worship that are due from us to God only. The Heathen World, by that snare to the eye, that tempting bait of Images, and some Carnalities that were ordinarily annext to the use of them, were brought to the worshipping of a many false, or no gods, and some of them the basest, meanest creatures in the world. The Jews contrarily were disciplined by God to the worshipping of the one, invisible, infinite Deity, that had never been seen in any resemblance, and was therefore so to be worshipt, in a place and a manner peculiar to him, and appointed by him. And the making of Images at that time being generally by the Gentiles designed to be worshipt, and the danger being very great, that the Jews would be corrupted by them, (though when that danger was not observable, they were not only counted lawful to be made, but set up sometimes by God's own appointment, as the Pictures of the *Cherubim*, &c.) this being eminently true of the graven or molten Images (which were by their Ceremonies of Consecration conceived to become the bodies of their god inspirited by them) they were strictly forbidden by God, and the last of them, that of embossed Images, became (as it is thought) unlawful to a Jew either to make, or to bow in their presence, though they did not perform any worship to them. And although that great strictness did not extend to all or any of the other Nations, and consequently not to us Christians; yet God's Jealousie of a rival being a thing wherein all mankind are concerned, especially Christians, the performance of any Divine Worship to any Creature in the World, and the very use of any other thing in the service of God which is by others worshipped, and by which we are in any imminent danger to be corrupted, is to be conceived forbidden to all Christians by the force of that Commandment. So also all that vileness and filthiness which was wont to be used in their Idol-feasts; (which hath been the subject of [m] another Discourse.) Besides this Negative part of the Commandment, other particulars there are to which the Affirmative part extends: as that, bowing down, adoration or bodily worship is due from us to the one true God, (though not to those idol false gods) a tribute peculiarly due to him, which hath made and redeemed our bodies as well as souls, and this debt must in any reason be paid to him; and the *worshipping of God in spirit and in truth*, *John* 4. 23. (which is only set in opposition to the worshipping on that Mountain, and in *Jerusalem*, *i. e.* to the Samaritan and Jewish worship) is no way exclusive of, or contrary to this external worship of the body, when it is bestowed on the one true object, and hath the fervency and sincerity of the soul going along with it; for then sure that (even bodily) worship is performed in spirit and in truth, whatsoever those words signifie; the spirits which we have, not ceasing to be such, when they are yoaked and joined with bodies. Images. [m] Of *Idolatry*. Duties of the Second Commandment.

S. What is the importance of the Fourth Commandment? *Of the Fourth Commandment.*

C. It is a designation of time for the special performing of God's publick worship. For the worship it self being first setled, the branches together with the object of it agreed on, in all reason some time should be set apart for the publick special performance of it. And the Precept in this matter given to the Jews, although it have something in it Typical, *viz.* the strict rest for that whole day, which imported a rest wherein all Christians are concerned, the ceasing of our whole life, from our own works, *i. e.* from sin, the true meaning of the Christian Sabbath, *Isai.* 58. 13. (and therefore the Fourth Commandment is interpreted by our Church Catechism to signifie to us the necessity of our *serving God truly all the days of our life*;) and secondly, although being a Positive Precept, given particularly to the Jews, it be not punctually in every particular obligatory to us Christians (that live not by their Laws) yet will it conclude, from the equity of that command, many things of use unto us. As 1. that it is not only lawful, but (for a publick community of men) necessary, to set apart some set times for God's service, and by the same reason some set places, set vestments, gestures, and other the like Ceremonies, such as may best both comply with, and help, accompany, and heighten our spiritual performances unto God. 2. That what is thus set apart to God's use, is said to be sanctified or hallowed, *i. e.* to have a [n] separate respect due to it, such, as that it must not ordinarily be mixed with profane and common uses: which is also the importance of the Rest joined with the hallowing, the not mixing our worldly employments with our divine performances. 3. That the remembrance of God's special mercies is a fit hint or occasion to pitch upon some day, or time, or place, *&c.* in relation thereto, and thus to discriminate it from others. Such was the [o] Creation of the World mentioned there, and the Resurrection of Christ in the Christian Church; and yet this latter not appointed to supplant or swallow up the former, but only, as it deserved of us Christians, to be preferred before it, as for some hundreds of years in the ancient Church, the Jewish Sabbath It is somewhat Typical and Positive. The equity of it to Christians. Set times to commemorate mercies.

[n] So διχωρίσθηναι, *Eccles.* 33. 8. is set to signifie that holy separate state bestowed ἐν γνώσει κυρίου, in or by God's knowledge, on one

day above another, according to the notion of the Hebrew קדש both for hallowing and separating. [o] The Creation and Resurrection. τὸ σάββατον ἐν τῇ κυριακῇ ἑορτάζειν, ἵνα τὸ μὲν δημιουργίας ᾖ σύμβολον, τὸ δὲ ἀναστάσεως, *Clem. Cor.* 7. 24. & l. 8. 33. & 67. *So Asterius hom. de repud.* calls it καλῶς συνωνόμασε τὸ σάββατον ἐν τῇ κυριακῇ. *Greg. Nyssen.* ἡμέρας ἀλληλαῖς· and therefore saith *Balsamon*, παρὰ τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων ἐζητήθησαν δι' ὅλου σχεδὸν τὰς κυριακὰς τὰ σάββατα.

was

was retained in (a great part, at leaſt, of) the Chriſtian Church together with the Lord's-day, and the ſervices proportioned to them both, but the latter preferred before the former: and if in every week, or month, or year, we ſhould ſet ſome time apart to commemorate God's mercy in the Creation, and all his other acts of gracious providence belonging to our preſervation, it would be no ſuperſtition, but an act of piety, in any ſingle Chriſtian, or (if authority ſhould think good) in any publick ſociety of them. So likewiſe the Birth, Paſſion, Aſcenſion of Chriſt, the Deſcent of the Spirit, the Birth or Martyrdom of the Apoſtles and Saints of Scripture, and any remarkable temporal deliverance, or (in proportion alſo) any matter of humiliation, any ſin or judgment on a Kingdom, *&c.* will by the example of God himſelf (both in that Fourth Commandment, and in other Feaſts and Faſts preſcribed by him) be reſolved on to be fit ſeaſons and opportunities to conſecrate ſome conſiderable part of our time (yea and of our wealth alſo) unto God. 4. That as God did then, ſo (Chriſt having tranſmitted his power to them) the Apoſtles and ſucceeding Church of God now may very reaſonably diſpoſe of us in matters of this nature, and direct all it's members into ſome uniform way, at ſuch ſet times, in ſuch ſet places of the Worſhip of God: and that they have ſo done, appears both by ſome mentions of the Lord's day in holy Scripture, and by the conſtant ſuffrage of the Fathers of the Church ſince that time; which is a ſufficient obligation on all Chriſtians to a due, conſtant, diligent obſervation of it, over and above that of the Fourth Commandment.

The Lord's day.

S. *How is the time thus ſet apart to be employed?*

How to be employed.

C. To the practice and advancement of Piety in private and in publick: in private, to private reading, prayer, thankſgiving, meditation, *&c.* in publick, to publick exerciſe of the ſame, publick reading, prayer, preaching, inſtructing of youth, (by the hand of the lawful Miniſter, authoriſed to be a publick perſon both from God to us, and from us to God) together with the uſe of the Sacraments, (in ſuch manner, and with that frequency, as ſhall ſeem good to thoſe to whoſe charge we are committed) with all due care, reverence, and zeal: not ſlightly, or formally, or profanely, but ſo as will beſt tend to the encreaſe of piety and charity, to the benefit, not enſnaring, of mankind, the Sabbath (and all ſuch inſtitutions) P *being made for man*, i. e. for man's good, and Chriſt (being God) the Author of this Poſitive Law, having delivered it with that reſpect to Moral duties, that the outward part of it (that which concerned bodily reſt) ſhould yield place to works of mercy or pity to our ſelves or others; and conſequently that man, and eſpecially the Chriſtian, ſhould not be ſo enſlaved to it, but that he hath power over it, to do what is moſt to his other Chriſtian ends of charity, mercy, *&c.* on that day. I ſhould ſpend a larger time on this Commandment, to give you a diſtinct apprehenſion of it, and to enforce the duties of the day (as they now belong to us) more earneſtly, but that it comes in with ſome violence in this place; and therefore I ſhall add no more of it.

P *Periculum animæ impellit Sabbatum. Proverb. Heb. & Sabbatum datum eſt in manus hominis, non homo in manum Sabbati.*

S. *I am well ſatisfied with that proportion which you have afforded me, and ſhould here conclude your trouble, had not the mention of the days of the Birth, Paſſion and Aſcenſion of Chriſt, and of the births and martyrdoms of the Apoſtles and Saints of Scripture, made it a little neceſſary for me to require your aſſiſtance and direction in that matter, to tell me whether you think it firſt lawful, and then either commendable or neceſſary, to retain ſuch Feſtivities in the Church, or indeed any, beſides that of the Lord's day already inſiſted on.*

Of Feſtivities.

C. That the obſervation of ſuch other Feſtivities is lawful, I ſhall firſt make appear to you: And that I may do it the more fully, I ſhall faſten upon ſome one of them (by analogy with which the reſt will alſo be concluded) and it ſhall be the firſt and the principal, that of the Nativity of Chriſt.

Of Chriſtmas.

And to vindicate the lawfulneſs of that obſervation againſt gain-ſayers, I ſhall think my ſelf obliged to clear this propoſition, That the celebration and commemoration of the Birth of Chriſt is under no moral or Chriſtian prejudice, is no way contrary, but altogether agreeable to the Doctrine of the New Teſtament and the frame of Chriſtian Religion.

S. *That you may do this, I ſhall mention to you in order, the prejudices which it is conceived to be under.* 1. *The Riot which is commonly uſed in the celebrating of this Feſtivity.* 2. *The ſin of Will-worſhip.* 3. *Of ſuperſtition in the beginning and continuing of it. Will you begin firſt with the firſt of theſe?*

The Riot unlawful.

C. I will, and firſt acknowledge to you, that all riot or exceſs is a ſin, and that far greater and more culpable in a Chriſtian than in any man elſe, particularly than in a Jew, whoſe promiſes of an earthly plenty are not near ſo contrary and unreconcileable with corporeal exceſſes, as are thoſe ſpiritual joys, which are the Chriſtians eminent (if not only) portion both in this and another life. But then ſecondly, It is as certain, that Feſtivities are very ſeparable from riot or luxury in a Chriſtian Common-wealth. The Heathen Feaſts and Sacrifices had little elſe in them: gluttony and drunkenneſs being the preſcribed worſhip and way of approving themſelves to ſome of their idol-gods, and uncleanneſs the deſign of others; if not openly in their Temples, yet ſecretly in their receſſes and myſteries: and ſo both ſorts recommended to them under the opinion of piety and holineſs.

The Feſtival lawful.

But the Chriſtian Feſtival being wholly made up of Chriſtian dainties, (Chriſtian inſtruction, Prayers, Thankſgiving and Alms, and not feeding corporally, ſave in the Sacrament only) is perfectly free from having any degree of luxury or exceſs intrinſecal or eſſential to it. As for the cuſtomary hoſpitality or good chear of thoſe ſeaſons, that (though it be a decent attendant on the Feſtivity) is not yet of the eſſence or ſubſtance of it; and therefore the exceſſes and vices of men, which alſo are but occaſioned at moſt, and not cauſed, by that good chear, are not in any equity imputable to that, much leſs to the Feſtivity it ſelf: the Prayers and Praiſes on that day (wherein the Feſtivity conſiſts) being ſurely free from the guilt of ſo much, as of occaſioning that riot. And indeed what uſe would there be of Laws or Magiſtrates, if it were not in their power (without utter aboliſhing the Feſtivity) to reform ſuch exceſſes as theſe? Mean while, it is every man's duty to take all care to remove this ſcandal, and purge this duty from ſuch blemiſhes as theſe, to be moſt ſtrictly temperate at ſuch times wherein Chriſt entred into the world to bring all purity into it: and then this will ceaſe to be an objection, if as yet it be one.

S. *This*

S. *This first prejudice hath been easily removed by you: please you to proceed now to the second, the charge of Will-worship that lies on it.*

C. This charge is wholly a mistake, whether you respect those which now observe, or those which first instituted this Festivity. In those which now retain that usage, and observe it in obedience to the Canons of the Church, and no otherwise, it proceeds from that moral principle of obedience to Superiours, which is a duty owing to the Fifth Commandment of the Law, as immediately and directly as chastity is to the Seventh. And for those who first instituted it, without any precedent command from others (and so are the only persons in whom it can possibly be called *Will-worship*) they will be also very far from any fault or guilt deriveable from hence: It being clear that even among the Jews some feasts have been instituted by themselves without any command of God, the feast of *Purim* in the book of *Esther*, and the feast of *Dedication*, 1 *Mac.* 4. 59. and the latter of them used in Christ's time in the New Testament, and approved by Christ's presence at it. And so the third, and sixth, and ninth hours of prayer were received only by Jewish custom or Law of their own, not of God's enacting, and yet are observed by the Apostles, *Acts* 2. 15. and 3. 1. and 10. 9. And indeed the case is clear, that any thing of this nature, of free-will-offerings, &c. is likely to be the more, not the less, acceptable for being voluntary.

The objection of Will-worship answered.

See Tr. of Will-worship.

S. *What say you then to the third prejudice, that of Superstition?*

C. That is a calumny also. For if the word *superstition* be taken in the proptiety of the notion either of the Greek or Latin, for the worshipping of [q] Dæmons, or the souls of dead men; then can it not without blasphemy (and making our God and our Christ (which alone are worshipt in that Festivity) a Dæmon, or spirit of a mere dead man) be affixt to this institution: or if it be taken improperly and abusively, for the placing of that sanctity in such days and performances which belong not to them, then will not this be any way appliable to the observation of this day: For the Birth of Christ (the business and occasion of this Festivity) is certainly a mercy of such a quality (whether we consider our own wants, or the no other way imaginable to repair them, or whether the strangeness of this way, or the goodness united to the wisdom of God in designing it) that it cannot well be overvalued by us, especially when it is affirmed by Christ himself of *Abraham*, (the representative of all faithful Christians, as well as father of all Jews) that *he rejoiced to see this his day of birth, or coming into the world*, with all attending it, *John* 8. 56. And again, when the Angel himself expresses it by the title of *good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people*, Luke 2. 10. because *this day is born to you a Saviour*, &c. And lastly, when (as an essay of that joy) the whole *heavenly host*, verse 14. join together in the Doxology, *Glory to God on high*, &c. and (as the Writer to the *Hebrews* applies it to this very matter of the time of God's bringing Christ into the world) *All the Angels of God worship him*, Heb. 1. 6. All which being considered as our copies and examples; there will be little reason to fear that a transcript taken so far short of the original should have any criminous excess in it; the greater danger is, that we offend on the other side. And secondly, for the services performed on this day, they are looked upon by us but as they are, as acceptable tributes and acknowledgments unto God, in the way (prescribed by him) of praise and thanksgiving, and so there is no appearance of excess or superstition in those neither. Thirdly, For the instituting or setting apart a day for this duty every year, this cannot be an excess; 1. Because a duty cannot be performed without the circumstance of time, and that it is a certain set time, tends only to the securing of the duty of some time against the frailties of men and disturbances of the world, which might otherwise supplant and rob it of all: And 2. because the Angels doing it on the very day of Christ's Birth, will not only be an evidence of the fitness (which is more than lawfulness) of doing it on a set day, but withal an example to us, both to observe the duty, and fix the time of performing it. And seeing they cannot be imitated by us exactly by our bearing them company on the very day, the next and most natural way of endeavouring it, is to do it on the anniversary return of that day. Fourthly, If the strict abstaining from the labours of the ordinary calling on that day be the thing charged with the excess, the answer is clear, That that Rest is agreeable to what God hath appointed on all days of Festivity and Fasting, and so proportionable to God's examples, and is also in it self absolutely necessary to a day of the publick service of God: the works of the calling being unreconcileable with the solemn Assemblies, and worldly thoughts very fit to be ceremoniously laid aside, that they may not intrude too rudely and mix with those services. And then what's so agreeable to God's patterns, and proper and natural toward so good an end, cannot be thought an excess, or culpable in that respect. Fifthly, For the setting apart this set day, the 25. of *December*, (which by some is doubted whether it be the day or no, and thence is made guilty of strengthening men in blindness and superstition) I answer, 1. That if indeed the day were mistaken, yet the matter of the mistake being of no greater moment than the false calculating of a day, (which were it (once) never so accurately set, the least slip in Chronology or want of exactness in Calenders would alter it again) the mistake will sure be very pardonable in those who verily think they are not mistaken: And as long as those who are supposed to be in this errour do perform the business of the day as completely and substantially on a mistaken day as they could do on the true one (if it were revealed infallibly which it were) the excuse of blameless ignorance will wash away greater errours than this of the day, supposing it were an errour. But then, secondly, there is little reason to doubt but that this which we now observe is the very day. For the testimony of Saint *Chrysostom* is clear for the tradition of it, out of the [r] Censual Tables at *Rome*, wherein the day is set down; affirming, that they [r] which knew those records exactly, and that had a long time celebrated it as from an [s] ancient Tradition, had now sent them knowledge of it. And so both the Greek and Latin Churches, which had very sharp contentions about the time of keeping of *Easter*, have yet agreed uniformly in this, asserting it from the * Tradition of the Church. In the next place, For the Character which Saint *Paul* sets on the observation of daies, *Gal.* 4. 10. (and to which the Fathers affix the Title of *Superstition*)

As also of Superstition.

[q] *Superstitum cultus.*

The 25 of December.

[r] To these *Justin Martyr* appeals, *Apol.* 2. concerning the place of *Christ's Birth*, ὡς μαθεῖν ἔστιν ἀπὸ τῶν ἀπογραφῶν, &c. *Sed & Census constat. Tertull. cont. Marc. l.* 4. *c.* 19. &, *Pendentibus adhuc recentibus Augustianis Censibus: Censum Augusti fidelissimum testem Dominicæ nativitatis, Romana archiva custodiunt.* [s] παρὰ τῶν ἀκριβῶς ταῦτα εἰδότων καὶ τὸν πάλαι χρόνον ἑορτὴν αὐτὴν ἀγόντων παραλήψεσθε τὴν ἀκρίβειαν, *Chrys. hom. in Nat. ad Antioch.* Οἱ ἄνωθεν καὶ ἐκ παλαιᾶς παραδόσεως αὐτὴν διατελοῦντες, &c. *ib.* * See *Clem. Const. l.* 5. *c.* 13. & *Aug. in Psal.* 132. & *de Trin. l.* 4.

tion)

tion) I answer, That it is most clear, that that place belongs not at all to Christian feasts. The words there may possibly refer to Jewish feasts, (as may seem probable from the mention of their willingness to be under the Law, *ver.* 21.) and then *the days*] will signifie Sabbaths; *the months*] New months; *the times*] their Anniversary feasts; and *the years*] their Sabbatick years and Jubilees. And in this interpretation those words will no way prejudge the Christian Feasts. For though the Jewish observations were Feasts like these, yet were they not forbidden as Feasts, but only as Jewish (now when they were out-dated by Christ) and so as ill symptoms in Christians, intimating their preferring of Judaism before Christianity, and depending on those legal observances for Justification. But it is also possible that the words to the *Galatians* may refer to Heathen observances, and so the mention of the Heathenism in which they had lived, *ver.* 8. doth seem to incline them; and Saint *Ambrose* interprets them accordingly; and then the meaning will be, that they [x] observed Ominous daies, as the Gentiles were wont to do; would not begin any business or journey upon such or such [y] daies, the day after the Calends or Nones, *&c.* And these again have nothing common with this or other Christian Festivities: for on them we may begin any enterprise that is reconcileable with the devotion due to the day; and that labour or travelling is not so, it is not [z] from any evil abode, but from the nature of the employment not very suitable with the publick services of the Church.

[x] This is called ἀισπᾶζ τὰς ἡμέρας.
[y] καιροὶ ἀπέξοδικοὶ, & ἀνεξόδικοι.
[z] *Ominis gratiâ.*

S. *But is not this Celebration guilty of that which (if it be not Superstition) hath yet a semblance of it, and is censured in the Pharisees by Christ*, viz. *The teaching for Doctrines the Commandments of men.*

The Objection from Teaching the commands of men, answered.

C. I must first admonish you what is meant by that phrase [*Teaching for Doctrines*] It is the affirming that such a thing is the [a] pleasure, *i. e.* command or will, of God; and the affirming that of the commands of men, is the same crime as to put the King's broad Seal to a deed of my own, or his stamp and impression on that which is not his coin. And thus to pretend a Tradition of the Jews, which was an invention of their own, to be a Law of God's enacting, or to set it up against any known Law of God's, is the crime noted by that phrase; and nothing else but what shall bear some analogy with that. And therefore still this is no way chargeable here on those that acknowledge this to be an Ecclesiastical Institution, and do not so much as pretend it to be prescribed by Christ, and which seek not thereby to supplant any thing that is appointed by Christ, but do it upon a Christian occasion, in perfect subordination to and compliance with all other Moral and Christian Laws or Institutions; and this as instrumental to an end commanded by Christ, the commemorating of his birth, praising and praying to him; and for thus doing pretend not to any higher Authority than may appear to belong to it.

[a] Δόγμα.

The Authority by which Christmas stands in the Church.

S. *You have now sufficiently cleared it from those prejudices which might fasten any ill character upon it: Please you now to proceed to inform me what that Authority is by which this Festivity pretends to stand in the Church of Christ; for that will be necessary to be superadded to the bare lawfulness of it, to render it either necessary or fit to be observed by us.*

C. The Authority by which it stands in the whole Church is that of the practice of the Primitive Universal Christian Church: Not that we have any certain evidence of the time of its beginning, but that the immemorial observation of it is an argument of the Primitive, if not Apostolick Institution of it. And thus indeed do the Ancient Fathers in their Homilies upon that day speak of it, as of a most ancient usage. Thus the very ancient Author of the Constitutions mentions a day solemnized in remembrance of Christ's birth: And *Origen*, one of our first Writers doth not only [b] vindicate that place of *Gal.* 4. from having any thing contrary to the Christian Feasts, (which were ridiculous, if there were none such) but also mentions the [c] Feast of the *Innocent Infants*, (which is now attendant on the Nativity, and cannot be imagined ancienter than that) as that which was by the holy Fathers, according to the Will of God, commanded to be for ever celebrated in the Church. Soon after him S. *Cyprian* hath a Treatise on this day. And *Ammianus Marcellinus*, speaking of *Julian* the Apostate, above 1300 years ago, mentions it (as his design to cover his Apostatical intentions) that he went solemnly to the Christians Church, and worshipped God [d] on that holy-day in *January* which the Christians called *Epiphany*: which day being mentioned so anciently as a known Festival of the Christian Church, gives not only to that day, but to Christmas, which that concludes, a far greater antiquity than that time of *Julian*'s, on occasion of which it is there mentioned. And so saith Saint *Chrysostom*, that though till his time the observation of it on *Decemb.* 25. was not fixt at *Antioch*, yet from *Rome* over all the West it had been so observed from the most ancient Records of Christianity.

[b] Against *Celf. l.* 8.
[c] *Hom.* 3. *in Matt.*
[d] *Feriarum diem quem celebrantes mense Januario Christiani Epiphaniam dicitant.*

By this, and much more that might be produced, it appears to be at the least an Ecclesiastical Institution, very early received over all the West, and the far greatest part of Christendom, and within 400 years universally solemnized; and sure this is a very competent Authority (when withall it is so probable, that it may be more, according to a rule of the Fathers, *That every ancient and general usage, whose beginnings are unknown, may be resolved to be of Apostolical institution or practice*) to oblige the continuance of so pious a solemnity in the Church, according to that of Saint *Augustine*, That [e] *all that acknowledge themselves sons of the Church, observe the Festivals of the Church*; (in which number he places [f] this of the Nativity in the Front) to which it is consequent, that they which observe them not, disclaim this Sonship, and cast themselves out of this family, upon a temptation much too slight to own or excuse an act of such unkindness to themselves, and ingratitude to the Christian Church, which designed it so much to their advantage. To this head of the ancientness of this institution in the Universal Church I shall add but one evidence more, and it is this, That as most of the first customs or institutions of Christianity were taken (by some light change) from the customs of the Jews, (Christ's *Baptism* from their *washings* at the Initiation of the Jews and Proselytes in the Temple, the Sacrament of the *Lord Supper* from their *Loaf* and *Cup* of Benediction after Supper, our *Easter* from their *Passeover*, the Christian from the Jewish *Pentecost*, and many other the like) so it was in this matter also. The beginnings of all months, and seasons, and years, were kept [g] Festival among the Jews: In like manner the Feast of the Dedication of the Temple, the anniversary commemoration

[e] *Recte sibi filia Ecclesiæ colunt qui se Ecclesiæ filios recognoscunt.* Ser. 253. de Temp.
[f] *Quotiescunque aut natalem Domini, &c. celebrare disponitis.*
[g] Domin. 1. Advent. See *Targum Hier.* in Gen. 1. 14. where the use of the *Sun and Moon for seasons & days & years*, is expresst by [*Let them be for the sanctifying by them the beginnings of months and years.*]

commemoration of the beginning (or birth as it were) of that house of God (as among other people * the birth-days of Cities, the day wherein the Trench was first cast up) hath usually been solemnized. And then, as the Temple was a type of Christ, (and he said by himself to be greater than the Temple, as the substance which the Temple fore-shadowed, his Flesh the Walls, and his Divinity the Glory which inhabited it,) so are these two, the Type and Antitype, the Feast of Dedication among them and the Nativity among Christians, most perfectly answerable the one to the other. And proportionably as among them the beginnings or Calends of every month were kept holy, so here twelve days together (one for every month) are joined to attend the Calends or Nativity of Christ. And all this, as it is a fair compliance with Gods institution among the Jews, so sure is it an argument of the Antiquity of the observation, that it is thus imitated from the Jews, for that signifies it to have been begun about that great time of Reformation, before the Jews Ceremonies were quite abolished, as the *Egyptians* Jewels were then taken from them, when the *Israelites* departed out of the Land, and began their journey toward *Canaan*. As for this particular Church wherein we live, there is little doubt but that this Festivity is of the same standing with the first Plantation of Christian Religion among us. If we reckon that from the conversion of the *Saxons* (to which the name of *English* is properly affixt) it is then [h] most clear by the Records of King *Ethelbert*. But if we speak of the *Britans*, then as their conversion is much more ancient (and *Tertullian*'s testimony is clear, that the *British* Islands were converted to Christianity before his time) so if there be any truth in that objection which some men have made against the celebration of this Feast among us (*viz.* that some Heathen usages are retained in it) this will be yet an higher evidence of the antiquity of this Festival in this Nation, so far as to render the original of it, if not Apostolical, yet very Primitive and near the [i] Apostles age: that being the time of the conversion of the Nation from Heathenism: and if it were not of the usage of this Festivity also, it is not imaginable how any Heathen custom should come to be adherent to it. This, I suppose, may help to recover this Festivity to some competent part of that reverence which in reason is due to Christian Antiquity in point of ceremony or observation (in a Kingdom especially where *common usage* is *Common Law*, the best that any man holds his estate by) and awake us to a more pious, Christian, spiritual, and not to a more voluptuous, carnal, Heathenish observance of it.

* *Palilia.*

[h] *Ethelbertus Rex, in fide catholica corroboratus, una cum Bertha Regina filioque ipsorum Eadbaldo, ac Reverendissimo Præsule Augustino, cæterisq; Optimatibus terræ, Solennitatem natalis Domini celebravit Cantuariæ, convocato ibidem communi tam Cleri quàm populi, quinto Idus Januarii.* King *Ethelbert*, with his Queen and his Son and *Augustine*, &c. celebrated the solemnity of the Birth-day of Christ at *Canterbury*, &c. Sir *Henry Spelman* in his *Anglic. conc. an. Christi* 605. [i] An Argument of this may be taken from the name of this day (in the Ancient Monuments) Mid-pinter dæg *i. e.* Mid-winter day. For this will conclude (if the imposition of the Name were answerable to the Nature of the season, and if the 25. of *December* (with the Western Church) be granted to be the day of Christs Birth) that when that name was first applied to Christmas day, the day was then not far removed from the *Solstice*, and that by calculation must be not long after our Saviours time. See *Baron. in Apparat.* and Bishop *Mount.* in his Answer to him.

I have detained you long on this Theme, (and longer than you had reason to expect when you first proposed your question about it) on purpose to shew you the proper basis on which this and other the Festivals of the Church are fastned, and to vindicate them from the little exceptions and envies which are raised against them, and by this one example to recommend to you that uniform obedience which is due from you to the commands of that Church wherein you were born, which, of all others in the Christian world, hath most adhered to the Universal Church of the first and purest ages, which is known to have censured and turned out *Aerius* for this (among other Heresies) his opposing and condemning the Festivals of the Church. The usefulness and advantages of which I shall now no farther enlarge to recommend unto you.

S. *I thank you for what I have, and have no reason to quarrel the length of it.*

You have now gone through that whole work with convenient brevity, the explaining all the Commandments *to me, (save only those three which you bid me expect ere long in your farther progress) both those mentioned by* Christ, *and those omitted by him, and so you have obliged me beyond your first undertaking. I shall now detain you no longer, but desire you to proceed to the next, the sixth Chapter of Saint* Matthew, *in that Sermon on the Mount, and consider what first we shall fall upon.*

LIB. III.

S. *What is the first general aim or design of this next part of the Sermon, beginning* Chap. 6?

Sect. I. *Three parts of divine Worship.*

C. The regulating of three Christian duties, *Almsgiving*, *Prayer* and *Fasting*. Three so necessary considerable offices of a Christian, that learned Divines have resolved them to be the three special Christian Sacrifices or [a] acts of divine worship: the first out of our Estates, the second of our Souls, the third from our Bodies; which are the three principal parts of a man, every one therefore obliged to pay its tribute of acknowledgment to the Creator.

[a] Aquin. 2. 2. qu. 85. art. 3. ad 2. *Tria fundamenta legis*, say the *Arabians*, see *Abul Faraii de Arab. Mor.* p. 29. *Partes fidei*, saith *Al Gezal*, Foundations of the Law, and sorts of Faith.

S. *I shall then presume them worthy of our distinct survey, and to that purpose pitch upon that first which I see first placed, that of* Almsgiving, *and expect what method you will propose to me as most proper to give me a clear sight of what* Christ *hath thought fit to represent to me concerning it.*

Of Almsgiving.

C. I shall reduce it summarily to these two heads. 1. A duty supposed; 2. A caution interposed for the regulation of this duty.

S. *What mean you by the* duty supposed?

C. I mean this, that the duty of Almsgiving here mentioned, is not so much here commanded by Christ, as presumed and supposed, as a duty that both the Law of Nature and of *Moses* required of all men (Heathens and Jews) before, and therefore need not to be commanded by Christ, but only to be thus honourably mentioned by him as a duty that he meant not to evacuate, but confirm; so far,

that he that would not obſerve it ſhould be unworthy the title of a Chriſtian, nay of a Jew or Heathen man, all Laws ſo ſtrictly exacting it of him. Thus you ſhall find it mentioned with the other two, *Faſting* and *Prayer*, by *Raphael* the Angel, *Tob.* 12. 8. as the three prime Branches of Piety or Goodneſs accepted and rewarded by God.

S. *The duty being ſo neceſſary, and yet only toucht on or named here, you may pleaſe a little to explain it to me.*

C. I will, by telling you, 1. That it is the ſame duty (expreſt by the ſame word) that Mercifulneſs is in the fifth Beatitude: but then 2. That it ſeems here to be reſtrained to that one kind of mercifulneſs which conſiſts in giving, and that peculiarly of relief corporal to them that want it; and therefore it will not be pertinent in this place to ſpeak to you of any branch of Mercifulneſs, but of that which we ordinarily call *Giving of Alms.*

S. *What do you think fit to tell me of that?*

C. Only theſe two things, as moſt proper for your direction in this duty: the firſt, for the ſubſtance of the duty; the ſecond, for the moſt convenient manner of performing it.

S. *What for the* ſubſtance *of the duty?*

C. That I am bound by all Laws of Nature, of *Moſes*, of Chriſt, as God hath enabled me, to relieve thoſe that are in want, the hungry, the naked, the fatherleſs and widow, and others deſtitute of worldly ſuccour, the doing of which is called [b] *Pure Religion*, or *Worſhip*, by Saint *James*, chap. 1. 27.

[b] καθαρὰ θρησκεία.

The manner of performing it.

S. *What directions have you for the moſt convenient* manner *of performing it?*

C. This is one eſpecially (which Saint *Paul*, 1 *Cor.* 16. 2. hath given me occaſion to think on) that every rich man, or thriving man, every one that hath either conſtant revenue or profitable trade, ſhould lay by him in ſtore, as God proſpereth him, for the uſe of the poor; dedicating yearly, or monthly, or weekly, ſuch or ſuch a proportion for this purpoſe, and ſeparating it from the reſt of the heap that it may be ready for ſuch uſes as the providence of God ſhall offer to us.

S. *How will this beſt be done?*

C. By a yearly valuation of my in-come, whether of Rents, or Gains by trading, and ſetting a part a reaſonable proportion of that, and then dividing that groſs proportion into as many parts as there be weeks in the year, and then every Lord's day (according to the Apoſtles direction) or otherwiſe weekly, to put into the poor man's bag, or box, or pocket, ſuch a juſt proportion, which from that time I am to account of as none of mine, but the poors propriety, which I cannot take from them again but by ſtealth, that I ſay not Sacrilege. This way of ſetting apart before-hand will be very uſeful both for the reſiſting of covetous thoughts, which will be apt ſtill to intercurr, when objects of Charity offer themſelves; and alſo for the having proviſion ready at hand, to give when we would be willing to give, which otherwiſe would ſometimes be wanting; and the doing this thus weekly, will make the ſum thus parted with ſo inſenſible, that we ſhall not miſs out of our eſtates what is thus conſecrated.

S. *But I pray what proportion yearly ſhould I thus deſign?*

The proportion of it.

C. The exact proportion or *quotum* I cannot preſcribe you, the Scripture having defined nothing in it, but (by commending liberality, and voluntary and chearful giving) rather intimating that there is no ſet proportion to be defined, but to be left to every man's own breaſt how to proportion his free-will offering. For although one place there be that ſeems to require all to be ſet apart for this purpoſe that comes in by way of gain from God's proſpering hand, to wit, that juſt now mentioned, 1 *Cor.* 16. 2. where he appoints that every one ſet apart [c] *treaſuring up whatſoever he hath gained*, or *thrived*, or *been proſpered*, (not, as we render it, *as God hath proſpered him*; for it is not [d] *as*] but [e] *whatſoever*]) yet it appears that that was in a peculiar caſe at that time, for the relieving the poor Chriſtians at *Jeruſalem*, who were ſo many, and ſo few to relieve them then, that all that could be ſpared was little enough for the turn; and therefore that can no more make a rule for all other times (unleſs when there is the like occaſion and conjuncture of circumſtances) than the having all common then, and bringing all to the Apoſtles feet, will be exemplary to us. I ſhall only, for your better direction, give you the beſt light I can, which will be by theſe gradations. 1. That the Jews, the people of God, were bound by the Law to ſet apart the Tenth of all their encreaſe every third year for the uſe of the poor. Every year you know the tithe was paid to the Levites; and when that was done, then another tithe was to be ſet apart, which for two years was to be eaten in a feſtival manner at *Jeruſalem*, and the third year it was for the fatherleſs and widow, *i. e.* for the poor, whoſe portion conſequently was (in effect) a thirtieth part yearly of their encreaſe; for to that proportion (you know) a tenth part every third year being diſtributed into three parts, and each of thoſe three aſſign'd to each year, will amount. But then 2. other commands there were given to thoſe Jews concerning the poor, as of permitting them to leaſe in the field, lending them without uſe, reſtoring the pledge before night, and other the like, and all this a Jew was bound to; he ſinn'd againſt the Law if he did it not. This was his [f] *righteouſneſs*, Deut. 24. 13. *i. e.* that degree of mercy which the Law required of him; in ſtead of which the Greek Tranſlators uſe a word ſignifying [g] *Alms* or *Pity*, the ſame which is in this place of Chriſt's Sermon: (and it is farther obſervable, that in this place ſome very ancient copies in ſtead of this word which ſignifies *Alms*, have another word ſignifying [h] *righteouſneſs*) all which ſignifies ſome degrees of Almſgiving to be required by the Law, without performance of which a Jew cannot be accounted righteous: And ſuch were thoſe third years tithings, and the reſt forementioned. But then 3. beſides this * Righteouſneſs of the Jew, or that proportion required to his being a righteous Jew, there was another higher degree among them, called [k] Mercy, or Goodneſs, or Bounty, or Charity, which, ſay their Interpreters, is more than righteouſneſs, [l] exceſs or abundance of righteouſneſs. Thus ſhall you ſee thoſe two words many times put together, not as equivalent, but one an higher degree than the other; *Dan.* 4. 27. *Break off thy ſins by* [m] *righteouſneſs, and thine iniquities by ſhewing* [n] *mercy to the poor*; the mercy ſet laſt, as being higheſt. So *Micah* 6. 8. *What doth the Lord require of thee, but to do* [o] *juſtice, and*

[c] θησαυρίζων ὅ,τι ἂν εὐοδῶται.
[d] ὡς
[e] ὅ,τι ἄν.
[f] צדקה:
[g] ἐλεημοσύνη
[h] δικαιοσύνην
* צדקה
[k] חסד
[l] יותרון
הטובה
Kimchi.
[m] צדקה
[n] חסד
[o] צדקה:

and love ° *mercy?* So when the compariſon is made by the Apoſtle between a P Righteous man and a * good man, *Rom.* 5. 7. the good man is this merciful-minded man, which far exceedeth the other. By which you ſee that he that will be a good, a pious, a merciful Jew, he muſt exceed thoſe terms which by the Law the Jew was bound to, *i. e.* muſt allow to pious uſes much more than the thirtieth part of his encreaſe every year. And this Law and direction being by God himſelf given to his own people the Jews, may deſerve ſo far to be conſidered by us, as it is an evidence of God's opinion or judgment then to that his own people. But then 4. though this be not a Law now binding us, as not given to us; yet being a Law of charity and mercy to my poor Neighbour, which for the ſubſtance of it is an eternal law of Nature, there will be ſmall reaſon for a Chriſtian to think himſelf diſengaged from that *quotum* or proportion which even the Jews (who were conſidered as in a ſtate of imperfection) were obliged to: ſave onely that this is now left to their own freedom which was before commanded; and it were ſhame that a Chriſtian thus left to his own freedom, ſhould come ſhort of what a Jew was brought to by conſtraint. But 5. on the contrary ſide, the more perfect law of Chriſt, and the more grace, and the more light (brought into the world by him) requiring higher perfection now, than before by law was required, (ſo that *except our righteouſneſs exceed* theirs, *we ſhall not enter the Kingdom of Heaven,*) may very juſtly be deemed to require a greater proportion of us now in works of mercy than of them was then expected. From whence it will be conſequent; 6. That as our r righteouſneſs muſt exceed their righteouſneſs, ſo our * mercy their mercy: *i. e.* that to be a righteous Chriſtian, (*i. e.* ſuch an one as performs what the law of Chriſt requires of him for Alms-giving) it is neceſſary to ſet apart much more than a yearly thirtieth of his revenue or encreaſe; and to be a merciful or benign or pious Chriſtian, much more again than that is neceſſary. But then 7. the Chriſtian (as alſo the Jewiſh) law in this matter doth not ſo conſiſt in an indiviſible point, as that any ſet proportion can be defined, lower than which would be the ſin of Parſimony, and higher than which the ſin of Prodigality; but is allowed its latitude, within which it may move higher or lower without ſin: yet ſo, as it may on one ſide be ſo low, that it will be unchriſtian love of money; and on the other ſide ſo high, (if it be to the cauſleſs neglecting and expoſing his own children and family) that it may be wretchleſs prodigality: Which two extremes being by the help of the former directions avoided, the rule will be, That the more liberal we are to them that want, or the more liberal in ſetting apart for them, to provide them a plentiful patrimony, the more acceptable it will be in the ſight of God, and the more liberally rewarded; according to that of the Apoſtle, 2 *Cor.* 9. 6. *He that ſoweth bountifully, ſhall reap bountifully.* By which, I conceive, is meant not only God's abundant retributions of glory in another world, but even his payments of t temporal plenty and bleſſings here, to thoſe who have been willing to make that Chriſtian uſe of that earthly talent committed to their Stewarding.

° חסד
P δίκαιος
* ἀγαθὸς
r צדקה
* חסד
t Μνησθεὶς ἡ παῖς σώζοι πατρώιον ὅτι-

κον Φερσέμβῳ, ὃς δ πλεῖτ@ ἀέξεται ἐν μεγάροισι· Ῥᾳ Ν κεν πλείοισι πόρῃ Ζεὺς ἄφθιτον ὄλβον, Heſiod. l. 1. *Non memini me legere malâ morte mortuum, qui liberaliter opera charitatis exercuit.* Hier.

S. *Do you believe that liberality to the poor is likely to receive any ſuch reward in this life? The reaſon of my Queſtion is, becauſe if there were any ground for the Affirmative, I ſhould conceive it a moſt convincing motive to all, even the moſt worldly-minded men, to* caſt their bread *thus* upon the waters, *if it ſhould return to them again in this life with increaſe. Liberality being a thing pleaſant and delightful even to fleſh and blood, to the moſt covetous-minded man; and nothing imaginable to deterr any from the practice of ſo lovely a duty, were it not for the fear of diminiſhing our ſtore, or bringing our ſelves to want by that means. I ſhall therefore in great earneſt deſire to hear your opinion in that point.*

C. I make no doubt of this truth, That mercifulneſs and Chriſtian liberality is the ſureſt way to plenty and contentment in this life; ſo far from ever being a * means of impoveriſhing any, that it is moſt conſtantly (when exerciſed as it ought) † a means of enriching them. And that you may not think this a phancy or ſpeculation or groundleſs confidence in me, I ſhall tell you, that I conceive there is not any one thing (temporal) for which there are ſo many clear evident promiſes in the Scripture, as this. For the giving you ground of Faith in this; I will name you ſome. And a foundation I ſhall lay, *Deut.* 26. 11. where there is by God preſcribed a form of prayer to be uſed by him that hath made an end of tithing all the tithe of his increaſe the third year, *i. e.* that, beſides the Levites and Feſtival tithing, hath alſo paid the poor their patrimony, (as appears by the reſt of the Verſe, and which till it be done, the third year tithing is not made an end of.) And the form preſcribed gives the man that hath ſo done, liberty and priviledge of claim and challenge to all kind of earthly bleſſings, Verſe 13. *Then thou ſhalt ſay before the Lord thy God, I have given to the ſtranger, to the fatherleſs,* &c. and thereupon, Verſe 15. *Look down from Heaven, and bleſs thy people Iſrael, and the Land which thou haſt given us, a Land flowing with Milk and Honey.* The mention of the Milk and Honey, and affluence, is an interpretation what that bleſſing is which is there prayed for ſo confidently, to wit, temporal plenty here: And God's preſcribing this form of prayer is argument enough that God will grant it to him, *i. e.* to every one that having performed this condition, doth humbly in prayer require the performance of ſuch promiſe. Only by the way, theſe two things muſt go together inſeparably, performance of the condition, and then prayer to God. According to that of the blind man in the Goſpel, that whoſoever is a *worſhipper of God, and doth his will, him he heareth.* Other places fit to be ſuperſtructed on this you have in the Pſalms of *David*, Pſalm 41. 1. *Bleſſed is he that conſidereth the poor and needy*, and what kind of bleſſing this is, appears by the context, *The Lord will deliver him, preſerve him, keep him alive, bleſs him on the earth,* &c. And beſides others, one remarkable place that Book affords, Pſalm 37. 25. *I have been young, and now am old; yet ſaw I never the righteous forſaken, nor his ſeed begging bread.* What is meant by the righteous there, will be evident, if you adviſe with Verſe 21. *The righ-*

Mercifulneſs rewarded with temporal plenty.

* Τίς ὃν τῷ μεταδιδόναι τοῖς πένησι ἠλάττωται πένης; Who was ever made poor by bounty to his neighbours? *Julian in fragm. p.* 572.

† Ἀποσώζει μοι τέλειον ὁ κλῆρ@ τὸ τίτθης ἐκ χώμῳ@ ὑπ' ἄλλων βιαίως, ἐκ βεγχίων ὧν οὐκ ἔχον ἀναλίσκοντι τοῖς νομίμοις. His patrimony which was violently detained from him, was yet preſerved intire to him upon his liberality to them that wanted, out of the ſmall

poſſeſſions which he had, *Ib. Appellatur illud quod in pauperes erogatur Zacat, quoniam opes adauget*; *the Arabick word for Alms is taken from hence, that Alms encreaſeth wealth,* ſaith the *Scholiaſt* on their *Ritual*: *Et quoniam erogatio ejus benedictionem conciliat opibus, Becauſe the giving Alms brings Gods bleſſing on Wealth,* ſaith *Al. Bidawius.* According to that of the *Alcoran*, *Similes ſunt illi qui opes ſuas erogant in via Dei, grano quod ſeptem ſpicas germinavit, They which lay out their wealth in the way of God, are like a grain that bringeth forth ſeven ſtalks.* And ſo ſaith *Ebnol Kaſſai, Al Zacato,* i. e. *Alms, juxta nominis ſignificationem denotat incrementum*; *at ex uſu legis erogationum ratæ portionis opum è facultatibus deſignatis, The word litterally ſignifies Increaſe*; *but in the uſe of the Law, the giving a ſet portion of every mans wealth out of that which he hath.*

teous sheweth mercy and giveth; and Ver. 26. *The righteous is ever* (or *all the day*) *merciful and lendeth.* His liberality is supposed such and so continual (*all the day merciful*) that one would think it enough to exhaust his patrimony, to bring him, at least his posterity, to want and beggery; and yet in all *David*'s observation, he had found by experience (so far as to make an Aphorism of it) that none were ever brought to want by that means: But, as it follows for confirmation of this truth, Ver. 26. *His seed is blessed*; his posterity are as prosperous as if their Father had digged through the Mine into Hell (where the Poets thought [a] riches dwelt) to fetch out treasure for them. Where although the rule do not necessarily hold so far, that no other means can make a merciful man poor, (for perhaps negligence, suretiship, some other sin lived in, and bringing a curse upon him, may; and mercifulness not prove antidote sufficient to secure him against all other poison) yet thus far it doth in *David*'s observation hold. 1. That that never brings any man to want; (whatever else may, that will not.) 2. That it is an ordinary means to help to more wealth, to enrich the posterity, to bestow temporal blessings on them: a benign favourable influence this hath upon all that belongs to him. And this (which *David* mentions as an Aphorism of his own observation) I believe I might extend to all ages, and challenge any Historian of past, or Observator of present times, to give one instance (out of his knowledge to the contrary) of any Christian Almsgiver that ever brought himself or his posterity to want (nay, that did not thrive and prosper the better) by that means. Some notable examples I have known in my time for the confirming what I now say, but could never yet hear of any to the contrary. To these I shall add a few places of testimony also out of the Proverbs of *Solomon*, 11. 24. *There is that scattereth, and yet encreaseth, i. e.* One sort of scatterers there is that encreaseth by scattering; and there is no cause of doubt but that the merciful is this kind of scatterer, which farther appears by the opposition in the rest of the Verse, *There is that withholdeth more than is meet, and it tendeth to poverty.* It is indeed a strange thing that scattering should be a means of encreasing, (giving, of having) and withholding, of poverty, (keeping, of not having:) but when it is considered how all temporal plenty is of God's disposing, how by his blessing and *opening his hand all things are filled* with plenteousness, and by his withdrawing his auspicious influence all things become improsperous, moulder and crumble into nothing, there will be small difficulty in believing God's promise for such kind of difficulties as these. Besides, the following Verse makes it farther clear that it belongs to this matter. Verse 25. *The liberal soul shall be made fat, and he that watereth shall be watered also himself.* And selling of corn being an act of liberality, Verse 26. in opposition to him that withholdeth it, it follows, *Blessing shall be upon his head:* and Verse 28. *The righteous, i. e.* the liberal again, (as opposite to him that trusteth in riches) *shall flourish as a branch*, i. e. be very prosperous. And although it follow in the last Verse, *That the righteous shall be recompenced on the earth, i. e.* meet with afflictions and punishments here; yet is that common state of good men reconcileable with temporal blessings here, as may appear, *Mark* 10. 30. *He shall have an hundred fold more in this life, houses*, &c. but this with persecutions, the Christians portion, along with them. So again, *Prov.* 13. 22. *A good man leaveth his inheritance to his childrens children.* Where if the good man be the same that is meant by that phrase, *Rom.* 5. 7. it will be distinctly pertinent to this matter (and so the context would enforce in the following words, *and the wealth of the sinner is laid up for the just*:) but if it be a more general word, yet then also this of the merciful will be contained under it. So again, *Prov.* 14. 21. *He that hath mercy on the poor, happy is he.* So 19. 17. *He that hath pity on the poor, lendeth to the Lord:* The vulgar read it, [*lendeth unto the Lord upon use*] (as *Tobit.* 4. 9. where it is said of the liberal almsgiver, that he *layes up a good treasure for himself*, the word which we render [b] treasure, signifies a sum of money put out to use) *and that which he hath given, will he pay him again*, and (it being lent upon use) pay him with use and interest also. On occasion of which place I remember an ancient story in *Cedrenus* (how true I know not) of a *Jew*, as ancient, saith he, as King *Hezekiah*'s time, that having read this place, and weighed it, resolved to try whether God would be as good as his word, gave all that he had but two pieces of silver to the poor, and then waited and expected to see it come again; but being not presently answered in that expectation, grew angry, and went up to *Jerusalem*, to expostulate with God for cheating him by this unperformed promise. The story goes on, that he going on his way, found two men a striving, engaged in an unreconcileable quarrel, about a stone that both, walking together, had found in the way, and so had both equal right to it, but (being but one, and not capable of being divided) could not both enjoy; and therefore to make them friends, he having two pieces of silver, doth upon contract divide them betwixt the pretenders, and hath the stone in exchange for them: having it, he goes on his journey, and coming to *Jerusalem* shews it to the Goldsmith; who tells him that it was a Jewel of great value, being a stone faln and lost out of the High Priest's *Ephod*, to whom if he carried it, he should certainly receive a great reward. He did so, and accordingly it proved; the High Priest took it of him, gave him a great reward, but withal a box on the ear, bidding him Trust God the next time. The story, if true, is an instance of the matter in hand; if not, yet an embleme or picture of it. So again, *Prov.* 22. 9. *He that hath a bountiful eye shall be blessed, for he giveth of his bread to the poor.* Where the Affirmative promise is most punctual, and the reason to confirm it most remarkable, being but the repetition of the thing it self, (as principles are fain to be proved by themselves) the bountiful-minded man shall be blessed, why? because he is bountiful, *i. e.* no other Argument is needful to prove it but this; the promise, infallible promise belonging peculiarly to such. And *Prov.* 28. 27. *He that giveth to the poor shall not lack:* a most definitive large style of promise, from whence no exception is imaginable, if we had but faith to depend upon it. And lest you should think that this referred only to the state of the Jews under the Old Testament, and belonged not at all to us Christians; you may 1. observe that these Proverbs of *Solomon* are not truths peculiar to that State, but extensive even to us Christians, and more peculiarly to faithful Christians, than to them, many of them. 2. That in the Gospel one place there is that repeats in sence one part of one of these places, that of 19. 17. [*He that giveth to the poor, lendeth to the Lord,*] to wit, *Matth.* 25. 40, 45. [*Inasmuch as ye did it to one of these, ye did it unto me.*] And then why may not the latter part belong to us also? 3. One plain promise of temporal things there is in the Gospel also to those

[a] πλοῦτος, *Pluto.*

[b] Δάνια.

thoſe that part with any of their goods for Chriſt's ſake, (and ſuch ſure are the Chriſtian Almſgivers that do it in obedience to Chriſt's Law, and charity to fellow-Chriſtians) *Matth.* 19. 29. and that in a general unlimited ſtyle, excluding all exception, *Mark* 10. 30. *There is no man that hath left houſe, or brethren,* &c. *and Lands, i. e.* worldly goods; but *he ſhall receive an hundred fold in this time* (the firſt lower Harveſt, this ſeaſon of Retributions) *Houſes,* &c. *i. e.* temporal bleſſings here, and then over and above in another world, *everlaſting life:* only with a mixture of perſecutions, as Saint *Mark* (or Saint *Peter*, who had asked the queſtion which occaſioned this Speech of Chriſt's, and whoſe *Amanuenſis* Saint *Mark* was) hath it: As before I told you that *Prov.* 11. 31. after all thoſe temporal promiſes to the Almſgiver, it is added, *He ſhall be recompenced*, or *receive his portion* of afflictions *in the earth.* By all theſe teſtimonies from the Word of God, both in the New and Old Teſtament, I conceive this doctrine as clear as any in the Scripture, That the promiſe of temporal plenty to the liberal is ſo diſtinct and infallible, that it can be no leſs than 1. a very groſs ignorance of plain Scripture not to obſerve it; and 2. an act of arrant infidelity not to believe it. Which I take to be the meaning of thoſe words, *Luke* 6. 35. *Love your enemies*, to wit, thoſe which will never repay you thoſe expreſſions of love, mentioned Verſe 34. and do *good*, and *lend* (even to them from whom you ſo little expect any retributions) [c] *diſtruſting nothing* (ſo the Greek ſignifies, *doubting, fearing, diſtruſting nothing*; as *Eccleſ.* 22. 22. [d] *fear not*, and Chap. 27. 21. *is* [e] *without hope*, and 2 *Mac.* 9. 18. [*] *deſpairing*, and in all the Bible in no other ſence but that of diſtruſt and deſpair) or making no doubt but that God will repay thee, though he to whom thou giveſt do not; at leaſt never fearing that God will ſuffer thee to be the poorer for want of that which in obedience to him, and dependence on his promiſes, is thus liberally laid out by thee. Agreeable to which is that Apoſtolical ſaying of *Barnabas* in his Epiſtle, † *Make no doubt to give, neither murmure when thou haſt given: give to every one that asketh thee* (where [h] *not doubting*] before [*giving*,] and [* *not murmuring*] after it, is a paraphraſe of the phraſe which I render † *diſtruſting nothing*, in St. *Luke*) And 3. it is a ſtrange (unreaſonable as well as) unchriſtian ſin, not to practiſe a duty which is in its own nature ſo amiable, ſo agreeable to our humour and diſpoſition as we are men, that to him that believes, and ſo reſts ſecure of this one particular [*that he ſhall not be the poorer for what he parts with on theſe terms*] there is not the leaſt objection or temptation imaginable againſt it, though even the covetous man himſelf were allowed to be the objector.

[c] μηδὲν ἀπελπίζοντες.
[d] μὴ ἀπελπίσῃς.
[e] ἀπέλπισιν.
[*] ἀπελπίσας.
† μὴ διψάσῃς δοῦναι, μηδὲ δι-δὸς γογγύσῃς· παντὶ αἰτοῦντί σε δίδου.
[h] μὴ διψάζειν.
[*] μὴ γογγύζειν.
† μηδὲν ἀπελπίζειν.

S. *I cannot but acknowledge the truth of your premiſſes, and reaſonableneſs of the concluſion from them, and only marvel what artifice the Devil hath gotten to enſnare men by, and keep them from doing that which is ſo agreeable to their humors and diſpoſitions, even as they are partakers of but ingenuous nature. God melt the heart and open the hand of the obdurate world, and teach us the due practice of it.*

I ſhall preſume you have no more neceſſary to be added to the explication of the duty here ſuppoſed [and thou when thou doeſt Alms:] *I ſhall call you from thence to the ſecond particular mentioned, the* Caution interpoſed, *and deſire to know what that is.*

C. The Caution is, *That we do not our alms to be ſeen of men*, or uſe any means in the doing of them to have glory of men, to be praiſed or commended by them. For this is an infirmity very ordinarily inſinuating it ſelf in our beſt actions, to blaſt and defame them in the eyes of God; every man being apt to deſire to be better thought of by man for the performance of this duty, eſpecially if he be an exceeder in it. Of Vain-glory.

S. *But were we not commanded before, that our* light ſhould ſhine before men? *What is that, but to do our good works ſo that men might* ſee *them?*

C. To this I ſhall anſwer, 1. By telling you that the performance of duties to God may be either publick, or private; the one in the Congregation, the other in the Cloſet: the former ought to be as publick as it may, that ſo it might be more exemplary, and tend more to the glorifying of God; and to that the ſhining of our light belongs: the ſecond, as private as it may, to approve our ſelves the more to God, and to demonſtrate that it is only our love and obedience to him, and not our deſire of the praiſe of men, that moves us to do what we do; and to this ſecond ſort of performances this Caution here pertains. And though this be more illuſtriouſly obſervable in the two following duties of Prayer and Faſting, yet will it hold in ſome meaſure in this alſo; the Church being deſigned for giving alſo, and every Chriſtian anciently wont to bring ſomewhat to the Corban every time he came to Church, a remainder of which cuſtom we have ſtill in the offertory at the Sacrament. Letting our light ſhine before men.

2. That there is great difference betwixt *doing our good works ſo that men may ſee them*, and *doing them to be ſeen of men*; and again, between *doing them ſo before men that they may ſee, and glorifie our Father in Heaven*, and *that we may have glory of men.* The former, if it have not the latter to blaſt it, (and if it be truly ſo, it excludes the latter) is only a Chriſtian charitable care that my good actions may be exemplary to others: the ſecond that they may be matter of reputation to my ſelf. The former reſpects only God's glory, and not mine own; the ſecond mine own vain aery credit here, and not (or more than) the praiſe or glory of God. The firſt is a moſt divine Chriſtian act, an expreſſion of great love of God, and deſire to propagate his Kingdom, of great love of my Brother, and deſire to make all others as good as my ſelf, by ſetting them ſuch Copies on purpoſe to tranſcribe: the ſecond is an evidence of great paſſion and ſelf love, and impatience of having our reward put off to ſo long a date as the reverſion in another world. And conſequently theſe two are very different, and accordingly are moſt diverſly rewarded: The firſt with a great degree of glory, for the glory we have brought to God's name; the ſecond ſo odious in the ſight of God, that even our almſgiving, or beſt actions are eaten through by this means (and ſmitten as the gourd with the worm) and come to nothing, find no reward in another world; the little reputation gotten here and affected by us, muſt ſerve our turns as the only reward we are to hope for: which ſhews the unhappineſs and folly of this ſin of vain-glory, it robs us of all the reward that our moſt eſteemable, acceptable free-will-offerings, our works of mercy, can hope for from God.

S. *Is this deſire to be ſeen, and have glory of men, a ſin, or no?*

C. I muſt return anſwer by theſe degrees. Firſt, That that part of our conſtitution that is ſo pleaſed with a little, mere, empty, vain blaſt of air, which ſignifies ſo little when had, and (like the

the wind) is ſoon and cauſeleſly changed into the contrary, is a very pitiful piece of carnality; and if it be indulged to immoderately, or if it thrive ſo well in us as to become the principal or chief mover in any, eſpecially in our beſt performances, it is then a ſinful and very culpable piece of us, not only depriving us of all other reward which awaits good actions, but * withal cheating the ſoul, and poſſeſſing it with that which is directly contrary to that love of God, and value of his acceptance, which is neceſſary to denominate the beſt things good. Secondly, from this it follows, that any one who is ſtrongly enclined to this, is obliged not only to pray againſt it, but to deſign ways to mortifie it; not only by conſidering the huge vanity and withal danger of it, but by repreſſing deſires of it, repelling injections of ſuch fancies, giving them no ſtay upon the Soul, and working ſome acts of revenge, at leaſt ſelf-denials, in this kind: as ſometimes in ſome indifferent things (which might lawfully be done, but yet have no kind of goodneſs in them, nor are viſibly ordinable to any good end) to deny himſelf the doing or ſaying them, if that principle of vain-glory ſuggeſt them, and nothing elſe, (eſpecially if that ſuggeſt them any thing ſtrongly;) and in brief, having and keeping a ſtrong guard over this weak part, that it neither cauſe danger, nor betray to loſing the reward. Thirdly, that the love of God, the value of his acceptance, and the comfort of a good conſcience, ought to be ſet up againſt this uſurper, and made the principle of all thoſe actions which have any thing of good in them; and that thoſe things of which theſe do not, or cannot own to be the principles, be not reflected on as things of any weight, or that add any thing of worth to any man, nor (if they may be as a diverſion innocently taken in) purſued with any deſign for their own, or that acquiſitions ſake, ſave only as that may advance a ſuperiour end. This being ſaid on one ſide, I conceive it perfectly lawful on the other ſide. Firſt, to look on a good reputation as on a good eſtate, *i. e.* as a very proper engine to do good with, and that neither to be prodigally miſ-ſpent, nor poſſeſt unprofitably. And if the heart be ſincere (and not as it is ordinary in covetous perſons, that pretend to wiſh for great eſtates only to do more good, but at preſent do little good with what they have; and when they get more, are forced to diſcern and diſcover the fallacy they had put upon themſelves) and if the ways of acquiring it be direct, ſuch as God may be moſt likely to proſper, *i. e.* doing things ſubſtantially, and not only ſuperficially good, (not uſing of tricks and deceits or *fucus*'s to ſet out beauty, but a perfect wholeſom diet, yet not excluding the addition of faſhionable ornaments, ſuch are wit, chearfulneſs of diſcourſe, &c.) and then deſigning this acquiſition (thus regularly gotten) only to pious uſes, the glory of God, the benefit of others, and the man's own living as profitably as he can, fruit to his account; If, I ſay, theſe Cautions be taken in, I conceive it very lawful both to enjoy, and to acquire, and ſeek a good reputation: whereas to do this either for it ſelf alone, abſtractedly from ſuch explicite deſign, or in a ſuperior degree for that, than for t'other nobler end, or immoderately and intemperately and with tranſportation for that; this makes it preſently ceaſe to be ſo.

* πρὸς ὄνησιν τοῦ δαυμαδίνται ἢ μαλακίαν τῆ τόνῳ τ' ἀρετῆς ἐιωδὲν ὑποχαλᾶν. Photius ep. 32.

Deſire of a good reputation lawful in ſome caſe.

So alſo the being pleaſed with it.

Secondly, the being pleaſed with this, when it comes (either deſigned or not deſigned) in order to, or in proportion with this good end, is perfectly lawful: and it will be judged whether it be ſo or no, by this; whether the deſign of the good end be as intenſe as this pleaſure is (I ſay not ſo ſenſibly delightful, but as conſtantly and induſtriouſly purſued as this is ſenſibly delightful) or whether the contrary be diſcernible upon ſtrict ſurvey and entire judging.

The ſafeſt courſe.

Thirdly, the good work being ſecured upon the right or good principle, and reputation being either not ſought at all, or ſought explicitely (or habitually) in order to ſome real good (living the more profitably, &c.) if praiſe do come in to the actor, (as many times earthly bleſſings do, *Matth.* 6. 33.) I conceive it may be taſted (ſimply as it is ſuch) as a refreſhment to the weary, and encouragement to the labourer (among the reſt of God's bleſſings) and ſo as Wine moderately uſed, if it do cauſe ſome gladneſs in the heart, I cannot lay guilt on that. But the ſafeſt courſe is (eſpecially where the inclination is naturally ſuch as makes the utmoſt caution neceſſary) before I deliberately taſte this pleaſant liquor, to conſider to what good uſe of mine or others it tends; and, if I find to none, to abſtain from ſipping of ſuch delicacies. But if any ſuch uſe be (not only poſſible, for almoſt every thing is ſo, but alſo) viſible, or but ſtrongly probable, I know not that that ſhould be neglected, or not purſued, only to deny my ſelf that praiſe which I foreſee, if I taſte, will be pleaſant to me. Laſtly, in performing of things in themſelves pious, or directly ordinable to a pious end, if I either deſire or feel pleaſure from praiſe, it will be eaſie enough to judge (and to keep my ſelf from deceit in judging) whether I do ſo (either wholly or immoderately) for my own praiſes ſake, or elſe for the good that is in the action, or that may come from the praiſe, and only ſecondarily and moderately (and in ſubordination to that) for the pleaſure of praiſe to my ſelf. And that is the matter in hand; and therefore every man is left to paſs judgment on himſelf, and to take care that he do not loſe the ſubſtance for a wretched ſhadow, or (worſe than ſo) * weaken that pretious flame within him, the love of God (which ſeldom wants allays, but rather all acts of heightning it) by indulging to a little falſe love of himſelf in his ſenſual capacity.

* Δι' ἐπαινῶν τὸ γλυκὺ τῶν χρὴ θεὸν πόνων πέφυκεν ὁπικαταβρίζειν, καὶ τ' σπρκὸς ἀναζωπυροῦνται ἡδοναί. Phot. ep. 32.

S. *But if it be lawful to receive and taſte the pleaſure of praiſe, why is it not lawful to deſire or deſign it?*

Deſigning of praiſe differs much from receiving or taſting it.

C. I anſwer, That the deſigning of praiſe differs much from the receiving or taſting it. The end deſigned in any action is one of thoſe things, which (as being eſſential to the action) gives it the denomination; which of any thing that is but accidental or extrinſecal, cannot be ſaid. From hence it follows (to this matter of the praiſe of men) that in a ſpiritual action to deſign the praiſe of men, though but as a ſubordinate end, is to mix a ſecular with a ſpiritual work, and that will defile it, and maim it, and rob it of the reward. But if it be deſigned as the principal end, then firſt it makes it ceaſe to be ſpiritual or Chriſtian, (and the reaſon is clear, for to its being ſo, ſpiritual, or vertuous in the Chriſtian ſence, † all muſt concur, the principal or motive, and the end or deſign muſt be Chriſtian and ſpiritual; and if either of thoſe be wanting, it is not vertuous: And if it be thus principally deſigned to the praiſe of men, not of God, then that neceſſary end is ſomewhat, and that ſomewhat is wanting;) and ſecondly, it renders the whole action conſidered together a groſs diſſimulation or hypocriſie, and an interpretative impiety, in preferring the praiſe of men before

† Bonum eſt ex cauſa integra.

before the acceptance of God, which is directly contrary to all justice and duty; and thirdly, a sacriledge, in prostituting a sacred thing to so vile uses. So likewise, when the action is matter of duty, and so necessary, as being under precept, it is also necessary that it be done principally in obedience to God's precept: and if it be not so, but either only or principally for the praise of men, then still it is, 1. no obedience to God; and 2. if it be abstaining in matter of a negative precept, it is an evidence that the person more fears the dis-reputation of men than the displeasure of God; or if it be in matter of affirmative precept, it is an argument and testimony again, that he will do more for the praise of men than to approve his obedience to God; or if it be, though not principally, yet subordinately, for the praise of men, then again it is a maim in that obedience. Only in indifferent actions, if we design them to that praise that is proportionable to them, and do that not immoderately, but in such a temper of appetite as is regular, and answerable to the lawful desires of any other worldly blessing (for that the praise of men is such, appears by its being proposed as a reward in Scripture; and that it is not only the advantageousness of it to us, in respect of the benefiting others by that means, either by our authority or example, that makes it a blessing, appears from hence, because it is a blessing (and the contrary a curse) even after death, when, as we have received our reward in Heaven, so we cease to be capable of making use of our authority to the edifying of others) then there is not from either of the two former considerations any such obliquity to denominate it a crime, though yet there is enough to keep down that which, by having designed a good end, might from Indifferent have grown Vertuous, from advancing to that dignity, to continue it in that lower Form or Classis of Indifferents, as a kind of Non-proficients or unprofitable servants, which with good usage might have improved or ascended higher, but have neglected to do so.

But now on the other side, for the coming in of praise undesigned in any of all these, it is but accidental to the person or action, and so that of which I am no way guilty (as, of what I have designed I clearly am:) and being not culpable in the coming of it in, and being a blessing of God in it self, certainly to reject a blessing of God's cannot be my duty; but, on the contrary, to look upon it as a blessing of God's, a performance of some part of his promise to his servants, and a testimony to their performances; and so to bless and praise him for it, is strictly and absolutely a duty. And as it is a duty so to acknowledge and bless God for it; so simply to taste it as it is, *i. e.* as a blessing of the earth, sent me by God's providence, and to enjoy it as such, with that pleasure and thanksgiving which is proportionable to it, is no irregularity, and so no fault in me; nor is in this case made such by any, either ill or secular principle, or design, motive, or end; for it is supposed that these are both spiritual and Christian. In brief, it must be resolved in every action, that that which is merely accidental (as the consequents or shadows) must be solemnly distinguished from that which is essential (as the motive and end are) that which is merely extrinsecal from that which is intrinsick, and so consequently must be done here; and if it be, this difficulty is answered.

Praise of men considered as a temptation to inordinate pleasure.

S. *But what if the praise of men, that comes in to me, tempt me to immoderate and excessive pleasure and transportation: may I do or say that which will probably bring me that praise, and with it that temptation?*

C. In that case as I foresee, so I must fortifie my self against that temptation, and either wholly deny my self liberty to take that pleasure, or take special care to moderate it; and if that prove successful to me, or till it prove unsuccessful, it is clear I am not bound to abstain from that action upon that objection only.

S. *But what if having formerly and frequently had this warning against this temptation, and having been thus fortified, I have yet constantly been foiled as oft as I have met with the temptation, and so judging by my own experience, have no reason to hope the contrary if I am again so tempted: am I not then bound to abstain from that action, whatever it be, which will probably bring in that praise, which will certainly bring that temptation?*

Three sorts of actions considerable in this matter.

C. I answer, that in this case the matter of the action is to be considered, and supposing that not to be bad or sinful, (for then there is no question but I am bound to abstain from it, without the addition of this farther charge against it) it may then again be of three sorts: either first, indifferent, under no precept or prohibition; or secondly, necessary, under precept, and so matter of duty; or thirdly, that which is neither of these, neither indifferent, nor yet necessary, but yet vertuous and excellent, more than is required by strict duty, and so better, and that to which God promises reward.

Indifferent.

S. *What if it be indifferent, neither ill, if it be not done, nor better, if it be?*

C. Then there is no question but the foresight of the danger and weakness ought to restrain me from that indifferent action.

Commanded.

S. *What if it be under precept?*

C. These precepts commanding such or such actions are to be supposed Affirmative precepts, which therefore do not binde * to do them always. And if it be indifferent whether it be done at this time, or no, *i. e.* neither commanded to be done at this time, nor better to be done at this time, then supposing some other season to be less obnoxious to the temptation, I am to abstain now and do it then. As in case it be in all respects indifferent whether I pray or give an alms now, or at another time, I am to chuse that time wherein I foresee least of that danger from that temptation.

* *Ad semper.*

S. *But what if it be at a time when it cannot be neglected without some breach of duty, as an act of Affirmative precept may by some concurrence of circumstances become duty at some one time; must this danger deterr me then?*

C. No, it must not, for that were actually to sin, to avoid the danger of possible or probable sinning.

S. *But what if the action be not necessary at that time,* i. e. *not under precept, but yet of that nature, that the more frequent it be the better it is, as whatsoever number of hours of daily prayer be affirmed or supposed the Christian's duty, if it be yet another hour beyond the former, (that intercepting no other business,*

buſineſs, to which I am obliged by ſtrict duty or charity) what is then to be affirmed?

Better. *C.* This falls into the third ſort of things at firſt enumerated, thoſe that are better, but not neceſſary; excellent, or rewardable, but not under precept. And of them the difficulty is greateſt; becauſe, as there is not particular precept to make the doing of them neceſſary, ſo there is not ſimple indifferency to make the omitting them as good as the doing of them. But yet the reſolution may be this, That though I am not bound in that caſe to do that excellent thing, (for, by its being not neceſſary, but excellent, that is ſuppoſed) yet I may lawfully do it, if the advantage that is in my view, to the glory of God, the good of my brother, *&c.* be above the proportion of the danger of falling into ſin, that I incurr by attempting it.

S. But what if the danger be greater or more viſible than the advantage is?

C. Then to him that apprehends it ſo, it is not lawful.

S. But what if the danger and advantage be equal, or apprehended to be ſo?

C. Then from that equal balancing of their circumſtances, nothing can be defined as yet; but then ſome other circumſtance may be conſiderable, and direct me to define it lawful to do that excellent thing, which is thus ſuppoſed to be in the even poiſe betwixt the advantage and the danger. For then, firſt, the conſideration that it is beſt in it ſelf, will incline to make it lawful, and nothing hinder it to be ſo: For as, when there is neither danger on one ſide, nor advantage on the other, that which is beſt, is lawful certainly; ſo in reaſon it is to continue, when, as there is addition of danger, ſo there is of advantage proportionable. But then, ſecondly, there is another circumſtance which makes the difference conſiderable. For he that doth that better action in order to that advantageous end, prudently and induſtriouſly, is accepted by God according to his intention and endeavour, though it fall out that that advantage do not follow; and ſo though that advantage be not certain, the vertue, and acceptableneſs, and reward of his action is certain: whereas on the other ſide, as the falling by that tentation is not certain in it ſelf, ſo it is far from being at all intended by me, but all fortifications made uſe of by me to the contrary, and ſo further ſome matter of hope left, that though I have hitherto conſtantly faln, yet I ſhall not now be ſo weak or unhappy. And thirdly if I do fall, yet there being nothing of my choice, at leaſt deliberate choice, or intention in that, (but only a treachery of ſome weak part of fleſh about me, which againſt my deliberate will, and my Prayers to God, and faithful endeavour, betrays me to it) I ſhall hope this will paſs for an humane frailty, if I do ſo fall: and the exceſs of the charity or love of God, and zeal to advance his glory, will be able to cover ſuch a ſin as this; as the Martyrs conſtancy and perſeverance in confeſſing the Faith of Chriſt, did cover ſome greater ſins, *viz.* killing themſelves, rather than they would have any villany committed upon them.

S. But will not my foreſight of that danger oblige me to prevent or avoid it? and if I do not ſo, will not that ſin become deliberate and voluntary to me, if I deliberately and voluntarily venture my ſelf into that temptation?

C. In the preſent caſe, I do not voluntarily venture my ſelf into that danger, as *voluntary* ſignifies that which I do either upon the free motion of my own will, or upon ſome carnal end or motive of my own, (as it would be, if either the thing deſigned by me were not better, or not lawful:) for it is clear, I venture the hazard only in intuition of ſome good to others, or of ſomewhat otherwiſe tending to the glory of God; and were it not for that, I would not venture it. And ſecondly, though I venture deliberately the poſſible, nay, probable, danger of falling; yet I do alſo deliberately and induſtriouſly fortifie my ſelf that I may not fall, and that is matter of ſome hope that I may eſcape. And if ſtill, through humility and fear and caution, I do not hope it actually; then though it be lawful for me, nay, perhaps better, to abſtain from that better upon that fear, becauſe that fear proceeds from one exceſs of love, (and every exceſs of love to God denominates the action better) yet if it fall out that the exceſs of love lie the other way, and incline me ſtrongly, and ſo carry me to that other purſuit of the glory of God in benefiting of others, even to the deſpiſing my own danger of ſin (I ſay not, ſin, but danger of ſin) in that purſuit; I ſuppoſe this will be ſtill lawful to me, being cauſed by ſo noble an impellent, *i. e.* only by the exceſs of love. And if in the event ſome ſin thus fall from me, it will be but frailty ſtill, reconcileable with my loving of God, and ſo with the continuance of his love to me.

S. I have by my queſtions given you occaſion to beat this matter of the praiſe of men very thin; be pleaſed now to give me the ſum of all in few words.

Deſire of glory of men is a ſin. *C.* It is this, That the deſire or deſign of the praiſe of men in the beſt action is ſurely a ſin, as a deflexion to the creature; and if it be the principal motive of our actions, then a waſting ſin, unreconcileable with charity or the favour of God, (for it ſeems the praiſe of men rules in us, and not the love of God:) but if the love of God be the principle, or prime mover of our actions, and this other, of the deſire to be ſeen of men, do only ſteal in as a ſecondary carnal intereſt of our own; then, though it be a ſin ſtill, and ſuch an one as will deprive us of all future reward of that good work to which it is adherent, yet, through God's mercy in Chriſt, and his equitable interpretation of our infirmities, it will not prevail ſo far as to ſeparate between God and us eternally, or to caſt us out of his favour. Mean while this favour, which he finds that is thus guilty of this blaſting ſin, will give him but little encouragement or comfort to indulge to it, when he knows that when it is the chief in his heart, (the principle of his actions, or ſuperiour to the love of God in him) it is then an act of arrant infidelity, and little mercy to be expected then; and even when it comes in but as a ſecondary, (appendant to his good deeds done out of a right principle) it is yet then a means to deprive him of all the reward or benefit of his beſt actions, his Almſgiving, Prayer, and Faſting, yea, and brings him low, to a very ſad ſtate here, and to a (comparatively) mean one hereafter. All which he that will adventure for a little paultry praiſe, that meer blaſt and wind and breath of ſinful men, is ſure very ill adviſed.

S. This being ſo unhappy a ſin, and yet ſo hardly gotten out of us, what means can you direct me to, to prevent it?

Means to prevent it. *C.* 1. A conſideration of the price it coſts us, [*Ye have no reward of your Father which is in Heaven*]

or

or [*they have their reward*] here, and so none behind in another world. 2. A resolution before-hand, never to make my good deed more publick than the circumstances (necessarily attending the present occasion) extort from me. If I do every good deed in the season and place that God represents the object to me, let him alone to provide for his own glory that is to rise from it; and therefore I shall not need in that respect to use any artifice to publish it, under pretence of making my light shine before men. Therefore I say, the second means will be a resolution not to make my good action more publick than it needs must, as by blowing a trumpet, or using any means proportionable to that, though in a lower degree, to call mens eyes toward me; or to do what I do (on purpose and by choice) in the market-place or street, or places of publick meeting and concourse; (for so the word rendred *Synagogues* signifies.) But 3. rather on the other side, if I find that humour of vanity getting in upon me, to labour for the greatest secrecy imaginable, (for that is meant by that high phrase of [*not letting the left hand know what the right hand doth*]) which, by the way, gives also a very useful advertisement for our direction in our dispensing of alms: Not to do them so much to the Beggar in the street, (who 1. is here (by accident) literally forbidden, *v.* 2. [*not in the streets,*] and 2. for the most part is a *disorderly walker*, and not the fittest object of such charity, (relief of his wants, without requiring his labour, being the nourishing his idleness) and withal 3. the publickness and openness which is necessary to the giving to him, is most useful and instrumental to our vain-glory) as to the poor labourer in secret, the House-keeper that comes not abroad, and yet needs aid and relief most truly, to support the burthen of a numerous hungry family, and withal cannot be any temptation to our vain-glorious humour, at least, is not so probably as the other. 4. The contemplation of the reward that attends my contempt of the praise of men, a thousand times more, even in kind, than that which the vain man attends to; to wit, to be praised of God openly before Men and Angels, in a full quire, all looking upon us and applauding, (whereas a few spectators of sinful men is all that can here be compassed:) and not only being praised, but rewarded also. And to fortifie you better, you may observe 5. that no person that receives the praise of men with any gust, is ordinarily able so to carry it, but it shall be discerned by those that are long near him; and when it is discerned, it is a quality generally looked on in others with so much contempt by all men, even by those that are guilty of it, that it really takes off more from the reputation of the best performances than any one ordinary vice can do: And then the less this is discerned by the person himself, the more unhappy are the fruits of it to him, and he yet the more mean; as he that thinks he is admired by all, and is deceived in it. This, as it is prodigiously true in a meer *animal gloriæ*, excessively taken with this pleasure, so it is proportionably in any other, that being so in a less degree, is yet too far so as to be discerned; and if, by careful concealing (without mortifying) the humour, it be not universally discerned, yet still those that do discern it, which generally are the wisest, and also the most censorious, (whose discerning it, is of most concernment) will accordingly judge of him. And if particular care be not taken of this, this humour will be the most contrary to the good end which alone is pretended to make it pardonable, and the most destructive of it of any thing.

ἐν συναγωγαῖς.

S. *I conceive you have now gone through the first of the three things, and fully satisfied all my scruples: God grant my obedience and practice and observation of your directions may be as perfectly complete, and impartial, sincere, and universal. I shall call you now to proceed to the second, beginning at the fifth, and extending to the* 16. *verse. In all which I expect what you will observe unto me.*

Sect. II. *Of Prayer.*

C. The same general parts that before; a Duty supposed, and a double Caution interposed. The Duty supposed is *Prayer*; that great prime branch of the worship of God, required of all that acknowledge God to be God, and most reasonable for all that acknowledge 1. the World to be ruled by his Providence; 2. themselves to have any need of his grace or pardon; or 3. that hope for any reward from him in another world.

S. *I shall desire your direction in divers particulars concerning this duty: And first, How many sorts of prayer are there?*

The sorts of it.

C. There is first Prayer of the heart, and of the tongue. Prayer of the heart, when the Soul sighs out its desires unto God; and of the tongue added to that, which is then Vocal Prayer. 2. There is either publick or private Prayer. Publick of two sorts: First, in the Church; secondly, in the Family. 1. In the Church, or meeting together of all that will join with us, called together by tolling of a Bell, *&c.* And this very useful and necessary, 1. for the publick Testimony of our piety; 2. for the stirring up and inflaming of others; 3. for the making of those common publick requests wherein all that meet are concerned, (as, for all men, the whole Church, the Rulers and Magistrates of that Community wherein we live, for pardon of sins, the gift of Grace, preservation from danger, and all other things that as fellow-members of a Church or State we may stand in need of;) 4. for the prevailing with God, (the union of so many hearts being most likely to prevail, and the presence of some godly, to bring down mercies on those others whose prayers for themselves have no promise to be heard) especially if performed by a consecrated person, whose office it is to draw nigh unto God, *i. e.* to offer up prayers, *&c.* to him, and to be the Ambassadour and Messenger between God and Man; God's Ambassadour to the people, *in God's stead, beseeching them to be reconciled*; and the peoples Ambassador to God, to offer up our requests for grace, for pardon, for mercies, to him. Then 2. in the Family, which is a lesser Congregation, the Master or Father of which is to supply the place of the Priest (and to provide this Spiritual food for all that are under his power and charge, as well as their corporal food) and to ask those things which in that relation (of members of the same family) are discerned to be most needful for all there present. Then for Private prayer, that is of two sorts again; either of Husband and Wife together, (who are as it were one flesh, and have many relations common to one another, and yet distinct and peculiar from all others) or of every man and woman single or private from all others, in the Closet, or other place of retiredness.

S. *Having mentioned the sorts, you will please also to mention the parts of Prayer.*

The Parts.

C. Those are set down by S. *Paul*, 1. *Tim.* 2. 1. *Supplications, Prayers, Intercessions, Giving of thanks.* [a] The first seemeth to refer to Confession and acknowledgment of sin, and beseeching pardon

[a] Λήσεις.

for it. A neceſſary daily duty both in publick and private, for our ſelves and others; only in private fit to be more diſtinct and particular, by way of enumeration of the kinds, and acts, and aggravating circumſtances of ſin. The [b] ſecond is the petitioning or requeſting of all things neceſſary for our bodies or ſouls in all our capacities, either as ſingle or double perſons; as members of Families, of Kingdoms, of Chriſtendom, of mankind it ſelf. The [c] third is the interceding or mediating for others, offering up prayers for friends, for enemies, for all men, eſpecially for our Lawful Governours, Kings, and all that be in authority, Spiritual or Civil. The [d] fourth is the returning our acknowledgments to God for all benefits received by us or others: being bound by the rule of gratitude, to be mindful of what we have received; by the rule of piety, to acknowledge God's hand in beſtowing them; of charity, to be ſenſible of whatever good any part of mankind hath been partaker of from that great Spring of goodneſs, as well as our ſelves; and by all theſe, to expreſs all in our Prayers and addreſſes to Heaven.

[b] προσευχαὶ.
[c] ἐντεύξεις.
[d] εὐχαριστίαι.

S. *My next enquiry muſt be*, how often *this duty muſt be performed?*

The times.

C. This great duty, conſiſting of theſe ſo many parts, muſt be performed frequently by all and every Chriſtian, without any ſlackning or intermitting of it; but how frequently, there is no precept, in this place, or any other Scripture: which argues, that though the ſubſtance of the duty be under particular precept, yet the frequency is left (after the manner of other free-will offerings) to every man's own conſcience and prudence, as occaſions and circumſtances ſhall direct. Yet from the commands and examples of Scripture ſome ſpecial directions we may take with us. As 1. That one day in ſeven is to be ſet apart for this purpoſe, (though not to be all ſpent in the performance of this one duty, yet) for this duty to be carefully performed both in the Church, the Family, and in private; and that with more ſolemnity than ordinary. 2. That other times, taken notice of by the Church, either by way of commemoration of particular paſſages in the ſtory of Chriſt, of his Saints, *&c.* or by way of commemoration of ſome notable benefits received, or on occaſion of particular urgencies, *&c.* be by us ſolemnly obſerved alſo, according to the rule of the ancient Catholick, or of the preſent particular Church wherein we live, in like manner as the Jews obſerved their days appointed them by Law. 3. That no man omit to perform this duty, at leaſt morning and evening, every day; this being ſolemnly required of the people of God, directed by the law of piety to begin and cloſe all with prayer, (which the very Heathens could judge neceſſary) and being the leaſt that can be meant by that precept of the Apoſtle, of *praying without ceaſing*, or *continually:* Which is thought by many to extend no farther than in proportion to the [e] daily ſacrifices among the Jews, which were conſtantly every morning and evening; but by none interpreted, or conceiv'd interpretable, to any lower proportion. But then 4. the examples of holy men in Scripture do add unto this number, ſome more, ſome leſs. *David* in one place ſpecifies the addition of a third, *at morning and at evening, and at noon-day, will I pray, and that inſtantly, i. e.* in a ſet, ſolemn, intenſe, earneſt addreſs, *Pſal.* 55. 17. (and ſo *Daniel*, Chap. 6. 10.) and this of noon-day is the ſame with the ſixth hour, which is a time of prayer, *Acts* 10. 9. uſed by St. *Peter*. Others again obſerved the ninth hour, *i. e.* about three of the clock in the afternoon, as *Peter* and *John*, *Act.* 3. 1. which is there called an hour of prayer, (it ſeems, commonly obſerved) and by *going up to the Temple*, it is likely that publick prayers were uſed at that time, (or if not, it is clear it was to pour out private devotions) and this ſuperadded to the former is a fourth time. And there is little doubt but that the third hour, *i. e.* nine in the morning, was an hour of prayer alſo, as will appear by *Acts* 2: 1. compared with *ver.* 15. and then that is a fifth time. And the evening prayer being anſwerable to the morning, and ſo uſed at ſix in the evening, as the other at ſix in the morning, the cuſtom of godly men hath been to ſhut up the evening with a *compline* or prayer at nine of the night, and ſo that is a ſixth time. To which *David* ſeems to add a ſeventh, *Pſal.* 119. 164. *ſeven times a day do I praiſe thee:* where praiſing being the fourth part of prayer, may be a denotation of the whole duty: although the truth is, the phraſe *ſeven times* may poſſibly be taken not ſtrictly to ſignifie that number, but as a phraſe or form of ſpeech to denote frequency. Theſe directions put together, (and pondered and compared with the leiſure that every man hath from the duties of his calling, and with the great invaluable benefits of prayer, and with the power of importunity, *i. e.* frequent coming to God in prayer, acknowledged by Chriſt, and with the concernance of thoſe things which we may ask and obtain by prayer, (above moſt other things which we ſpend a great part of our time on) and with the reaſonableneſs of giving God a liberal portion out of our time, as well as our eſtates, who hath allowed us ſo much beſides to our own uſes) will be very helpful to any that will judge diſcreetly what is to be done in this buſineſs; and then ſtill you muſt add this reſolution, that what is well done and well weighed for circumſtances, being for the ſubſtance a duty commanded, the more of it is performed, it will be the more acceptable to God.

[e] Θυσίαι ἐνδελεχισμῶ, Ex. 29. 42. See Eccl. 45. 14. καθημέραν ἐνδελεχῶς δίς.

The Forms.

S. *From theſe Scruples ſatisfied, give me leave to proceed to another: What kind of forms my prayers may, or muſt be preſented in.*

The lawfulneſs of ſet forms.

C. In this there are two queſtions couched. 1. Whether any ſet form of Prayer be Lawful to be uſed. 2. if it be, Whether any other may be uſed. And then, what directions may be had for that. To the firſt I anſwer poſitively, That ſet forms of prayer are lawful, both as the word [*ſet*] ſignifies premeditate limited forms, as oppoſed to extemporary; and as it ſignifies preſcribed, and for ſome occaſions and uſes commanded. That it is lawful to uſe a ſet determinate form of words, either written or faſtned in our memory, is apparent both by the example of Chriſt, who in St. *Luke* bids us *when we pray, ſay, Our Father*, &c. (not only pray after this pattern, as the words in St. *Matthew* may be interpreted; but uſe theſe very words, *When you pray, ſay, Our Father*, &c. *Luke* 11. 2.) and of *John Baptiſt*, who *taught his diſciples to pray* in ſome form, though we know not what it is, *Luke* 11. 1. as alſo of the Prieſts under the Law, by God's appointment, that uſed a ſet form of bleſſing the people, *Num.* 6. 24. and of our Saviour himſelf, who uſed a part (if not the whole) of the 22 *Pſalm* upon the Croſs, *My God, my God, why haſt thou forſaken me*, &c. and of the Church of the Jews, and Chriſtian Churches through all times, who have had their Liturgies, as ways and forms of ſerving God publickly, and as means to preſerve the true Religion from all

all corruptions in Doctrine. And to theſe Arguments may be added one more, of common obſervation, That even when the Miniſter (or whoſoever is the mouth of the reſt) prayeth, though in a form of his own preſent extemporary effuſion, yet at that time all others preſent are limited to his conceptions, and pray in as ſtinted a form as if what the Miniſter prays were read out of a Book, or dictated by his memory. That it is alſo lawful to uſe a *ſet* (as that ſignifies a *preſcribed*) form of prayer, is as apparent, 1. by Chriſt's preſcribing one, which he would not ſure have done, if it had not been lawful to have uſed it being preſcribed; and ſo alſo, 2. by the other examples mentioned, which are moſt of them preſcriptions; 3. by the no objection againſt the uſe of them; for ſure, if it be lawful to uſe them, it is lawful to preſcribe them at ſome time, and for ſome uſes, (for that a thing in it ſelf acknowledged and proved to be lawful, ſhould by being commanded by lawful Authority become unlawful, is very unreaſonable, unleſs Lawful Magiſtrates be the onely unlawful things) and at other times to uſe other liberty is not forbidden, and ſo hereby there is not any invaſion or tyranny uſed upon our Chriſtian liberty; 4. by the great benefit that accrues to the Congregation in having diſcreet well-formed prayers, and ſo not ſubject to the temerity and impertinencies of the ſudden effuſions; and the ſame ſtill in conſtant uſe, and ſo not ſtrange or new to them, but ſuch as in which they may with underſtanding go along with the Miniſter, and by the help of their memory the moſt ignorant may carry them away for his private uſe; and generally thoſe that want ſuch helps, are by this means afforded them: and laſtly, by the conſideration of this one ſpecial farther advantage of them, *viz.* that by means of preſcribed Liturgies the unity of Faith and Charity is much preſerved.

Of other unpreſcribed forms.

S. *Well then, ſuppoſing theſe* Set-forms *to be lawful in themſelves, and lawful to be preſcribed, another queſtion you taught me to ask, Whether* any other may be uſed but ſuch?

C. Yes doubtleſs: For the Church being obeyed in the obſervance of the preſcribed Liturgy in publick, permits ſometimes (and upon ſpecial incidental occaſions preſcribes) other forms in the Publick Congregation, ſo it be done prudently, and piouſly, and reverently, and to edification; and ſo alſo in the family, or in Viſitation of the ſick, if the particular condition of one or other do require it: and in private, in the Cloſet, it is not ſuppoſed by our Church but that every one may ask his own wants in what form of words he ſhall think fit; which that he may do fitly and reverently, it will not be amiſs for him to acquaint himſelf with the ſeveral addreſſes to God, which the Book of Pſalms, and other parts of holy Writ, and all other helps of devotion will afford him, either to uſe as he finds them fit for the preſent purpoſe, or by thoſe patterns to direct and prepare himſelf to do the like.

The qualification of Prayer.

S. *What qualifications be required in our prayers to make them acceptable to God, or prevalent with him?*

In the Perſon.

C. Three ſorts of qualifications. One in the perſon that prayeth; and that is, that *he lift up clean hands without wrath or doubting, i. e.* 1. That he be purified from all wilful ſin, bring not any unmortified wickedneſs with him for God to patronize. 2. That he have charity to his brethren, and humility; the two contraries to wrath. 3. That he come with confidence to God's throne, aſſuredly believing that if he ask what he ought, and what God hath not decreed againſt, God will grant it him either in kind, or by giving him that which is better for him. For this a Chriſtian is bound to believe, that God is the *hearer of prayers*, that they which *ask ſhall have:* only this with theſe limitations, unleſs God by his All-ſeeing eye judge ſomewhat elſe better for us, or by ſome particular decree hath determined the contrary; as when the deſtruction of a Nation is determined, then though *Noah*, *Daniel*, and *Job* intercede for it, *they ſhall only ſave themſelves*, but not the Nation.

In the Prayer.

S. *What other ſort of qualifications is there?*

C. In the prayer it ſelf. As 1. That the matter of it be juſtifiable; ſuch things as God hath promiſed to give his children: or when that is doubtful whether it be ſuch or no, then with ſubmiſſion to his wiſdom as well as his will, if he ſeeth it beſt for us, and not otherwiſe. 2. That the things that belong to our ſouls, and wherein God may moſt be honoured, and our neighbour benefited, be moſt and primarily deſired. 3. Zeal or fervency. 4. Attention, as it is contrary to wandring idle thoughts; which (though they are very apt ſtill to interpoſe, and no hope ever to be wholly without them, yet) muſt be laboured againſt, and by the uſe of all means probable repelled, and pardon for them asked ſolemnly of God. 5. Conſtancy and perſeverance in asking, commended to us, by the Parable of the importunate Widow. 6. The uſe of ſuch bodily reverence, ſuch geſtures and poſtures as may both help to inflame our zeal, and be a fit companion of our ſpiritual worſhip. And 7. ſometimes adding to our prayers Vows of voluntary oblations, after the example of *Jacob*, *If God*, &c. and thoſe either when we pray to receive any ſpecial mercy from God, as *Jacob* did; or by way of gratitude and acknowledgment to God, when we have received them. *Gen.* 28. 20.

Thoſe that muſt follow our Prayers.

S. *What is the third ſort of qualifications?*

C. Thoſe that are to follow our prayers. 1. Obſervation of God's returns to our prayers; and in that of God's gracious providence in denying what would have been leſs fit, and granting that that is more. 2. Returning him the thanks, and the glory of all his grants and denials. 3. Conſidering and ſetting a value on this great unparallel'd dignity and prerogative of a Chriſtian, in talking and converſing, and prevailing with God; no difficulty of acceſs, no doubt of acceptation. 4. Raiſing from his mercies a ſtock and treaſure of confidence for the future, together with a love of him; and by his denials, learning to make fitter addreſſes the next time. 5. Expreſſing our gratitude for his mercies by our acts of charity and bounty to our brethren that ask of us, or need our aid; and, in caſe of precedent vow, paying that which we have vowed.

The Cautions.

S. *If there be nothing elſe which you will add concerning the Duty ſuppoſed, be pleaſed to proceed to the* Cautions *interpoſed in it?*

Of vain-glory.

C. The firſt of them is common with that in the matter of almſgiving, that the deſire *to be ſeen* or *praiſed of men* for our piety do not interpoſe in our devotions: to that purpoſe, that it be not done

in Common Assemblies, (meaning thereby not the Church, or publick assembling to that purpose in the house of God, as the word [f] *Synagogues* might seem to import, but any place of publick view, where men use to be Spectators) nor in the *corners of streets*, *i. e.* places chosen on purpose as most conspicuous, (for he that is in the corner of streets is seen by all in either street;) but that our private prayers (which peculiarly are here spoken of) be as private as may be, in the *Closet*, and the *door shut*; and, as near as we can, no eye but that of Heaven admitted to behold us. For if, in a duty wherein God is so nearly concerned by way of honour, and our selves both in duty and for the obtaining our needs, we can take in so poor an accession as the consideration and desire of the praise of men, it is most just that that should be our reward, and no other expected from God for us.

[f] συναγωγαῖς.

S. *What is the second* Caution?

Of vain repetitions.

C. That we *use not vain repetitions.*

S. *What is meant by that phrase?*

βαττολογία.

C. The word in Greek is a proverbial word, referring to a person whose name was *Battus*, and a fault that he was observed to be guilty of; which, seeing it is now uncertain what it was, we shall best gheſs of by the context here, particularly by the reasons that are here annexed to the Cautions. 1. Because by this we shall be like the Heathens, *who think to be heard for their much speaking.* 2. Because we shall be like them in thinking that our many words help God to understand our meaning, which he *knows before we begin to pray.* By which it is plain, 1. That all repetition in Prayer is not forbidden, because all such is not against either of those reasons; and withal because both *David* in his Psalms (particularly, *Psalm* 136.) and Christ in his Agony, used the same words in prayer many times. 2. That the thing here forbidden is somewhat that the Heathens were guilty of; as before, the Hypocrites were of the vain-glory. 3. That the thing most probably to be fixt on, is this, the tumbling out of a many unsignificant words, (as the Heathen Tragedies express their manner) or the same words over and over again, not out of fervency of mind, but to lengthen out the prayer as long as they can, counting this length of words a good quality, or that that makes it either more powerful or more acceptable with God; which indeed was the peculiar fault of the Gentiles, the Jews rather using conciseness and brevity in their prayers. From all which it follows, that the bare length of prayers, any farther than either the necessity of our several wants or the fervency of our zeal requires, or than may tend to the inflaming of our zeal, is not acceptable to God, or like to prevail with him; but rather to do the contrary, if it be affected by us: which is farther evidenced by the manner of that prayer which is here by Christ commended to us, as a pattern and form of ours to be ruled and directed by, *Our Father*, &c. A very concise and short Prayer.

Of the Lord's Prayer.

S. *Being by our Saviour's speech and our progress (in attendance thereon) fain upon the* Lord's Prayer, *though I have formerly in the explication of our Church-Catechism learnt somewhat of the understanding of it; yet it being a prayer of such special weight and difficulty, I shall again desire your particular directions for the understanding of every part and branch of it distinctly. And first, is there any thing that from the general fabrick of the words you would observe to me?*

C. Yes, this one thing, that our first and chief care ought to be the glory of God, advancement of his kingdom, and obedience to his will; *i. e.* the setting up God in that excellence that belongs to him; which is the sum of the three first Petitions: And then after that, the care of our selves, and those things wherein we are most concerned; the sum of the three latter. To which if we annex the Doxology [*for thine is the Kingdom*, &c.] which is the reflecting on God's glory again, the observation will be enlarged, that the Glory of God, *&c.* ought to be our first and last care; and all that is good to our selves, taken in only as it may best consist with that, on each side enclosed and bounded and limited with it. Just as we read of the Liturgy used by the Jews, that of the eighteen prayers used in it, the three first and the three last concerned God; and the rest between, themselves and their own wants. But the truth is, the ancient *Greek* Copies have not those words of Doxology: and there is reason to think that they came in out of the Liturgies of the *Greek* Church; where (as now in many places) the custom was, when the Lord's Prayer had been recited by the Presbyter, for the people to answer, by way of Doxology, (as after the reading of every Psalm a [*Glory be to the Father*,] &c.) *For thine is the Kingdom, the power, and the glory, for ever and ever.* Amen.

S. *Please you then to enter on the particular survey of this Prayer. Where first occurs the title which we bestow on God in it, which I already conceive as a means to raise up our hearts to him, and a ground of Confidence that he can and will hear our prayers. But what is the particular importance of it.*

Our Father.

C. First, That we look on God as Children on a father, with all reverence, and love, and gratitude, as on him who is 1. our Creator, and Father of our Being; 2. more particularly set out to us in that relation than to any other sort of creatures, (as *Plato* said, God was a [g] Maker of other things, but a [h] Father of Men.) Secondly, That all the acts of a father on earth are by him performed to us, but in a far higher and more excellent degree, as far as Heaven is above Earth. Such are 1. *His begetting us anew to a lively hope, i. e.* his giving us his Spirit, the principle of spiritual and celestial life: 2. His continuance of assisting grace to preserve what he hath begotten: 3. His, first, preventing, secondly, exciting, and thirdly, illuminating grace, as a kind of education to our Souls: 4. His providing an inheritance for us in another world, not by the death of the Father, but by the purchase of the Son, to be instated on us at our death; (which is the coming out of our non-age, as it were.) And (besides all this, wherein he is a father to our souls and spirits) many, nay, all kind of paternal acts to our very bodies, which we owe more to him than to our earthly parents who begat them: as also the feeding, preserving, maintaining, adorning, and at last crowning of them. Thirdly, By this title, and in it that particle [*Our*,] we 1. signifie our belief of God's free bounty and fatherly respect to all our kind, and that we labour not to ingross or inclose it to our selves; 2. we extend our prayers to them as well as to our selves; 3. we express our faith, and reliance, and total plenary dependence on him as ours, and without whom we can hope nothing; 4. by the adjoining of this title [*which art in Heaven*] we celebrate his infinity, immensity, all-sufficiency, and all the rest of his Attributes,

[g] ποιητής.
[h] πατήρ.

Attributes, whereby he differs from our fathers on earth, *i. e.* from men, and the honourableſt of creatures.

S. *From the Title you may pleaſe to deſcend to the Petitions: and firſt to thoſe which concern God; of which (all together) if you would teach me any thing, I ſhall be ready to receive it.*

C. I ſhall from thence only trouble you with this, That the form of wiſh rather than prayer retained in all thoſe three, different from the ſtyle of the three latter, doth contain under it a ſilent prayer to God, to take the means or way of performing this into his own hands; and by his grace or providence, or however he ſhall ſee fit, to take care that, by us, and all mankind, *His Name may be hallowed, His Kingdom may come, His Will be done*, &c.

Hallowed be thy Name.

S. *What is meant by the firſt Petition*, [Hallowed be thy name?] *And firſt, what by* God's name?

C. By his name is meant himſelf; God in his eſſence and attributes, and all things that have peculiar relation to him: It being an ordinary Hebraiſm that [* *thing*] and [*word*] [k *doing*] and [*ſpeaking*] [l *being called*] and [*being*] [m *name*] and [*eſſence*] (as [*his Name ſhall be called Wonderful,*] *i. e.* he ſhall be a wonderful one) ſhould be taken promiſcuouſly the one for the other.

* πρᾶγμα & ῥῆμα. k διοσιὸν & διλογίη. l κλησθήσεται & ἔσται. m ὄνομα αὐτῦ & αὐτός. n קדש

S. *What is meant by* hallowing?

C. The n Hebrew word, or Syriack dialect, in which Chriſt delivered it, ſignifies to *ſeparate from vulgar common uſe*, to uſe in a *ſeparate manner*, with that reverence and reſpect that is not allowed to any thing elſe, in that notion that holy is oppoſed to common or profane. Thus is God hallowed, when he is uſed with a reverence peculiar to him above all other things; when ſuch power, majeſty, dominion, goodneſs, *&c.* are attributed to him that are competible to nothing elſe. Thus is his *Name hallowed* when it is reverently handled; his Word or Scripture, when weighed with Humility, received with Faith, as the infallible Fountain of all ſaving truth, applied to our Souls, and the Souls of our hearers, as the inſtrument deſigned to our endleſs good, the *Power of God ordained to Salvation.* Thus is his Houſe conſecrated to his ſervice; his Prieſts deſigned to wait on him and officiate; the Revenues of the Church inſtated on God for the maintenance of his lot or Clergy; the firſt day of the week among us (as among the Jews the laſt) ſet apart for the worſhipping of God publickly and ſolemnly. And every of theſe is hallowed, when it is thus according to the deſign uſed ſeparately, when none of theſe mounds (to fence each) are broken down, but all preſerved from the inrode of ſacrilegious profaners.

S. *Having explained the ſingle terms, what is now the meaning of the Complexe, or Petition?*

C. I pray to God that he will be pleaſed, by his grace poured into my heart, and the hearts of all men, and by the diſpenſation of his gracious providence, to work all our hearts to ſuch a reverence, and awe, and ſeparate reſpect unto Him, his Majeſty, his Attributes, his Works of Grace, his Name, his Word, his Day, his Miniſters, his conſecrated Gifts, (the patrimony of the Church, devolved from him upon the Miniſters thereof) that the ſins of ſacrilege, and profaneneſs, and Idolatry, and irreverence, and indevotion, *&c.* may be turned out of the World; and the contrary vertues of Chriſtian piety and reverence and devotion ſet up and flouriſh among us.

S. *O bleſſed Father, Thus be thy Name* hallowed *by me and all mankind.*

Thy Kingdom come.

Pleaſe you now to proceed to the ſecond, [Thy Kingdom come.] *And firſt, What is meant by* Gods Kingdom?

C. The exerciſe of Chriſt's Spiritual Regal Power in the hearts of all his Servants and Subjects, or Diſciples, that give up their names unto him, 1. here in this imperfect Kingdom of Grace, where the mortifying of every unruly affection is the erecting of a throne for Chriſt; much more the uniform obedience of a whole World of humble, pious, meek, peaceable, charitable Chriſtians, when God by the power of his Grace ſhall be pleaſed to new form and mould the univerſality of Chriſtians into the temper of his Chriſt; which though we know not whether it will ever be, yet it well becomes us to endeavour and pray for it: 2. In the great final doom of all enemies, and crowning of all Saints, which ſhall be attended with a Kingdom which ſhall have none end, Chriſt giving up the Kingdom to his Father, and all his Saints being taken in to reign with him for ever.

S. *What do you mean by praying that this* Kingdom of God may come?

C. I pray that God by his Grace, inſpired into my heart, and the hearts of all men, and by his bleſſed diſpoſal of all things below, will ſo begin to ſet up his Kingdom in our hearts immediately, ſo weaken the power of the adverſary and the malice of oppoſers, that it may by degrees of flouriſhing daily encreaſe; and that all other things which are in his purpoſe may be orderly compleated; till at laſt this mortal compounded Kingdom which hath ſo much mixture of infirmity and ſin and rebellion in it, be turned into a Kingdom of perfect holineſs and immortality.

S. *O come*, Lord Jeſus, come quickly *into thy* Kingdom *of Grace here, for the illuminating and preventing, for the purging and cleanſing, for the regenerating and ſanctifying of our Souls, for the beſtowing on us that precious bleſſed grace of perſeverance; and in the Kingdom of thy glory, for the perfecting and accompliſhing of us hereafter.*

Thy will be done.

Proceed we to the third Petition, [Thy will be done on Earth as it is in Heaven.] *What is meant by* God's Will?

C. His commands whatſoever they are, but eſpecially thoſe which are delivered to us in the Goſpel by Chriſt.

S. *How is his* Will done in Heaven?

C. It is performed by the Angels, who are his miniſtring ſpirits, doing thoſe things in the governing of the world below, and of every of us, which he appointeth them to do. And this which they are thus appointed, they do willingly, chearfully, ſpeedily, and without neglecting any part of it.

S. *What do you mean by the* doing it on Earth?

C. The obedience of all men here below.

S. *What then is the full importance of the whole Petition?*

C. We

C. We pray to God that he will ſo inſpire his grace into all our hearts, and ſo direct us by his providence, and aſſiſt us to performance, that we may obey him in all his commands here on earth willingly, readily, cheerfully, ſpeedily, impartially, (or ſincerely, without indulging our ſelves to any kind of ſin, in the omiſſion of any part of our duty to him) as his Angels daily obey his commands in Heaven.

S. *Bleſſed Lord, give us this grace to* will, *and aſſiſt us to* perform.

From the Petitions that reſpect God, we may now proceed to thoſe that reſpect our ſelves more particularly; though by your explication I perceive that in thoſe which reſpect God we are nearly concern'd alſo.

C. It is true in ſome kind, but not ſo immediately and particularly as in the latter three; of which one thing you may obſerve in general, which yet I cannot conveniently declare to you, till I have explained to you the particulars.

Give us this day our daily Bread.

S. *Be pleaſed then to do that, and firſt in the former of them* [Give us this day our daily bread] *to tell me what is meant by* Daily bread.

C. By *bread* is meant all the neceſſaries of life. By [*daily*] ſomewhat which the word in Engliſh doth not diſtinctly ſignifie, yet well enough expreſſeth the ſence of it. For thus it is: The word in *Greek* may come from a word which ſignifies [o] *the day approaching*, whether that be the now inſtant day, or elſe the morrow, that is (in the Scripture ſence of the [p] Hebrew anſwerable to it) the future, the remainder of our lives, how long or ſhort ſoever it is, (which time, becauſe it is uncertain, men ordinarily make this an excuſe for their covetouſneſs, that they may lay up for their age, and ſo the older they are, they grow the more covetous:) If we fetch the word rendred [*daily*] from hence, it will then denote, ſo much as ſhall be ſufficient or proportionable for the [q] future or remainder of our lives, which in our prayers we beſeech God to take into his care, and to diſtribute unto us *this day*, that is, (as Saint *Luke* interprets it) [r] *daily*, or *day by day*. Another way there is of deducing the word which we render [*daily*] ſo that it ſhall ſignifie that which is agreeable or fit for my [ſ] being or ſubſiſtence; not ſo as to reſtrain it to the loweſt proportion with which a man can ſubſiſt or live, but that which is [t] agreeable to his condition taken with all its circumſtances, for that is it which is called his Being; and then it will be exactly agreeable to *Solomon*'s prayer for *food convenient for him*. And ſo in either ſence the prime importance of this Petition is, *Lord, give us day by day that which ſhall be ſufficient for the remainder of our lives.*

ἄρτον ἐπιούσιον. [o] Ἐπιοῦσα. [p] סחר and ſo alſo אחר rendred ὄπισω χρόνου, Deut. 32. 29. [q] Ἐπιοῦσα, ἐπερχομένη. Phavor. ὄπισω τυχὴ, the future events of things, as oppoſed to παροῦσα the preſent, *Niceph. Baſil.* Δηγ. ἡ, [r] τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν. [ſ] ἀναγκαῖον τῇ ἑκάστῃ οὐσίᾳ ἡμῶν ἀρμόζων, Phavor. *Panis diminſi noſtri*, others.

S. *You ſaid, this was the prime importance of it, which ſeemed to imply that there was another; what is that?*

C. The moſt obvious and natural ſence I call the prime ſence, becauſe the words do firſt yield it; that is (as I told you) all that belongs to the bodily neceſſaries of this life, food and raiment; but a ſecondary ſence there is, which though the word yield but in the ſecond place, yet is a more weighty conſiderable ſence, to wit, as *Bread* imports in a ſpiritual acception the food of the Soul, the grace of God, without which the Soul can as little ſuſtain it ſelf as the body without food; and then the *daily bread* is that meaſure of continual grace which will ſuffice for the remainder of our warfare here, which we beſeech God day by day to beſtow upon us, to aſſiſt and uphold us in all our wants, and refer the care thereof unto God, who, we are confident, *careth for us.*

S. *I beſeech God thus to care for us all, and* give us day by day for the remainder of our lives all things neceſſary for our Souls and bodies.

Forgive us our treſpaſſes.

You may now pleaſe to proceed to the next, i. e. *the fifth Petition*, [Forgive us our treſpaſſes as we forgive them that treſpaſs againſt us.]

C. There will be little difficulty found in that. To *forgive*, is, to *abſolve*, *pardon*, free from puniſhment; and the word *treſpaſſes* ſignifies all manner of offences againſt God: the word in *Greek* is * *debts*, which is a *Syriack* expreſſion to ſignifie *ſins*. And it ſeems to be thus occaſioned. Every man is bound to perfect exact obedience to God by the condition of the firſt Covenant, and that under an heavy penalty, if he fail: He then which hath ſo failed, is thus God's debtor to puniſhment; which if it be not forgiven him, Satan God's officer will fetch out a Writ againſt him, caſt him into priſon, and there leave him (till he hath *paid the uttermoſt*, i. e) eternally. We therefore pray to God to remit theſe *debts* of ours, the payment of which would go ſo deep with us. And whereas we add [*as we forgive them*, &c.] that is only a mention of a qualification in us (made neceſſary by Chriſt, to make us capable of that remiſſion of God's) and as an Argument to enforce that Grant, by profeſſing our ſelves freely to pardon all thoſe that by any injuries done to us are become our debtors, *i. e.* might juſtly in ſtrict Law be by us proſecuted to puniſhment.

* ὀφειλήματα.

As we forgive.

S. *Lord, grant us all this free pardon through the ſatisfaction of Jeſus Chriſt, for all our ſins; and give us grace thus to forgive all others that have injured us, as freely as we hope for pardon from our God.*

Lead us not into temptation.

I ſhall lead you to the laſt Petition, which ſeems to be made up of two members, [Lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from all evil.] *What is meant by* temptation *firſt, then by* God's leading *into it?*

C. By *temptation* is meant any allurement of pleaſure or profit, or determent of danger or evil, which may bring me to fall into any ſin. [*To enter into ſuch temptation*] (as *Mat.* 26. 41. the phraſe is uſed) ſignifies ſo to be involved with either of theſe that I cannot get out. [x] To *make to enter*, or to *bring*, or to *lead into it*, (which are all one) is to occaſion our thus entring, or being involved: which God may do by leaving us, or by withdrawing his grace. So that the meaning of this Petition is, not, that God would not permit us to be tempted, (which is the lot of all, eſpecially the moſt godly men, *James* 1. 2, 3.) but that he will not ſo forſake or leave us to our ſelves, ſo deſtitute, and withdraw his grace, ſo deliver us up (in time of temptation, either through proſperity or adverſity, or Satan's aſſaults) that we be not able to extricate our ſelves, that he will not leave us to be overcome by temptation; for ſo [*to be tempted*] Gal. 6. 1. ſignifies, the word being of a real paſſive ſignification, (of which nature there be many in the New Teſtament) and ſo noting the being *overtaken* alſo, the being enſnared by ſin, wrought on by temptation: for the poſſibility of that only is it, the

[x] εἰσφέρειν.

the conſideration of which will move us to reſtore ſuch as be already overtaken, which is the ſubject of that verſe.

S. *Lord, do not thou thus leave or forſake us in time of temptation, ſo far as that we be overcome by it.*

But what is the importance of the other member of the Petition?

C. The former was only negative, for not bringing us to this great hazard by forſaking or deſtituting us; the latter is poſitive, for deliverance from temptation; not again from falling into it, but from being overcome by it: which God may do by either of theſe ways. 1. By giving us a proportionate meaſure of ſtrength or grace to bear it and move under it, how heavy ſoever the preſſure be; or 2. by tempering the temptation to our ſtrength, and not permiting the aſſault to be over-heavy. And that God will do this (by which of theſe means he pleaſes) and deliver us from the power or hurt of temptation, (which then only becomes evil when we are overcome by it) is the ſum of that ſecond part of the laſt Petition, *Deliver us from evil*, or *out of evil*: whether by that we mean the evil one, Satan, the Artificer and deſigner and improver of temptations; or the Temptation it ſelf, either that of our own luſt, or the world, and enemies of Piety. Deliver us from evil.

S. *Lord, be thou thus ſeaſonably pleaſed to reſcue and deliver us (when we ſhould otherwiſe ſurely be overcome) by the power and aſſiſtance of thy mighty grace.*

I now remember you told me, one thing would be obſervable from the general view of theſe three Petitions, which, having now explained them, it will be ſeaſonable to afford me.

C. It is this; the order wherein God is wont to diſpenſe his ſpiritual gifts unto us, by the order wherein Chriſt directeth us to petition them. Thus, God 1. gives grace to ſanctifie (that *Manna* from Heaven, that *Bread of Life*, without which we are not able to live to God.) 2. He pardons ſins to them that are thus fitly qualified to receive his pardon. 3. He aſſiſteth and upholds from falling into ſin, *i.e.* He firſt Sanctifieth; ſecondly, Juſtifieth; thirdly, gives grace to perſevere. And in this order we muſt deſire and pray for theſe ſeveral degrees of grace.

S. *What now have you to add concerning the Doxology added to theſe Petitions?*

C. This, that whether it were delivered by Chriſt, (and taken either out of *David*'s form, 1 *Chron.* 21. 9, 11. or out of the ancient forms of the Jews) or whether it were by after copies annexed out of the Liturgies of the ancient *Greek* Church, it is a very fit form of acknowledgment to God to enforce the granting of the Petitions; eſpecially thoſe three which reſpect God; thus, [*Thy Kingdom come*] for [*Thine is the Kingdom:*] [*Thy will be done*] for [*Thine is the Power:*] [*Hallowed be thy Name*] for [*Thine is the Glory*] *for ever and ever.* The firſt of theſe is the acknowledgment of God's Dominion due to him over the world; and is not (nor can be) ſaid in earneſt by any but thoſe that reſign up their Souls for him alone to reign in, as the ſole Prince and Monarch of their Souls: He that retains one rebel-luſt out of God's obedience, doth mock him when he repeats thoſe words. The ſecond is, the acknowledgment of God's Omnipotency and All-ſufficiency, as the Fountain of all that grace and ſtrength we beg for; and he that cannot rely on him for all that is neceſſary for this life and another, doth reproach him when he ſaith *Thine is the Power.* The third acknowledgeth the thanks, the honour, the glory of all we are or have, to be due to him from whom all is received; and he that can impute any thing to himſelf as his own acquiſition, can never be thought in earneſt when he ſaith [*Thine is the Glory.*] The *Amen* that concludes, is but a ſolemn ſtyle of the *Jewiſh* firſt, and then *Chriſtian* Church; either noting the faith of him that prayes, and confides that what he here prays for ſhall be granted; or, only a recollection of all that is before prayed for by the ſpeaker (by which all that are preſent, uſe to make themſelves partakers of the ſeverals, and to expreſs their joining in each with him) [*So be it.*] Anſwerable to what is at length in our Litany [*We beſeech thee to hear us, good Lord.*] The Doxology. Thine is the Kingdom. The Power. And the glory. Amen.

S. *I perceive after the recitation of this Prayer, one appendage there is which cometh in as it were in a Parentheſis, before our Saviour proceeds to the next matter* [For if we forgive men their treſpaſſes, *&c.* verſe 14, 15.] *What is the meaning of that?*

C. It is a returning by way of review, or giving a reaſon of one paſſage in the former Prayer, (and but one, as if that were the moſt hugely important of any) to wit, why thoſe words [*as we forgive them that treſpaſs againſt us*] were interpoſed; namely, becauſe in God's forgiving of us, he hath a peculiar reſpect to our free pardon and *forgiving of other men*; as appears by the Parable, *Matth.* 18. 35. where he that had his debt forgiven him by the King, yet going out and challenging his fellow-ſervant, and exacting payment from him, hath the former forgiven debt moſt ſadly brought upon him again; and this applied there (*ver.* 35.) particularly by Chriſt to every of us, who *from our hearts forgive not our brethren their treſpaſſes.* And therefore whoſoever prayeth for forgiveneſs in this prayer, doth not only oblige himſelf to forgive all others, but he doth even curſe and bring down imprecations upon himſelf, and deſire God in effect never to pardon him, if he be not thus qualified by pardoning of others. It will therefore be moſt abſolutely neceſſary for every man that takes this prayer into his mouth, firſt to put all malice, deſire of revenge, or grudge, out of his heart; or elſe his prayer ſhall be turned into a curſe to him: and that is the importance of this paſſage. Prayer for pardon obligeth to forgive.

S. *You have paſt through the ſecond period of this Chapter, the weighty duty of Prayer; together with the Cautions and Directions belonging to it. Let us now by your leave advance to the third, reaching through the next three Verſes,* 16, 17, 18. Moreover when thou faſteſt, &c. *Where firſt, I pray, what is the importance of the phraſe* [Moreover] *becauſe that was not formerly uſed in the ſecond of the three?* Sect. III. *Of Faſting.*

C. It firſt noteth, this duty not to be ſo ordinarily and frequently taken notice of as the former, (and therefore a note of remark is prefixt to it.) Secondly, that this is alſo a duty neceſſary to be ſuperadded to the practice of the other two, if we will be Diſciples of Chriſt; it being a part of the worſhip of God alſo, eſpecially when it cometh in conjunction with them.

S. *Well then, I ſhall preſume you will continue the ſame method in handling this which in the former two you have obſerved; by taking notice of,* 1. a duty ſuppoſed, 2. a Caution interpoſed. *I ſhall deſire to receive*

receive firſt what you will recommend unto me for the Duty which is here ſuppoſed, [thou, when thou faſteſt.] What kind of faſting *is here ſpoken of?*

C. Not the ſolemn preſcribed Faſts of the Jews, (for thoſe were not to be concealed or diſſembled) ſuch as the great day of Expiation, called the *Faſt which God hath choſen* (deſcribed *Iſaiah* 58. in thoſe expreſſions which are ordinarily thought to belong to the weekly Sabbath-day, but both there and *Levit.* 16. 31. and 23. 32. and *Num.* 29. 7. moſt clearly belong to that day of Expiation;) nor thoſe other three added to that under the time of the ſecond Temple: but days of private Faſting, that every one preſcribed themſelves as free-will-offerings, ſome once, ſome twice, ſome oftner, every week, denying themſelves their lawful ordinary food, commonly not eating till the going down of the Sun, and then very moderately alſo. Which exerciſe as Chriſt diſlikes not, but rather approveth it by his mention here; ſo he deſires to free and reſcue it from the vain-glorious deſign of Phariſaical Hypocrites in the uſing of it. But before you will be well capable of hearing and aſſenting to your duty in this of Faſting, or denying your ſelf your lawful food, it will be neceſſary, by way of preparative, for you to know your duty in reſpect of ſobriety; or what eating and drinking (abſtracted from the ſuperaddition of this duty of faſting) is lawful for Chriſtians. For as he which is not advanced ſo far in the School of Nature as to obſerve rules of Juſtice, will ſcarce be a fit auditor of the doctrine of Almſgiving premiſed; ſo certainly, he that hath not ſubmitted himſelf to the rules of Sobriety, will be hardly brought to hear of Faſting: and beſides, the truth is, that the unjuſt mans alms will avail him little, and as little the Drunkards or Gluttons faſts. And therefore it will not be amiſs awhile, before we proceed, to take in the conſideration of this duty of Sobriety.

Of Sobriety.

S. *I acknowledge the reaſonableneſs of the Propoſal. What then do you mean by* Sobriety?

C. That temperance in eating and drinking which (whatſoever may be ſaid of it under the Old Teſtament among the Jews, who being allured to the ſervice of God (eſpecially) with the repreſentation of temporal promiſes, of plenty, *&c.* could not ſo fitly be interdicted the liberal uſe of meats and drinks, but might be allowed ſomewhat in that matter which is not allowable to Chriſtians, at leaſt might be ſo far permitted the exceeding of thoſe ſtrict terms of Sobriety without danger of the like puniſhment) is now ſtrictly commanded Chriſtians in the New Teſtament, and that under threat of damnation to him that frequently, or willingly and indulgently, offendeth herein. Thus 1 *Cor.* 6. 10. it is ſaid of [y] *drunkards,* that they *ſhall not inherit the Kingdom of God:* Where the word is not to be reſtrained to thoſe who drink to beſtiality, to the depriving themſelves of the uſe of their reaſon, that drink drunk, as we ſay; but belongs to all that drink wine or ſtrong drink intemperately, though through their ſtrength of brain they be not at preſent intoxicated by it. So *Gal.* 5. 21. among the works of the fleſh, *which they that do ſhall not inherit the Kingdom of Heaven,* there is mention of [z] drunkenneſs, and revellings or comeſſations, or exceſs in eating. So *Rom.* 13. 13. both are together forbidden, * ſurfeitings, or exceſs in eating, and drunkenneſſes, or exceſs in drinking. And ſo 1 *Pet.* 4. 3. [a] Exceſs of wine, comeſſations and drinkings. And on the other ſide is ſobriety commanded, 1 *Theſ.* 5. 6. 8. And *Titus,* Chap. 2. it is mentioned as a ſpecial deſign and end of the appearing of Chriſt, that we ſhould be inſtructed to walk (juſtly, and piouſly, and) *ſoberly in this preſent World.* The firſt of thoſe three referring to our duty to our neighbour, the ſecond to our duty toward God, and that of ſobriety to our duty toward our ſelves, (nothing tending more to the preſervation of our ſelves than that; and nothing being more hurtful and more unagreeable with that charity which we owe to our ſelves, our bodies as well as ſouls, than intemperance) and ſo in thoſe Three is the whole duty of man comprized.

[y] μέθυσοι (from μέθυ *ſtrong* or *ſweet wine*) all one with *Vinoſi* or *Vinolenti.*
[z] μέθαι καὶ κῶμοι.
* κῶμοι & μέθαι.
[a] οἰνοφλυγίαι, κῶμοι, πότοι.

S. *How many* ſorts of exceſs *in eating and drinking be there, to which* Sobriety *is oppoſed?*

Exceſs in eating and drinking, of two ſorts.

C. The exceſs is of two ſorts: one in the quantity, when we eat or drink to the over-charging of the body; and the ſobriety contrary to that, is the eating and drinking no more than agrees with the health and good temper of it, though we do allow our ſelves the pleaſures and delights in choice of meats, *&c.* Another exceſs there is in the quality or delicacy of meats or drinks, and a ſtudied care and purſuit of ſuch as are thus moſt delightful; and the ſobriety contrary to this, is when we content our ſelves with that meat and drink which is neceſſary or uſeful to the health and ſtrength of our bodies, and neglect or deſpiſe all other delicacies.

In Quantity.
Quality.

S. *Are both theſe kinds of* exceſſes *condemned, and* ſobrieties *commanded us Chriſtians?*

C. Some difference there is in this matter. The former of thoſe exceſſes is ſo expreſly forbidden, that he that uſeth it, is *excluded from the Kingdom of God,* 1 *Cor.* 6. 10. *Gal.* 5. 21. And conſequently the contrary ſobriety is ſtrictly commanded under that heavy penalty. But the ſecond kind of exceſs is not ſo certainly and expreſly forbidden, nor the contrary ſobriety ſo diſtinctly and peremptorily commanded under penalty of *excluſion from the Kingdom of Heaven,* to him that uſeth that exceſs only in the choice of meats that are moſt delicious. Yet becauſe it is not improbable that the words in the original do belong and extend to quality as well as quantity, *i.e.* to exceſs in either, (and the [b] word uſed for drunkards and drunkenneſs, comes from the word that ſignifies [c] ſweet as well as ſtrong wine) and becauſe there are two conſiderations which make this exceſs in the quality or delicacy to be unagreeable to the compoſition of the Evangelical rule of life, I cannot but ſay that this kind of ſobriety is commanded alſo, and that the contrary habit to it deſerves to be deemed a ſin.

[b] μέθυσοι, μέθη.
[c] μέθυ.

Two conſiderations pertaining to the latter.

S. *What be thoſe two Conſiderations?*

C. 1. The hope of eternal life and endleſs ſpiritual joys, that are propoſed to us in the New Teſtament; which if they be ever ſuffered to enter into and fill our hearts, will produce a diſ-eſteem and mean opinion, and in time a contempt and ſcorn, of all carnal delights and pleaſures, will bring us to an *uſing* (the pleaſant part as well as the profitable of) *the world as if we uſed it not,* and (ſo we may have *food convenient for us*) a not caring for any choice or ſuperfluity, an abſtaining purpoſely from all ſupervacaneous pleaſure. The ſecond conſideration is the duty of charity and liberality to our poor brethren, required of us and recommended to us in the Goſpel: In which, he that fares deliciouſly, and takes care (not only for the preſerving of the health and ſtrength, but alſo) for the pleaſing and entertaining of his palate, will ſurely be leſs able to diſcharge his duty; that ſupervacaneous pleaſure bringing a ſuperfluous expence and charge along with it. Theſe two conſiderations will

will make it very hardly ſeparable from ſin, for any man to allow himſelf this ſecond kind of exceſs: Though I ſhall not be over-forward to pronounce damnation to him that is guily of it; 1. becauſe I am not ſo ſure that there is in the New Teſtament any particular direct immediate command againſt it; 2. becauſe the vertue of ſobriety, eſpecially in this ſecond ſort, conſiſts not in any one point indiviſible (ſo that it ſhould poſſibly be reſolved, that he that eateth this kind of meat ſinneth not, and he that eateth any more delicious doth ſin;) 3. becauſe there is no certain rule by which to define delicious meats, that being moſt delicious to one which is leſs to another; 3. becauſe indeed to a temperate healthy man the plaineſt and ordinarieſt meats are moſt delightful and pleaſing alſo. On which and the like reaſons I ſhall not make haſte to condemn or terrifie any man in this matter, nor tell him, the abſtaining from delicacies is by any expreſs precept required of him; but only mention to him theſe ſeven things. Firſt, that it is a vile and unchriſtian thing to ſet the heart upon ſuch mean carnal delights: Secondly, that what I can conveniently ſpare from my ſelf, I ſhould reſerve for thoſe that do or may want it: Thirdly, that there is exceſs in the quality as well as quantity of meats and drinks; and that the exceſs in, or indulgence to, the former, is a moſt forcible provocation to the latter, which is acknowledged a damning ſin: Fourthly, that a Chriſtian may do better to deny himſelf lawful pleaſures, than to do all that is not unlawful: Fifthly, that the end of eating and drinking is the preſervation of health and ſtrength, and not the delighting the palate: Sixthly, that though a well tempered healthy man's appetite ordinarily demands thoſe things that are fitteſt for him, and conſequently in that caſe the ſatisfying the appetite may not be amiſs, yet firſt, the appetite is oft intemperate in its demands: oft demandeth this or that, which by ſome cuſtom it hath been uſed to; and then that cuſtom being equivalent to a diſeaſe ſometimes, ſometimes the author of ſome real diſeaſe, that diſeaſe ſhould be cured, and that appetite mean time not obeyed: ſecondly, the appetite is tempted many times by the object, either really preſent, being ſet before us, or imaginarily, being repreſented by the phanſie; and then the motion of the appetite is no argument of the meetneſs of ſatisfying it. Seventhly, that faſting (or abſtinence wholly) is alſo a Chriſtian duty, to be uſed ſometimes. And by theſe rules I ſhall leave any prudent and ſincere Chriſtian to direct himſelf in this matter, and deſire him in the fear of God to be careful that he offend not againſt that Chriſtian neceſſary duty of ſobriety in any kind.

S. *But may not* Feaſting *be lawful now among us Chriſtians, and ſo* delicious *fare?*

C. Feaſting, as it is an expreſſion of thankſgiving to God, and celebration of ſome act of his mercy; as it is an act of hoſpitality for the receiving and treating of others as well as our own family; as it is a means of preſerving and encreaſing mutual love and charity among men, is certainly now lawful and commendable: But all theſe ends and uſes may be provided for without luxury and delicacy, (only variety perhaps will be uſeful in ſundry reſpects) and again without any man's overcharging himſelf, and therefore will never be an excuſe or apology for either. And as for honeſt mirth and chearfulneſs, it will not at all be provided for by immoderate or delicious eating or drinking, but rather hindred by it; raiſed tumultuouſly perhaps by that means for the preſent, but then apt to degenerate into ſcurrility, *&c.* and withal attended with bitterneſs in the ſtomach, with ſatiety and drowzineſs, which is moſt contrary to it. In brief, the true Chriſtian Feaſting is when the poor and rich meet at the ſame common entertainment, and they that want partake of others plenty in the ſame common meal, contrary to the [d *Every man his own ſupper.*] Where for one to be drunken, *i. e.* to eat or drink exceſſively, is as great a ſoleciſm as for another to go away hungry. Of Feaſting. d Ἴδιον δεῖπνον. 1 Cor. 11. 21.

S. *I ſhall hope to lay that doctrine of* Sobriety *to heart, and ſo to be in ſome meaſure qualified for that ſuperſtruction and ſuperaddition of* Faſting, *which occaſioned this diſcourſe. Which becauſe you reſolved to be a duty ſuppoſed in a Chriſtian, and acceptable to God under the Goſpel, I muſt firſt deſire the ground or reaſon of that affirmation.* Of Faſting.

C. 1. Becauſe it is here in the ſame manner joined with the two former, *Almſgiving* and *Prayer*, which are unqueſtionably ſuch duties. 2. Becauſe it is here promiſed a reward by Chriſt, if it be not blaſted by vain-glory. 3. Becauſe it is foreſeen by Chriſt to be that, that men are apt to expect praiſe for among men. 4. Becauſe Chriſt in other places approves, if not commands, the uſe of it; only affirms the ſeaſon for his Diſciples to faſt, to be then not ſo agreeable, *becauſe the Bridegroom was with them*, Matth. 9. 15. *But when the Bridegroom ſhould be taken away, i. e.* after the death and departure of Chriſt, *then ſhall they faſt in thoſe days.* 5. Becauſe Chriſt bringeth in the Phariſee boaſting that he *faſts twice in a week*, and lays no manner of cenſure on him for ſo faſting, but only for the pride in boaſting of it: and (I remember) it is Saint *Chryſoſtom*'s direction, that we ſhould only avoid the Phariſees pride but not neglect his performances: as on the other, forſake the Publicans ſins, and retain his humility. 6. Becauſe it was prevalent with God (being joined with Prayer) to the working of miracles, *Matth.* 17. 21. and ſo again probably *Acts* 1. 14. for the obtaining the preſence of the holy Ghoſt in a ſpecial manner, *Acts* 2. 1. and uſed by the Apoſtles before the Ordination of Miniſters, *Acts* 13. 3. and 14. 23. 7. Becauſe the performance of this is thought by Saint *Paul*, a ſufficient occaſion for a temporary *parting of man and wife*, 1 Cor. 7. 5. which otherwiſe he would not adviſe; which ſignifies this to be an employment of weight among Chriſtians. 8. Becauſe it is mentioned by St. *Luke* as a part of the worſhip of God, joined with Prayer, in *Anna*, *Luke* 2. 37. of whom it is ſaid, *That ſhe departed not from the Temple*; e *ſerving*, or *worſhipping*, *God in prayers and faſtings night and day*; of which, I conceive, this is the importance, That ſhe conſtantly frequented the Temple at the hours of Prayer, (not that ſhe dwelt or continued always there; for *ver.* 38. there is mention of her coming thither) and uſed conſtant obſervations of faſting, and in ſo doing worſhipt God. 9. Becauſe *Cornelius* his viſion, which brought him to Chriſtianity, is mentioned to have been at a time of his faſting and praying. 10. Becauſe of the many good ends and uſes to which faſting is proper, and in reſpect of which it looks yet more like a Chriſtian vertue, than conſidered as a bare abſtinence from a meal it doth. A duty. e λατρεύουσα,

S. *What be thoſe ends or uſes?*

C. 1. As an act of ſelf-denial, which it is, when otherwiſe I would eat, but chuſe rather to abſtain, The uſes of it.

ſtain, to perform this act of that which in general Chriſt requireth of his Diſciples. 2. As an act of [f] revenge, which you find among the effects of godly ſorrow, and parts of repentance, 2 *Cor.* 7. 11. and ſuch may faſting be, if on conſideration of (and by way of puniſhment on) my former plenitude and luxury, I now think fit thus to puniſh my ſelf. 3. As a means of expreſſing my humiliation for ſin, in time of God's wrath lying upon a Nation or any particular perſon, and for the averting of that wrath: to which faſting hath been always counted very agreeable, and found to be very ſucceſsful, both in the Old Teſtament and in all Stories of the Church. 4. As a means to fit any man the better for the performing the duty of Prayer as he ought. To which purpoſe he that doth not acknowledge its propriety of uſefulneſs, is certainly a man of a ſtrange making; much diſtant from the beſt ſort of Chriſtians, whoſe experience will ſure commend it to him. 5. As a means to enable me to the performing of works of mercy, by giving that to the poor which is ſpared from my ſelf; which therefore ſhould be always obſerved in either publick or private faſts which we keep religiouſly, that we may never be the richer for what is thus ſpared, leſt we ſeem (or be tempted) to faſt for covetouſneſs, as others do for ſtrife, *Iſaiah* 58. To which purpoſe it is that you ſee here *Alms, and Prayer, and Faſting*, joined together by Chriſt, not to be divided by us. If the meal we faſt from bring any thing to our purſes, it will not be accepted: For, *Iſai.* 58. the Faſt which God hath choſen, or that which is acceptable to him, is ſaid to be that when we *break the bread to the hungry*, &c. 6. As a means to abate the deſires and luxuriances of the fleſh, and make the body more tractable and tame, and patient of receiving the dictates of Reaſon; and to ſubdue in it inclinations toward uncleanneſs, when thoſe are likely to prove too ſtrong for us. To which purpoſe that faſting ſhould be uſeful, it will not be hard for any man to gheſs that conſidereth the cauſe of carnal deſires in the Body, and that old ſaying, That without *Ceres* and *Bacchus* (the belly-deities) *Venus*, or incontinent deſires, grow cold.

[f] ἐκδίκησις.

S. *Is all kind of faſting then acceptable to God?*

C. No certainly: To faſt out of ſorrow or mourning for the death of a friend, is not ſo, (though not ſinful neither.) To faſt to ſave the charges of eating, to be the better able or more at leiſure to tranſact buſineſs of the world, is not ſo (though again not ſinful.) And by theſe you will gheſs at ſome other kinds alſo. Yet you may mark ſtill, that one thing there is in all faſting, to wit, ſelf-denial, which though it is not by every one that faſteth propoſed as an end, yet if it be ſo propoſed, by ſo doing that Faſt ſhall be acceptable to God.

An obiection againſt Faſting being a duty.

S. *I have yet one Objection againſt all which you have ſaid in this matter, and it is this, That all this while you have not mentioned any command or precept of Faſting in the New Teſtament, and therefore do I not believe there is any ſuch: and for the Old Teſtament, though there be a command for the obſervation of the great day of Expiation every year, yet, firſt, that was only obligatory to the* Jews; *ſecondly, it was a Publick Faſt, and not pertinent to this place, which ſpeaks of Private Faſts; thirdly, if it ſhould be thought to concern us, yet being but once in the year, it would not be conſiderable. From all which, it being ſuppoſed that there is no Precept now particularly obliging us Chriſtians to faſt, it may ſeem to follow, that faſting is not now acceptable to God.*

Anſwered.

C. To your whole Objection I anſwer, 1. That there is no neceſſity of a precept of Faſting, to aſſure us that it will be acceptable to God: there was no precept for voluntary oblations under the Law, (ſave only a direction, when they were offered, that they ſhould not be offered maimed, *&c.* as here there is, that we ſhould not blemiſh our faſting with deſire of praiſe of men) and yet they were accepted; and many other evidences have been produced to prove the uſe of faſting to be acceptable to God, though not commanded. 2. Though there be no explicite command of faſting in the New Teſtament, yet from the nature and conſtitution of the Goſpel it may be collected that there are in ſome caſes ſome tacite commands of it: As when all degrees of uncleanneſs, all ſatisfying the deſires of the fleſh, are forbidden, ſave only in lawful matrimony, and no allowance of polygamy or concubines. To him that finds himſelf unable thus to live in conjugal chaſtity, the uſing of means which may help to it are tacitely commanded by God; and ſo conſequently Faſting, if that be the only means left him, (as many times it is.) And then, as to the Diſciples that could not caſt out that Devil which would not go out but by prayer and faſting, it is accounted infidelity by Chriſt not to uſe that means, *Mark* 9. 19. ſo will it be the like unchriſtian ſin in him that uſes not this means, ſo neceſſary to ſo neceſſary an end. The ſame may be ſaid in caſe the Magiſtrate under whom we live preſcribes the obſervation of it, or whenever any man ſeeth it neceſſary, or very probable that we ſhall be hindred from the performing of ſome duty (which he owes to the glory of God, or edification of his brethren) unleſs he faſt that day. Laſtly, the caſe may be ſo ſet, that a man may diſcern himſelf able without any detriment to his health, or danger of ſhortning his life, *&c.* to uſe frequent faſting, and withal by that means much advance his ſpiritual ends, have greater vacancy for holy employments, greater ſtore for works of mercy, *&c.* and then ſure in this caſe the commands of praying and mercifulneſs will be alſo tacite commands of faſting. So that though there be not any particular explicite precept, obliging every man whatſoever under pain of ſin to faſt ſimply, thus, or thus often; yet tacite commands there may be to them that are by any of theſe circumſtances fitted for it: and even to thoſe that for the preſent are not, it will yet be fit to be conſidered and counted of as a duty that they may be concerned in; and that if in no other reſpect, yet in this, that they are' Chriſtians who aſpire to an angelical life and inviſible joys, and ſhould therefore deny (and by that wean) themſelves of thoſe ſenſual, corporal pleaſures of eating and drinking, ſo far as to preſervation of life and health, and to their duty to themſelves, may be agreeable.

S. *How often then ſhould a Chriſtian faſt?*

Times of Faſting.

C. By what hath been ſaid you will gheſs it unlikely that I ſhould undertake to preſcribe poſitive ſet rules for this; the duty I ſhall leave to you as a voluntary oblation for you to offer as frequently as prudence joined with due care of your health, and as piety and the Spirit of God ſhall prompt you, and only tell you theſe three things. Firſt, that the Phariſee *faſted twice every week*, and that that was never cenſured in him as a piece of Phariſaiſm or hypocriſie, or fault of any kind, but as commendable, if he had not boaſted of it. Secondly, that every Chriſtian ought to have his ſolemn ſet

days

days for the performing that great and weighty duty of Humiliation, in calling himself to account for all his ways, and confessing his sins to God more particularly; and those days should not be too slow in their returns, lest his Soul be too deep in arrears, and so unwilling to come to accounts at all. It is very reasonable for every man or woman of leisure to set apart one day in the week for this turn: or if the whole day or any other part of it may not thus be spared from the business of his calling, yet the dinner-time that day may be borrowed from eating, and thus more usefully employed without any disturbance to his other affairs. And he that useth not some such constant course (which yet on special occasions may be altered) will be in great danger to be found and censured a neglecter of the duties of a Disciple of Christ. Thirdly, that over and above this common duty of all men, some other wants there are or may be in this or that man, to the repairing of which, Fasting may be very instrumental, as hath been shewed; and so proportionably is to be more frequently used by them who have this need of it; of which their own Conscience in the fear of God is left the Judge. All this hath been said of Private Fasting, because that is peculiar to this place: For Publick Fasting, the direction must be had from the Laws where we live; which so far at least oblige every one, that he offend not against them either contemptuously, or with scandal.

S. *I shall now desire Gods direction and grace to incline me to the performance of this my duty, so as may be acceptable to him, and to pardon me for my former omissions of it, which truly have hitherto been very great.*

You may please now to proceed to the Caution *interposed, wherein I shall presume it superfluous for you to say much, having twice already insisted on it, in order to Prayer and Almsgiving.*

The Caution in it.

C. The Caution is it self in plain intelligible words, [*When you fast, be not as the Hypocrites, of a sad countenance, for they* (*disfigure*, we read; perhaps the word only signifies) *vail*, or *cover their faces*, as mourners were wont to do, *that they may appear to men to fast*] but (rather than so) *do thou, when thou fastest, anoint thy head, and wash thy face*, (for thy outward guise, appear in thy ordinary countenance and habit; for the Jews were wont to anoint themselves daily, unless in time of mourning) *that thou appear not to men to fast, but to thy Father which is in secret*; that thou maist appear desirous to approve thy self to him only, who only is able to reward thee.

S. *You have now past through those three great Christian duties, which by their so near confederacy here, and by what you have said of them, I find so linked together, that it is very reasonable we should set apart some time for the joint practice of them all together: For though it may be fit to give alms when I pray not or fast not, and to pray when I neither give alms nor fast; yet sure my fasts wherein the expence of a dinner is saved, should be joined then with Almsgiving* (*to wit, giving to the poor that which is thus spared*) *and always with Prayer.* God give me a heart thus to practise it.

Sect. IV. *Of the desire and love of wealth.*

Having thus far advanced, you may please to proceed to that that follows, which I perceive to be a new matter, [Lay not up for your selves treasures upon earth, *&c.*] *and so on in one continued thread to the end of the Chapter. Of all which what is the chief summary importance, you may briefly tell me.*

C. There are two things to which all the ensuing sixteen Verses belong, and the second of them appendent to the former, into which the discourse insensibly glides. The former is, for the mortifying of all desire and love of wealth: the latter for the moderating our worldly care or secular providence, which I told you would serve in stead of (and might be laid up by us as) an improvement of the Tenth Commandment, [*Thou shalt not covet.*] The former is set down in the six ensuing Verses, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24.

S. *Why do you refer these words*, Lay not up, *&c. to the mortifying of* desire and love of wealth?

C. Because a Treasure is a metaphorical word, to signifie that which men desire and love most importunately, and set their heart upon; and so the prohibition of *laying up our treasure on earth*, is in effect the forbidding to love, or desire, or set the heart upon any earthly riches as a possession; but only to use them so, as may most improve our future account, *i. e.* by liberal dispensing of them to raise a bank which may enrich us for ever in another world. For the enforcing of which prohibition and exhortation, he mentions, 1. The vanity and uncertainty of worldly riches; which evidences how unfit they are for our hearts to be set upon. One kind of them, that which consists in costly vestments, the Moth, a poor despicable creature, can and doth destroy and make useless: another kind, our Corn, and other the like Fruits of the earth, (of which the Fool so applauded himself, that he had *store for many years*) [g] eating (for so the word rendred *Rust* doth signifie) whether of men, or (the ordinary attendants of granaries) vermin, bringeth to nought; or if you will retain the word in our Translation, [*Rust*] it must then be taken in that notion as it belongs to Corn in the field, and is called [h] Smut, when by some wind or the like the grain is smitten or blasted, and made good for nothing. And then for money, or our any other kind of treasure, never so closely and safely lockt up, thieves can and ordinarily do *break through and steal it from us.* And it is observable that that Moth, and the like, are [i] bred in the things themselves; and so those kind of possessions are subject to these destroyings when no outward violence approaches them: and that is a mighty evidence of the vanity and uncertainty of riches, that many times vast estates and possessions do insensibly, no man knows how, crumble and moulder to nought, rich men without any visible expences come to arrant beggery, and all the providence in the world cannot keep them from it, but rather betrays them farther; the greater their love of money is, the swifter their ruine follows them. And 2. the infatuating power of riches, when we come once to love them, to resolve to have them, (which Saint *Paul*, 1 *Tim.* 6. 9. calls, [k] *they that will be rich*) and to that purpose to serve or wait upon them, which way soever they lead us: Our hearts are then so wholly set upon them, that we cannot at all serve God, or endeavour to approve our selves to him. This our Saviour proves by the contrariety of the commands of these two Masters, *God* and *Mammon*; for if their commands might be subordinate one to the other, they might both have their answerable obedience; God in the first place, and Mammon or worldly wealth in the subordination. But God's commands being contrary to Mammon's, *i. e.* to those courses which are necessary to the getting of riches, he that

Vanity of wealth.

[g] βρῶσις.
[h] ἰρυσίβη, ἔντιγο.
[i] Καθάπερ ἐν ἱστῷ μὲν ἰδὲ, ξύλοις ὄφεις καὶ τερηδόνες συμφυεῖς οἱ λῦμαι, δι' ὧν καὶ κῆν πάσας τὰς ἔξωθεν διαφύγωσι κλεῖς, ἀπ' αὐτῶν φθείρονται καὶ συσσήπονται· κατ' αὐτὸν τρόπον, &c. Polyb. Hist. l. 6. p. 59. A.

The infatuating power of it.

[k] οἱ βουλόμενοι πλουτεῖν.

will grow rich (that is bent on that design) must give over all hope of being (or passing for) God's servant.

S. *What be the commands of God that are so unreconcileable with the service of Mammon, or vehement desire of wealth?*

God's commands unreconcilable with Mammon's.

C. 1. His command of doing justice, exact justice, as that excludes all violence, fraud, oppression, *&c.* 2. That command of the justice of the tongue, in performing of promises, though to the greatest hindrance and damage, and in not slandring any for the wealth of the whole world. 3. His command of absolute contentment in what state soever I am set by him. 4. That command of selling, and giving to the poor; *i. e.* if otherwise thou canst not relieve thy indigent brother in distress, but by selling somewhat of thy own, then to do that, though it be most unlike to prospering or thriving in the world. 5. That command of freedom and ingenuity of spirit, of unconcernedness in these worldly, inferiour, transitory things, of self-resignation, dependence on God's providence for our daily bread; instead of all the carking infidelity of the worldling. And 6. That precept of earnest desire and contending for peace. 7. That of meekness, patience, praying for enemies.

S. *How are all those so unreconcilable with* Mammon's *commands?*

C. You will discern it in the particulars. 1. Mammon prescribeth violence to every man, oppressing the poor righteous man, any that stands in our way to our espoused gain. 2. Mammon commands (not only despising our faith in performance of disadvantageous promises, but also) false accusing, blasting, defaming of any which are likely to keep, or get any preferment or possession that we have a mind to; as in the example of *Jezabel* toward *Naboth* it appears, when her husband had a longing after his Vineyard. 3. Mammon commands a perpetual unsatisfiedness, a kind of dropsie-thirst, infused still more and more at the encreasing of our plenty: Mammon will not be thy friend, but on condition thou shalt be more importunate in getting wealth, more passionate in making court to Mammon after this increase than thou wert before; and so generally you may observe it, the more possessions men attain to, still the more covetous they grow. 4. Mammon commands tenacity, a most strict keeping of our own; nay, a perpetual desire of being a purchasing, of making some new bargains, of enlarging the walk; and if Christ require to sell and give, you see the rich man, Mammon's servant, presently leaves him, he *goes away very sad, because he was very rich.* 5. Mammon hath all manner of slavish tremblings, cowardly, uningenuous fears for his subject's task, (quite contrary to self-resignation) a dismal thoughtfulness at every apprehension of danger, a perpetual carking and hovering over his wealth, and a venturing on any the most unlawful, unchristian practice, whenever that great Law of self-preservation, (as Mammon tells him) *i. e.* the law of Mammon, but of no other Law-giver, (I am sure not of Christ) suggests it to him. 6. Mammon commands War (for enlarging of dominion of possessions) that more glorious name of piracy, which Saint *James* seems to have considered, when he saith, *Wars come* [1] *from our pleasures*, Jam. 4. 1. which are surely those pleasures consequent to the delight or lust of the eye, desiring to have, *verse* 2. It being most clear, that covetousness puts men upon all the most furious War, and contentions, and quarrels in the world. 7. Mammon sets men upon the most malicious acts of revenge of any thing: The covetous man hath still so many enemies in his black book, so many quarrels to answer, injuries to repay, trespasses to revenge, that his whole life is a kind of hell to him; not knowing how to be quit with every of them, he is fain to treasure up quarrels many years together, and study nothing but the payments of such debts. Other contrarieties might be mentioned between the commands of God and Mammon. God commandeth to *keep the heart*, Mammon the *wealth, with all diligence*, or *above all keeping*: God commands *sorrow for sin*, Mammon sorrow for losses: God commands confession of Christ and all Christian truth, and never more than when it is most opposed, when it is like to bring most danger to the confessor; Mammon commands *prudence, wariness, time-serving, never hazarding any thing for truth's sake: The righteous is bold as a Lion*; when the Mammonist, with his wealth and heaps before him, dares not quatch without a licence from Mammon, and assurance that it shall cost him nothing. These and an hundred more contrarieties evidence the truth of our Saviour's general speech [*That no man can serve two Masters*] brought home to this conclusion, *You cannot serve* [illegible] *and Mammon*, and from thence enforce the prohibition of [*not laying up our treasures upon earth*] or setting our heart on worldly riches; which is the main importance of those six verses. But beside, there is a positive exhortation in these verses to charity and liberality, which is meant by *laying up our treasure in heaven, i. e.* so laying out our wealth, as that it may bring us in those everlasting returns, as Christ explains the phrase by the like in another place, *Give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in Heaven*; and, *Make you friends of the unrighteous*, or transitory, or unstable *Mammon*, (contrary to the true durable riches) that *when you fail, they may receive you*, i. e. (by an Hebraism) you may be received (as, *this night they shall require thy soul*, is all one with, *thy soul shall be required*) *into everlasting habitations*. And besides other benefits of your liberality, this will be one, That when you thus lay up your wealth by giving it to God and his poor children, your heart, which duly follows that treasure, will have no temptation to fasten on the earth, but on heaven: where our treasure dwells, our hopes are laid up, our joy is to be expected, and so *there will our hearts be also.*

[1] ἐκ τῶν ἡδονῶν.

S. *I shall not trouble you longer with this matter, it being so obvious and plain, only methinks two Verses there are in the midst of these which sound not to this matter, and are somewhat obscure; I beseech your help to direct me to the meaning of them:* they are *Vers.* 22, 23. [The light of the body is the eye; if therefore thy eye be single, thy whole body shall be full of light; but if thy eye be evil, thy whole body shall be full of darkness. If therefore the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is that darkness?]

C. These words, as they are mostly interpreted concerning the goodness or ilness of intentions, are not indeed very pertinent to the business in hand, of liberality, and of love of money; you may therefore give me your patience, while I give you the natural genuine interpretation of them, and then you will discern how pertinent they are to the present matter. To which purpose, I shall first tell you what is meant by a *single and an evil eye*; secondly, by *light and darkness*; thirdly,

by

by the similitude here used; and then, fourthly, how all belongs to the point in hand.

S. *What is meant by the* single and evil *eye?*

C. The word [m] *single* signifieth in the New Testament, liberal; the *single eye*, liberality, bounty, distribution of our wealth to the poor. So *Rom.* 12. 8. *He that giveth* [n] *in singleness*, or, as our margent readeth, *liberally*: 2 Cor. 8. 2. [o] *The riches of their singleness*, we read, *liberality*: chap. 9. 11. [p] *To all singleness*, we read, *to all bountifulness*; and vers. 13. [q] *Singleness of distribution*, we read, *liberality of distribution*, or *liberal distribution*: *Jam.* 1. 5. *That giveth* [r] *to all men singly*, we read, *liberally*. Contrary to this, the *evil eye* signifies *envy*, *covetousness*, *unsatisfiedness*, *niggardliness*, and all the contraries of *liberality*. So *Matth.* 20. 15. *Is thy* [s] *eye evil, because I am good?* i. e. Art thou unsatisfied therefore, because I have been more liberal to another? thou hast thy due, why art thou discontent or unsatisfied? So *Matth.* 7. 21, 22. *Out of the heart cometh the evil eye*, i. e. *envy*, *covetousness*, *unsatisfiedness*. (For this is observable, that envy is generally set as the opposite to all liberality, and God by the [t] Fathers is said to be *without envy*, meaning most liberal and bountiful.) The word which is here rendred * *evil*, being equivalent to [x] an Hebrew word which signifies the greatest degree of illiberality or uncharitableness; and the word *eye* being added proverbially, perhaps because that part hath most to do in covetousness, which is called *The lust of the eye*, 1 *John* 2. 16.

Liberality.

[m] ἁπλῶς.
[n] ἐν ἁπλότητι.
[o] πλοῦτος ἁπλότητος.
[p] εἰς πάσαν ἁπλότητα.
[q] ἁπλότητι κοινωνίας.
[r] πᾶσιν ἁπλῶς.
[s] ἢ ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου πονηρὸς ὅτι [t] ἀγαθός, *Damas.* as ἀφθονίστως, *Chrysost.* [x] πονηρός. רשע

S. *What is meant by* light *and* darkness?

C. By *light*, Christianity, or the state of the Gospel. We *are of the light* and *walk like children of light*. And *darkness*, contrary to that, unchristian heathenish affections or actions.

S. *What is meant by the similitude here used?*

C. That as in the body of a man the eye is the directer, shews it what it should do, and if it be as it ought, directeth it the right way; but if not, leadeth into most dangerous errours: so in the man the heart (mentioned immediately before) if it be liberally affected, having *laid up its treasure in heaven*, and fastned it self on it, will direct the man to all manner of good Christian actions; but if it be covetous, unsatisfied, worldly, hard, illiberal, it brings forth all manner of unchristian, heathenish actions. And then *if the light that is in thee be darkness*, if the heart in thee be unchristian, heathenish, *how great is that darkness?* What an unchristian condition is this?

S. *I shall not now ask you how all this belongs to the point in hand.*

C. It is indeed plain enough already, that it belongs perfectly to the business. And this is the sum of all. 1. That liberality and charity in the heart is a special part of Christianity, hath a notable influence toward the production of all Christian vertues, and a main argument and evidence it is of a Christian to have this grace in him. 2. That uncharitableness, worldly-mindedness, unsatisfiedness, uncontentedness, envy, covetousness, is a sin of a very ill effect and consequence; betrays a man to all most unchristian sins, *fills him full of iniquity*, (according to that of Saint *Paul*, 1 *Tim.* 6. 10. for *the love of money is the root of all evil*, &c.) and is a sad symptom, where-ever we find it, of a great deal of ill besides. All which comes in very pertinently on occasion of those words, *Where the treasure is, there will the heart be also*; and is a foundation for that appendent affirmation [*You cannot serve God and Mammon.*]

The influence of it on all Christian vertues.

S. *You have fully cleared this difficulty, and passed through the first of the two things contained in the remainder of this Chapter, that which pertains to the mortifying* all desire and love of wealth. *God make it successful in my heart, to work all covetous earthly affections out of it, and plant all contrary graces of liberality and mercifulness in their stead.*

You will please now to proceed to the other thing, the moderating of our worldly care *and* providence, *in the following words*, [Take no thought for your life, *&c.*] *and that taking its rise from the former* [Therefore I say unto you, Take no thought, *&c.*]

Sect. V.

Being come unto this, I cannot but remember my self, and put you in mind that you formerly told me, that I might reserve my expectation of this, as of an improvement of the Tenth Commandment of the Decalogue: How may that be cleared?

Of the Tenth Commandment.

C. By observing the importance of the negative part of that precept of the Law, which is directly the prohibition of all covetous thoughts, and desires of other mens possessions, (expresst after the manner of the Hebrews by enumeration of particulars, the *house*, the *wife*, &c. and by way of analogy, the honours as well as wealth, all considered as the possessions of other men.) This prohibition immediately contains a positive command of contentedness with our present estate, whatever it is, without any desire of change, murmuring, repining, disquieting of others: and so thus much is contained in that Old Commandment: A greater and superiour degree in which matter, is this of *not taking thought for the morrow*: for that prohibition doth not only restrain our appetites from roving to that which is other mens, from disquieting and disturbing of others, and (as the last Commandment is described, *Matth.* 10. 19.) the depriving (in thought, and endeavour, and wish) the labouring to get away from another man that which may by his loss (and not otherwise) accrew to me; but this of not *caring for the morrow*, is the not disturbing or disquieting my self, the turning out all worldly thoughtfulness out of my breast, and not only those which are terminated in anothers loss or damage.

S. *Will you then be pleased to proceed to that Christian pitch which is here set down?*

C. I shall now proceed to that point, which takes up all the verses to the end of this Chapter, and in it only detain you with two things. 1. The precept or doctrine of worldly thoughtfulness. 2. The inforcements of it, shewing how reasonable it is to be observed and practised, though it seem a strange doctrine.

Of worldly care.

S. *To begin with the first, what care and solicitude is it that is here forbidden?*

C. It is set down in these three several phrases. First, [y] *Take no thought for your life, what you shall eat, or what you shall drink; nor yet for your body, what you shall put on*, Vers. 25. Secondly, [y] *Take no thought, saying, what shall we eat*, &c. Verse 31. And thirdly, [y] *Take no thought for the morrow*, Verse 34. From all which, it appears that the thing here forbidden is that, what-ever it is, which is the full importance of the Greek word, rendred [[z] *taking thought*] which being derived by Grammarians from

[y] μὴ μεριμνᾶτε.
[z] μέριμνα.

[a] μεϊζον νῦν. from a phraſe which ſignifies in Engliſh to [a *divide the mind*] doth then ſignifie a *dubiouſneſs of mind*, or *anxiety*; and that a want, (or littleneſs) a defect of Faith, Verſe 30. a not believing as we ought, that God that gives us life and bodies, will allow us means to ſuſtain one, and array the other. Saint [b] μετεωρίζεσθε *Luke* expreſſes it by a word which we render [b] *doubtful mind*, or careful ſuſpence, but ſignifies *hanging betwixt two*; as not knowing how to reſolve whether God will do this for us or no. Or, perhaps, it [c] μετέωρον θηρεύσεως. *Eccleſ.* 37. 14. is a figurative ſpeech from a word ſignifying a [c] *watch-tower*, or *high place*, whither men get up to ſee what is coming, which is an argument of great fear and care in them. Now that I may give you the clear evidence of the Chriſtian doctrine in this matter, I will deliver it diſtinctly in theſe few Propoſitions. Firſt, That this is a truth (infallible truth) of God's, That God will for the future provide for every ſervant of his, food and raiment, a competence of the neceſſaries of life. This truth may appear by the promiſes to this purpoſe in the Scripture. Two there are of this nature, that the Margents of our Bibles in this place refer to: *Pſal.* 55. 22. *Caſt thy burthen on the Lord, and he ſhall ſuſtain thee:* 1 Pet. 5. 7. *Caſting all care on the Lord, for he careth for you.* To which you may add Chriſt's promiſe, that *If we ask we ſhall have, if we ask not amiſs*, ſaith S. *James*; which ſure we do not, if we ask but what he taught us to ask, *this day our daily bread, i. e.* (as in the explication of the Lord's Prayer was ſhewed) *day by day thoſe things that are neceſſary for the remainder of our life.* Many other promiſes you will obſerve to the ſame purpoſe, and particularly this in this place by way of expoſtulation, Verſ. 30. *ſhall he not much more cloath you, O ye of little faith?* intimating ſtrongly a promiſe that he ſhall, and requiring faith or belief of this promiſe at our hands. Secondly, that want of faith or truſt in this promiſe, not believing this truth, is a piece of the damning ſin of infidelity, ſo charged here upon them that believe it not, Ver. 30. Thirdly, that any carking ſolicitude for the future is an argument of this diſtruſt, this not daring to rely on God's providence and God's promiſe, and ſo an unchriſtian ſin.

S. *But is not every man commanded by the Apoſtle*, 1 *Tim.* 5. 8. to provide for his own, eſpecially thoſe of his own houſe or kindred? *And if he doth not, defined* to have denied the faith, and to be worſe than an Infidel? *Sure then, this want of thoughtfulneſs and ſecular providence will rather be* infidelity.

Providing for our own.

C. Becauſe you lay ſuch weight upon that one place of S. *Paul* to *Timothy*, and ſeem to think it ſo contrary to this preſent doctrine of our Saviour, (which if it were, it would yet be more reaſonable to bring S. *Paul* to our Saviour by ſome commodious interpretation, than to evacuate the force of all our Saviour's diſcourſe on this matter by this one place of S. *Paul*) and becauſe *Rom.* 13. 14. the Apoſtle's caution, being rightly rendred [make not proviſion for the fleſh to coveting] or [turn not the care or providence for the fleſh into coveting or getting away other mens goods] (forbidden in the Tenth Commandment) ſuppoſes that this *proviſion for the fleſh* is apt to be ſo abus'd; I ſhall therefore firſt endeavour to give you a clear view of that place, for there is ſome miſtake in it, and you will diſcern it by this view of ſome few verſes in a brief Paraphraſe. Verſ. 3. *Let thoſe widows which are widows indeed, (i. e.* which have neither husbands nor children to relieve them) be reſpected and relieved by the Church. Verſ. 4. *If any widow having no husband, hath yet* (as it follows) *children or grand-children, let them, i e.* thoſe children, *learn firſt to ſhew piety or kindneſs to their own houſe, i. e.* to their parents, and ſo [d] repay or requite them for their paternal care, do what their parents had done to them, (ſee Verſ. 16.) Verſ. 5. *But the widow that is perfectly ſuch, i. e.* hath [e] no children to relieve her, ſhe doth in that ſolitude and widow-hood hope on God, and *continue in ſupplications and prayers* (at conſtant times) *night and day.* Verſ. 6. *But ſhe that liveth luxuriouſly is dead while ſhe lives.* Verſ. 7. *And do you give ſuch rules as theſe, that they may be blameleſs.* Verſ. 8. *But if any man or woman do not provide for, or relieve thoſe that belong to them, eſpecially thoſe that are of their family* (as the parents muſt be reſolved to be) *he or ſhe hath denied the faith, and is worſe than an infidel.* Verſ. 9. *Let none be choſen to be a widow which is leſs than ſixty years old*, &c. You ſee this whole diſcourſe is to ſhew what kind of perſon might be fit to be choſen to be a widow in the Church, one to be maintain'd out of the Churches ſtock; and among the reſt of the qualities requir'd of her, this is one, that ſhe muſt be one that hath no child able to maintain her, to provide for her: The word ſignifies (more generally) to [f] *take care of*, as a Father of a child, or as a child here of a forlorn deſtitute parent. And then ſtill that differs much from the notion that worldly phancies affix to this place, thinking themſelves oblig'd to provide eſtates and riches for them, whereas the words cannot be extended to command any more than this, That every maſter or Miſtreſs of a family muſt take care of, and relieve their parents, and thoſe of their family, (or which remain in their [g] houſe or family,) and then that will not come home to that thoughtfulneſs, or ſecular fore-caſting, to which in your objection it was applied. The ſhort is, the place refers to the duty of the rich, not to let the Church be burthened with relieving their poor kindred, eſpecially their parents, which are of their family) have a right to live in their houſe, and a propriety to be maintained by them, or that they do take care for and relieve them, (ſtill ſuppoſing they are able to do it:) and ſo this belongs nothing to ſaving of wealth for them, but ſpending it on them when we have it, and not laying it on the charge of the Church to do it; and that will ſufficiently weaken your argument. But then ſuppoſing this of ſecular fore-caſting and providing for neceſſaries of life to be the thing here ſpoken of (as it is apparent it is not, but only [h] relieving the parents out of what we have) then, to take away all ſcruple, and to reconcile this prohibition of Chriſts with this preſent of S. *Paul*'s, it will be neceſſary to add a fourth Propoſition, That for preſent ſupplies, a Chriſtian not only may, but muſt uſe thoſe lawful and proper means that are ordinarily in his power to uſe to the attaining that end: and this is ſo far from diſtruſting of God, or not depending and believing on him, that it is indeed a ſpecial act of this faith, the doing of what he requires us to do, and without our doing of which he hath not promiſed to ſupply us. His promiſes, which are the object of our faith, are not abſolute but conditional promiſes: they require and ſuppoſe a condition to be performed on our part, and then give us a right to the thing promiſed, and not before. Every man therefore muſt do ſomewhat himſelf to provide

[a] ἀμείβας ἀποδῶναι, *vices referre.*

[e] μεμονωμένη, ſo μόνη Eſth. 14. 14. ſignifies one that is perfectly alone, which we render *deſolate*; and ſo *Bar.* 4. 16. μόνη is ſhe that having her daughters carried away captive, is left quite alone.

[f] προνοεῖ, ἐπιμελεῖται, Heſych. Πρόνοια, προαιρούμενος, ἐπιμέλεια, φροντίς. So children that are expoſed by their parents are ἀπρονόητοι in *Harmenopulus.*

[g] Οἰκείων.

[h] As *Alex. Aphrodiſ.* ſaith, πᾶν τὸ προνοῦν τίνος, ἀναδόντι τῷ προνοουμένῳ πειστικόν, Ἀποριτ. 18. & Ammonius in Schol. on the applies that of

[d] ἀμοιβὰς ἀποδῶναι, *vices referre.*

[e] μεμονωμένη, ſo μόνη Eſth. 14. 14. ſignifies one that is perfectly alone, which we render *deſolate*; and ſo *Bar.* 4. 16. μόνη is ſhe that having her daughters carried away captive, is left quite alone.

[f] προνοεῖ, ἐπιμελεῖται, Heſych. Πρόνοια, προαιρούμενος, ἐπιμέλεια, φροντίς. So children that are expoſed by their parents are ἀπρονόητοι in *Harmenopulus.*

[g] Οἰκείων.

[h] As *Alex. Aphrodiſ.* ſaith, πᾶν τὸ προνοῦν τίνος, ἀναδόντι τῷ προνοουμένῳ πειστικόν, Ἀποριτ. 18. & Ammonius in Schol. on the applies that of

ἰ. φασὶ, having reſolved, that one of Gods operations is προνοητικὴ τῶν καταλειφθέντων, *providing for thoſe that want*, the Poet to it, Θεοὶ δωτῆρες, &c. *Gods giving them what they want*, making his (*providing*) and his (*giving*) all one.

for

for his own, (and not to do ſo is infidelity in S. *Paul*'s ſtyle; juſt as the Diſciples are called faithleſs, for not caſting out of the Devil, *that would not be caſt out but by prayer and Faſting*, *i.e.* for not uſing that means to caſt him out, *Mark* 9. 19.) muſt endeavour to be inſtrumental to God's providence, and not fly to his extraordinary protection, when his ordinary is afforded us. God doth not uſe to multiply miracles unprofitably; nor at all, but for the begetting or confirming of our faith: which cannot be the caſe when we neglect thoſe means of making good God's truths, which are already by him afforded us: but only, when all lawful means have been tryed improſperouſly, then it will be God's ſeaſon to ſhew forth his extraordinary power. In the mean time, it is ſufficient that he offer us means to bring us to that end which he promiſeth; and if we neglect thoſe means, and ſo fail in our performance of the condition required of us, we thereby diſcharge him of all obligation to make good the promiſe to us; which was not abſolute for him to do without us, but conditional, for him to do if we failed not in our parts.

S. *But what are thoſe* means *required on our parts, as ſubſervient to God's providence in feeding and clothing us?*

C. I ſhall firſt name you ſome that are ſuch means; and then others that are miſtaken for ſuch, and are not. The true means you may know in general by this mark, that all means perfectly lawful, (*i.e.* all things that are proper to that end, and are no way prohibited by God) are ſuch, and all unlawful are not. But then particularly, firſt, Labour and diligence in ones lawful calling is ſuch a lawful means; As in ſpiritual, ſo in temporal things, if we * labour, or work, God will † cooperate. As in the war with *Amalek*, when *Iſrael* fights, God will fight with them: Poverty is the *Amalek*, our honeſt labour is our fighting againſt it, (and therefore the idle perſon is called, 2 *Theſſ.* 3. 6, 7, 11. [1] a diſorderly walker; the word (being military) ſignifying one out of his rank, one that is not in file to fight againſt his enemy) and when we are thus employed, God our Captain hath ſworn that he will have war, will fight againſt that enemy, with us, for ever; and that, as the Lxxii. read in that place, * *with a ſecret hand* aſſiſting him that is thus buſied, proſpering him inſenſibly that is thus employed: A ſure bleſſing on the laborious, *Prov.* 10. 4. *The hand of the diligent maketh rich*; and, on the other ſide, *he that will not labour*, ſaith the Apoſtle, *let him not eat*: which is there a piece of Apoſtolical diſcipline, to beſiege idleneſs and ſtarve it up; and that an image on earth of what is done in Heaven, it being the rule of God's ordinary providence, that they that neglect the means ſhall not obtain the end. This promiſe being conditional (as all others) not to the idle, profane fiduciary, but to the faithful labourer; the abſolute Stoical depender on Fate may ſtarve for want of induſtry, die for want of phyſick, and be damned for want of repentance; and all this not through too much, but too little faith, the not taking the means along with him, which were predeſtined by God to bring him to a better end.

Means ſubſervient to God's providence in ſuſtaining us. Labour. * ἐργάζεσθαι. † συνεργῶν. [1] ἀτάκτως περιπατῶν, ἀτακτῶν. * ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ ἐργαζομένους.

S. *What other ſort of means is there required of us by God to this end?*

C. Prayer to him for *our daily bread*; the condition without which there is no one thing which we have promiſe to receive from him: *Ask, and ye ſhall have*, &c. but not otherwiſe. So elſewhere, the worſhipping of God is joined with the *doing of his will*, to make us capable of God's hearing.

Prayer.

S. *What other means?*

C. Honeſt thrift; the not ſpending upon our luſts, our vanities, thoſe good things of this world that our labour and prayers have by God's bleſſing brought in to us. For the prodigal may ſtarve as well as the ſluggard; he that drinks out his bread, as he that doth not earn it. God hath not undertaken for any ſin, that it ſhall not ruine us: his protection is like that of the Law, for them only that travel in the day and in the rode; not for the diſorderly walkers in any kind, that have any by-path, or night-work to exhauſt that treaſure that his providence hath, or is ready to beſtow. And the ſame that I ſay of luxury, may be ſaid of other harpies and vultures, that leave men oft-times as bare as the high-way robbers; that fly ſin of cloſe adultery, that eats out ſo many eſtates, yea, and that other of ſtrife and contention, that peſtilence, as it were, that walketh in darkneſs, and devours the wealth as well as the ſoul. And there are no reparations to be expected from God for ſuch loſſes. One means more there is to which God's promiſe of temporal plenty being annexed, we may well add it to the former, The exerciſe of acts of juſtice and mercy. *Bring you all the tithes*, ſaith God by *Malachi*, *into my ſtore-houſe*, Mal. 3. 10. *i. e.* both the Prieſts and the poor man's tithe, and *prove me now herewith, If I will not open the windows of heaven, and pour you out a bleſſing*, &c. To which purpoſe the Jews had a proverbial Speech, † *Pay tithes on purpoſe, that thou mayſt be rich.* And there are many places of Scripture to the ſame purpoſe which before were mentioned; and threatnings on the contrary, that the *withholding more than is meet ſhall tend to want.* To theſe may perhaps be added another means, having alſo the promiſes of long and proſperous life annexed to it, that of meekneſs and obedience; of which ſaith the Law, their *days ſhall be long in the Land*, flowing with milk and honey; and the Goſpel, that they *ſhall poſſeſs the earth*: as alſo it is affirmed of Godlineſs in general, that it *hath the promiſes of this life*, *i. e.* of ſo much of the proſperity of this world as ſhall be matter of contentment to them. Now theſe being by God deſigned as fit and proper means to the qualifying us for the performance of his promiſe, (his providing of ſecular ſufficient wealth for us) and the condition required on our parts, it will be but the believing of a lie, for any man to neglect theſe ſeveral means required on his part, and yet to claim or challenge the end promiſed on God's part: in the ſame manner and degree as it is for the impenitent ſinner remaining ſuch, to believe and challenge the pardon of his ſins and ſalvation.

Thrift. Acts of mercy. † *Da decimas in hoc, ut ditęſcas.*

S. *I cannot but conſent to this truth, and acknowledge the fitneſs of the means, which you have mentioned, as truly ſubſervient to that end.*

But you told me, There were alſo ſome were miſtaken for ſuch means, but are not: What are thoſe?

C. 1. Secular wiſdom, policy, contrivance, (for though this ſeem ſometimes to obtain that end, yet firſt, there is no promiſe made to it; ſecondly, it many times faileth of the deſign; nay, thirdly, it hath oft-times a moſt remarkable curſe upon it. 2. Hoarding up all that comes, pinching the back and belly to fill the bag. 3. Going to Law, and contentiouſneſs. 4. Tenacity, not giving or lending

Falſe means.

lending to thoſe that truly want; the griping illiberal hand. (*Give, and it ſhall be given unto you*, not elſe.) 5. Immoderate care and ſolicitude; loving and courting of the world. 6. Deceit and injuſtice; and eſpecially, Sacrilege and Perjury. Each of theſe in the eſteem of the world are the faireſt way to wealth, yet in the event prove the ſtraight rode to curſes and poverty. It is a *ſnare to devour that that is holy*, ſaith *Solomon*, and *after vows to make enquiry*; and that ſnare meaning treachery to the wealth as well as the Soul. See the flying roll, *Zach.* 5. 2. (which was formerly mentioned,) and the *curſe that it brought with it*, Verſ. 3. And that *entring into the houſe of the thief, and of him that ſweareth falſly*, Verſ. 4. *i. e.* on his family alſo, and *it ſhall remain in the midſt of his houſe*, and never leave haunting it, till it *conſume it with the timber and ſtones:* that which a man thinks would be beſt able to endure, the firmeſt part of an eſtate, moulders and crumbles away between the fingers of the perjured perſon; noting this to be a conſuming ſin, (and a conſumption is an hereditary diſeaſe, an embleme of which is to be ſeen, *Num.* 5. in the perjured woman, Verſ. 27. *The water that cauſeth the curſe, ſhall enter into her, and become bitter, and her belly ſhall ſwell, and her thigh rot*, thoſe two parts of the body that have relation to the poſterity.) 7. Diſtruſt of God's promiſe, for ſure never any man got any thing of God by not truſting him: He that will not take his word, muſt find out ſome other pay-maſter. 8. Oppreſſion, violence, ſpoiling of others, (though that ſeem a ſure preſent courſe to bring in wealth) for the threat of the Prophet *Iſai.* 33. 1. belongs to ſuch, *Wo unto thee that ſpoileſt; when thou ceaſeſt to ſpoil, thou ſhalt be ſpoiled.* Men are ſeldom ſuffered to taſt any of the fruit of thoſe ſins, leſt they or others ſhould fall in love with them.

S. *You have now abundantly diſcharged your promiſe, in ſetting down the true, and the pretending means.*

Have you any more Propoſitions now to add to the four already mentioned in this buſineſs?

C. Only theſe two. 5. That he that uſeth theſe true means appointed by God, and diſcards the falſe ones ſuggeſted by the world, by Satan, or by his own ravening ſtomach, is more ſure of not wanting for the future, is better provided for a comfortable old age, and a thriving proſperous poſterity, than all the worldlings's arts can poſſibly provide him. He that gives over all anxious thought for himſelf, enters into God's tuition, and then ſhall ſurely be never the poorer for not caring. 6. That the uſing of unlawful (though never ſo ſpecious or ſeemingly neceſſary) means to the getting or preſerving of worldly wealth, or the neceſſities of life, is a moſt direct piece of infidelity, moſt clearly forbidden in the phraſe of *Taking thought:* This being the diſtruſting of God and his authorized means, and flying to the witch with *Saul*, or rather the Devil, to help us to it; the ° dividing our minds or * hanging betwixt two; or rather indeed forſaking of one, and cleaving to the other; diſclaiming God and his providence, and truſting to our ſelves and our own artifices. And this ſure will be granted to be the greateſt fury, the greateſt perturbation and anxiety of mind imaginable, which thus drives us out of our Reaſon, our Chriſtianity, to thoſe courſes which are moſt contrary to both.

° μέριμνα. * μετεωρισμός.

S. *I conceive the ſum of your whole diſcourſe on this matter is this, That for the good things of the world, God having made* promiſe *to give them to his ſervants, and his promiſe being* conditional, *requiring at our hands the uſe of means to obtain the thing promiſed*, It is our duty to uſe thoſe means, labour and prayer, *&c.* and then ſo fully to truſt God for the performing his promiſe, as never to have anxious or dubious thought about it; *never to flie to any any unlawful means, to provide for our ſelves. And by this way of ſtating, I acknowledge our Saviour's ſpeech here fully reconciled with Saint* Paul's *command of providence, whatſoever that might be thought to ſignifie, and ſo with* Chriſt's *praying for temporal bleſſing*, &c.

Anxiety.

I have only one ſcruple wherein I ſhall deſire your ſatisfaction, whether God doth not ſometimes leave men deſtitute of food and raiment, and how then it can be infidelity to be anxious in that point? or, How can God's promiſe of caring for us be ſaid to be performed?

C. I anſwer, 1. That it is not ordinary for men to be left deſtitute of food and raiment; and though ſometime it cannot be had but by begging of it, yet God having in his providence deſigned the rich man to be his Steward, (the wealthy man's barn to be the poor man's ſtore-houſe) no man is left deſtitute that is afforded this means. 2. There being ſo many other means (forenamed) required of us to be inſtrumental to God's providence, it will hardly be found that any man is left thus deſtitute, who hath not firſt been wanting to himſelf; and ſo the whole matter will be imputable to his default, and not to God's. 3. That if the utmoſt be ſuppoſed which is imaginable, that ſome one be left ſo far deſtitute as to come to ſtarve, yet may the promiſe of God remain true and firm; for that promiſe obligeth him not to eternize the life of any: which being ſuppoſed, that he ſhould die by famine is as reaſonable and reconcileable with this promiſe, which can extend no farther than that he will ſuſtain us as long as he ſees it fit for us to live, but no longer) as that he ſhould die by ſword or peſtilence; and that death will be as ſupportable as many other diſeaſes and deaths, of the Stone, Strangury, Dyſentery, *&c.* 4. That ſuppoſe God do thus deſtitute us, yet our anxiety or ſolicitude, our uſing of unlawful means, can never be able to relieve or ſecure us; whatſoever we can in this caſe call to our relief, God can curſe and blaſt alſo, and make it as unable to help us as the Reed of *Egypt:* and though ſometimes God permits unlawful means to offer us help, when lawful fail us, to make trial of us, whether we will uſe them, and diſtruſt God (who ought to be truſted and relied on, *though he kill us*) or no; yet is it far more ordinary for thoſe who have fled to all manner of diſhoneſt means of encreaſing wealth, to come to abſolute beggery and diſtreſs and contumelious ends, than in any mans obſervation it will be found for the truſters in God to do. 5. Why may it not be thought and found true upon every man's ſelf-examination, that ſuch deſtitution, whenever it befals a child of God, is a puniſhment of ſome ſin, which God in mercy ſees fit to puniſh here, and not in another world? As particularly, that of littleneſs of faith in this matter; as *Peter*'s ſinking, *Mat.* 14. 30. was a puniſhment of his fear, and doubting, and *little faith*, which ſome good men are very ſubject to, and whereſoever it is found, may expect to be puniſhed, as being it ſelf a ſin, and containing in it ſo many other ſins. 1. The ſin of diſobedience to Chriſt's command here, in his [*take no thought*] Verſ. 31. 2. The ſin of infidelity, not truſting, and ſo denying

Deſtitution.

μὴ μεριμνήσητε.

(in

(in actions at leaſt) God's veracity, the attribute wherein he chiefly glories; giving him the lie, as it were, an affront and contumely to the Almighty. 3. The ſin of worldly-mindedneſs, placing our care and affection on ſuch baſe and inferiour objects, incurvation of the immortal Soul to a thing ſo much below it, and robbing God of his due, that peculiar Creature of his, the heart, ſo naturally his, and moreover ſo importunately begg'd for by him: not to mention many other ſins, which conſtantly follow this ſolicitude, (where it is once entertained, not as a tranſient paſſion, but a Chronical diſeaſe) though not conſtantly the ſame, as indevotion, impatience, unmercifulneſs, cowardice, worldly ſorrow, maligning of others, *&c.*

S. *Having thus largely explained the Prohibition, you may pleaſe to add in one word what is the contrary Chriſtian duty that is here commanded by Chriſt?*

Praiſing God.

C. Praiſing God for our preſent wealth, and truſting him for the future.

S. *What do you mean by the former?*

C. Praiſing him four ways. 1. By acknowledging the receipt; 2. uſing it, and rejoycing in it; 3. miniſtring, or communicating to them that have not; and 4. if any thing ſtill remain, keeping it as inſtrumental to God's providence for the future, laying up what God gives us to lay up.

S. *What do you mean by the latter?*

Truſting him.

C. 1. Believing his promiſe; 2. obeying his directions in the uſe of his authorized means, and none elſe; and 3. referring the ſucceſs chearfully to him, and praying to him for it without doubting.

S. *I conceive you have done with the Precept or doctrine, which now I ſee how fitly it is annexed to the former matter of not ſerving of Mammon, 1. As an Anſwer to the Mammoniſt's reaſon or motive to his ſerving of Mammon* [*that he may not be deſtitute on the morrow:*] *2. As an improvement of that former exhortation, to which it may be ſeaſonably ſuperadded, but would never have entred or have been admitted without that harbinger. I beſeech God to ſink it down into my heart. To which end, I preſume you will give me your aſſiſtance by proceeding to the ſecond thing propoſed from our Saviour's words here, the* Inforcements of this duty, *ſhewing how reaſonable it is to be obſerved by a Chriſtian.*

Seven inforcements of it.

C. I ſhall proceed to that, and give you the inforcements as they lye. A firſt inforcement is the conſideration of what God hath done to us already. 1. He hath given us life it ſelf, which is much more, and a far greater act of power and mercy, than to give food for the continuing of that life. 2. He hath given us the very body we take ſuch care of, and that is much more again than the raiment that muſt clothe it. And thoſe he hath given without any aid of ours, without our uſe of (direct or indirect) means, and therefore, no doubt, can provide ſufficiently for the ſuſtaining of both. And for his willingneſs to do it, if we truſt and relie on him, thoſe very former mercies of his are pawns and pledges of it. God (ſaith a Father) by giving, becomes our debtor. Every mercy from ſo good a Father, comes forth Twins; a gift and a bond together; a preſent payment, and a future pawn; a ſum paid down, and an annuity made over: the having beſtowed favours, being his greateſt obligation to continue them. When we can begin with the Pſalmiſt, *Pſal.* 100. *It is he that made us*, then we may confidently go on, *We are his people and ſheep*, &c. And then, *O go your ways into his gates with thankſgiving*, not only for paſt mercies, but in confidence of future alſo, *his mercy is for everlaſting*, &c. A ſecond Inforcement is taken from the example of God's providence toward other creatures: Firſt, for food, from the *Fowls of the air*; Secondly, for raiment, from the *Lilies of the field*. For food, in that thoſe Birds without any trade of Husbandry, of ſowing or reaping, *&c.* are by the providence of God ſufficiently ſuſtained, (Nay, of many birds it is obſerved, they are fatteſt ſtill in coldeſt and ſharpeſt weather:) Nay, that ſort of birds that St. *Luke* mentions, *Luke* 12.24. the Ravens, are a creature, that, if *Job* or the *Pſalmiſt* may be believed, *Job* 38. 41. *Pſal.* 147. 9. hath more of the providence of God illuſtrious in it than any other. Naturaliſts have obſerved of that creature, that it † expoſeth the young ones as ſoon as they are hatch'd, leaves them meatleſs and featherleſs, to ſtruggle with hunger, as ſoon as they are gotten into the world; and whether by dew from Heaven, a kind of Manna rained into their mouths, when they gape (and, as the Pſalmiſt ſaith, *Call upon God*) or whether by flies flying into their mouths, or whether by worms bred in their neſts, as ‖ ſome think, or by what other means, God knows, *God feedeth them.* And therefore perhaps it was, that that creature, to make its return of gratitude to God, flies preſently on his errand to feed the Prophet *Elias* in the Wilderneſs: In which this was ſure very obſervable, that that creature which is ſo unnatural as not to feed it's own young ones, did yet at God's command feed the Prophet: as ſometimes thoſe bags of the Miſer are opened liberally to God's children (at their death, in building Hoſpitals, *&c.*) which had been ſhut to their own all their life. This example ſignifies, (and being uſed by our Saviour, proves) That God can, and will ‖ do the ſame to us much more, and accordingly our Saviour ſhuts it up with an expoſtulation, [*Are not you much better than they?*] Man is a much more conſiderable creature than thoſe birds, man is the Monarch of all them, (and *the life of my Lord the King is worth ten thouſand of theirs;*) and therefore ſurely a far greater part of God's providence than they, and ſo more ſure to be competently provided for, though no thoughtfulneſs of his contribute to it. But then this muſt be taken with ſome Caution along with it: not that we ſhould neither ſow nor reap, becauſe the Fowls do neither; but that we ‖ ſhould take no anxious thought as they neither ſow nor reap; that it is as unreaſonable for a Chriſtian to diſtruſt God's providence, to bury his ſoul in an anxious care for earthly things, though the very neceſſaries of life, as for the Raven to be ſet to Husbandry. Had men acquired but as much Religion, dependence, truſt, reliance on God by all the Preaching of the Goſpel, by all the cultivation of ſo many hundred years, as nature teacheth the young Ravens as ſoon as they are hatcht, *viz.* to gape toward Heaven, and ſo in a plain down-right, natural, inarticulate way, to call on God, the Mammoniſt idol would ſoon be driven out of the world, and a cheerful, comfortable dependence on Heaven (in deſpight of all our jealous, traitorous fears, that worldly hearts betray us to) taken in ſtead of it, an obedient ſubmiſſion to Gods direction in uſing thoſe means that he directeth us to, and then reſigning all up into his hands to diſpoſe of, with an [*if I periſh, I periſh*] and [*I will wait upon the Lord which hideth his face, and I will look for him*] and [*Though he kill me, yet will I truſt in him.*]

† ἐκβάλλει τοὺ νεοσσοὺς ἢ κόραξ.

‖ *Valeſius.*

‖ Φιλεῖ δὲ ὁ Θεὸς τοῖς ὅτε αἰσχίοις ὄντα τὰ οἰκοθεν μηχανᾶσθαι οἵοις τε ἐσιν, ὧν μὴ πονησὶ μὲν, ἀπορωμένοις τὰ ἔσχατα ὀπιπυρῶν τε καὶ συλλαμβάνεσθαι. *Procop. Vandal.* 1. ‖ μὴ μεριμνᾶν.

The other example concerning Raiment from the *Lilies of the field* lies thus; God in his forming of the World hath beſtowed a ſtrange proportion of natural beauty and ornament upon the Lilies, that grow in every field or Garden, though thoſe are of a very ſhort duration, and being not ſenſitive, do contribute nothing to their own beauty, but moſt evidently the whole work is wrought by God only, and all the care and ſolicitude and temporal advantages of gold, and the like artificial bravery, cannot equal or compare with that natural beauty which God hath endowed them with. Which conſideſiation, as it may well leſſen our deſire of the gallantry in clothes, and mortifie our pride which they feed in us (the utmoſt that we can attain to in this kind being not comparable with that which is in the vegetable, *i. e.* meaneſt living Creatures;) ſo may it give us a fiducial reliance on God for all things of this nature, who ſure can clothe us as well as thoſe, and will certainly provide for us ſuch raiment as is convenient for us, by our uſe of ordinary means, without our anxious care and ſolicitude for the future.

S. *What is the next enforcement of this duty?*

C. An argument taken from our own experience in things of ſomewhat a like nature, Ver. 27. For the ſtature of ones body, or the age of ones life, (the ſame * word ſignifies both, but is thought in this place, to denote the former only) every of us know and confeſs, that our care and ſolicitude can do nothing to make any conſiderable addition to it. Now certainly, the lengthning of the life for a few days or hours is not ſo great a matter as life it ſelf; nor the tallneſs or ſtature of the body, as the body it ſelf, (for what matters it how tall a man is?) And therefore it being ſo confeſtly the work of God only to diſpoſe of theſe leſs things, our ſtature, *&c.* how much more reaſonable is it to believe that the ſame God, without any anxious ſolicitude of ours can and will conſerve our life and body, by giving us thoſe things which are neceſſary to their conſervation.

* ἡλικία.

S. *What is the next enforcement?*

C. The contrary practice of the Gentiles, Verſ. 32. The Heathen indeed, who either acknowledge no God at all, or deny his providence over particular things, do uſe this kind of ſolicitude, † ſeeking vehemently and importunately for all theſe things, *i. e.* for food and drink and clothing for the remainder of their lives, or for ſuch a proportion of wealth as will be able thus to furniſh them till their lives end. And this may be allowed or pardoned them, that have no better principles to build on, but would be a ſhame for Chriſtians to have gotten no higher, by the acknowledgment of the true God, and his particular providence and care over all Creatures, (but eſpecially over us men, for whoſe uſe all other Creatures were created) and by the doctrine of Chriſtianity, which teacheth us faith or dependence on Chriſt for all, and deſires to mortifie all love of the gains and pleaſures of this world in us, (by promiſing us a richer inheritance than this earthly *Canaan*) and to work in us an indifference and untroubledneſs of mind for all outward things, and many other graces in order to this, which no Heathen could ever arrive to.

† ἐπιζητοῦντες.

S. *What is the fifth enforcement?*

C. It is ſet down in theſe words, *Ver.* 32. [*For your heavenly Father knoweth that you have need of all theſe things,*] *i. e.* Theſe things that are neceſſary for you (and others you need not ſeek after) God knows you have need of, as well as you; and that God is your Father, and cannot be ſo unkind to you, as not to be willing to beſtow them on you; and that Father an Heavenly Father, and conſequently is perfectly able to beſtow them.

S. *What is the ſixth enforcement?*

C. This, that there is a far more eaſie, Chriſtian, and compendious way to all theſe neceſſaries of life, than our ſolicitude or anxious care; to wit, the ſetting our minds upon our higher intereſts, minding and intending of thoſe joys in another life, and that way of Chriſtian obedience which will lead us to them: which if we do thus intend, God hath promiſed to give us theſe neceſſaries of life, as an appendage or addition over and above; *Piety having the promiſe of this life as well as of another.*

S. *What is the ſeventh enforcement?*

C. Becauſe the time to come, for which we deſire to lay in before-hand (and by that means lay a double burthen on that part of our life which is preſent, to provide for it ſelf and that other alſo) will, when it cometh, be able to take care and make proviſion for it ſelf. The Manna that came down from Heaven to the Iſraelites, fell every day, and therefore there was no need of laying up in ſtore, (and if it were done, it putrified) of reſerving any part of the preſent portion; for, for the time to come, they were ſure to be as plentifully provided as for the preſent they were: and ſo the providence of God, that hath brought us in a preſent ſtore, will be able and ready to do the like for the remainder of our lives, when it comes; and therefore all that we ſhall acquire by this ſolicitude before-hand, is only to accumulate trouble and diſquiet upon our ſelves, *viz.* beſides that due labour and induſtry which we owe to God, (as ſubſervient to his providence) and to our ſelves for our preſent ſubſiſtence, ſo much more alſo as will ſecure us for the future; which what is it but to multiply toil upon our ſelves, above the proportion that God hath deſigned to us? Whereas the trouble that belongs to every day for the maintaining of it ſelf (*i. e.* the labour and ſweat that we eat our bread in) is ſufficient for that day, without our artifices to encreaſe it, and requires too much (rather than takes up too little) time of diverſion from the duties of piety, to theſe ſo vile inferiour offices. The duty being thus largely enforced, and our hearts by ſo many Engines and Pullies raiſed from this earth of ours to that principal care of celeſtial joys, it may now be thought reaſonable to hearken to Chriſt in a prohibition which was never given to men before, and ſo this hard ſaying will be ſoftned; this circumciſion of the heart, amputation of all thoſe ſuperfluous burthenſom cares of the World-ling or Mammoniſt, will be found ſupportable to the Chriſtian. I ſhall need add nothing to ſo plentiful a diſcourſe of this ſubject, but my Prayers, *That we all be in this the true Diſciples of Chriſt, Scholars and Practiſers of this heavenly leſſon.*

LIB. IV.

S. *I See there is yet, after all the trouble that your charity to me hath coſt you, another occaſion and opportunity ſtill behind, ready to tempt you farther to continue your favour to me, in leading me through the Seventh Chapter, wherein this* Sermon on the Mount *is concluded. You may pleaſe therefore to enter upon that, and tell me what you find eſpecially conſiderable in it.*

C. One ſtrict particular Chriſtian precept I find in that Chapter, which, before I told you, will do well to be added to thoſe many that the former Chapters have afforded, as an improvement of the Ninth Commandment of the Law; and the four general ones; with a concluſion of the whole Sermon.

S. *What is the particular precept you ſpeak of?* Sect. I.

C. It is ſet down poſitively in the five firſt Verſes, and then a limitation, or explication, or caution added to it, Ver. 6. The Precept is Negative, Not to judge other men, Ver. 1.

S. *Why do you make that an improvement of the Ninth Commandment?* *Of the Ninth Commandment.*

C. The Ninth Commandment is, [*Thou ſhalt not bear falſe witneſs againſt thy Neighbour.*] That primarily forbiddeth thoſe falſe teſtimonies in judicature which are born againſt *i. e.* are born, and are harmful to any of) our Neighbours, *i. e.* any other man. Then, ſecondly, all perverting the courſe of judgment, by bribes, *&c.* Thirdly, all kinds of detraction, backbiting, whiſpering, wronging, or defaming any, open contumely, or wounding with that ſword of the tongue moſt ſecretly; all kind of lying or falſe ſpeaking, which may any way hurt any other. As for thoſe untruths which, although they are ſuch, are yet ſo far from being deſigned to the hurt of any, that they are perhaps truly gainful to all that are concern'd in them, (as in that known caſe, when a raging furious perſon purſues another to kill him, and asks a by-ſtander which way he went, and that by-ſtander, knowing what he will do, if he either ſay nothing, or do not directly miſguide him, ſhall thereupon, to ſave one from the ſin of killing, and the other from being kill'd, ſay that which is not true) I cannot tell how to reduce this, or the like, to this Ninth Commandment, becauſe this untruth is no ſin againſt my Neighbour (the purſuer or purſued) or hurtful to him, but on purpoſe deſigned to their greateſt good: whatever is amiſs in it muſt be reduced to ſome other prohibition, either as a variation from that attribute of God's, who is Truth it ſelf, and who muſt be imitated in that, as in juſtice of our actions, *&c.* (and accordingly when it is ſet down as a damnable ſin to *do evil that good may come*, Rom. 3. the Apoſtle inſtances in a lye, when by occaſion thereof God's glory is more ſet out) or elſe as a breach of that contract which is betwixt all men, that our words ſhall be agreeable to truth. Now theſe which I have named being the chief (if not only) things forbidden in this Commandment, it will eaſily appear, that the prohibition of judging my brother is a yet higher pitch than what is thus forbidden in, or readily reduced to this Commandment, as you will grant when ye ſee what *Judging* is. Officious untruths.

S. *What is meant by* Judging? Of Judging.

C. 1. All raſh and temerarious, 2. all ſevere, unmerciful cenſures of other men.

S. *What mean you by* raſh cenſures? The ſorts of raſh Cenſures.

C. Such as are not grounded in any manifeſt clear evidence of the fact, but proceed from my jealous and cenſorious humour; being ſtill forward to conclude and collect more evil of other men than doth appear to me. As 1. when by ſome indifferent actions done by my Fellow-Chriſtian, and, appearing to me) I ſurmiſe ſome other evil thing not far diſtant from that, and which may poſſibly be ſignified by it, but is not ſo neceſſarily: or 2. when another man's action being capable of two interpretations, the one faſtning evil upon it, the other not, I take it on the evil ſide, and cenſure him for that action, for which, perhaps, God the ſearcher of hearts will never judge him; (or, in caſe God ſees it to be evil, but I do not, then however thus to judge, is in me temerarious judgment;) or 3. when any other man hath done any thing apparently evil, yet from thence to infer a greater guilt in him than to that action neceſſarily belongs, as the action being perhaps capable of extenuation by circumſtances, for me to deprive it of thoſe extenuations, and paſs the judgment which would belong to it abſolutely conſidered; or 4. upon the commiſſion of one or more ſingle actions, not ſufficient to build up an habit, or argue a malignity in the agent, to cenſure him as guilty of that habit or that malignity, this is ſtill temerarious judgment: which commonly proceedeth, whereſoever it is, from pride, ambition, vain glory, or from envy, malice, uncharitableneſs, and ſelf-love, from one or more of theſe, and falls under the judgment due to the ſuſpicious, contumelious, whiſperer, buſie-body, *&c.* Quite contrary to that *charity* that *hopeth all things, believeth all things, thinketh none evil*; to that humility that thinketh *better of others than of our ſelves*; that peaceableneſs which Chriſt commendeth to us; that kindneſs and pitifulneſs in *bearing one anothers burthens*, and ſo leſſening them, and not making them heavier by our cenſures.

S. *What mean you by* unmerciful cenſures? Unmerciful Cenſures.

C. Thoſe which have no mixture of mercy in them, *Jam.* 2. 13. The precept of forgiving thoſe who have wronged me is by Chriſt improved in ſome kind, and extended even to thoſe offences which are done againſt God, ſo far as that I be obliged by it to look upon them (in others) in the moſt favourable manner, (as on the other ſide I ſhould be moſt ſevere in the examining and judging my ſelf) and always remit of that rigor and ſeverity which the matter is capable of, as knowing that my own beſt actions muſt be lookt on favourably by God, and not ſtrictly weighed by him, or otherwiſe they will never be accepted by him.

S. *To what purpoſe is all that which in this matter is added to this prohibition in the reſt of this period?*

C. It is, firſt, a determent from this ſin. Secondly, a direction how to avoid it. The Determent this; to conſider how fearful a thing it were, if God ſhould judg us without mercy; and how reaDeterment from them.

Direction how to avoid them.

ſonable it is, that he ſhould ſo do, if we be ſo unmerciful to other men. The Direction, to reflect our eyes and cenſures, every man upon his own ſins, and there to buſie them in aggravating every one into the ſize that juſtly belongs to it; by this means to pull down my own plumes, to abate my proud cenſorious humours, and then thoſe will appear but motes in another man, which now do paſs for beams with me. He that is truly humbled with a ſenſe of his own ſins will be willing to wink at faults in another; at leaſt not to improve and enlarge them, not to cenſure and triumph over them.

S. *What is the limitation or caution, or explication of this Precept added in the ſixth verſe?*

A limitation of this prohibition.

C. The ſum of it is this, That this Precept of not judging is not ſo unlimited, that it ſhould be unlawful for me to cenſure or think evil of any man: as in caſe he be an open prophane perſon, expreſt by a Dog or Swine, the one a creature ſo accurſed, that the price of him was not to be conſecrated; the other ſo unclean, that it was forbidden to be eaten by the Jewiſh Law; and both of them Emblems of an habitual impenitent Sinner, 2 *Pet.* 2. 22. The firſt, again, intimating ſuch as bark and rave at all good Exhortations, contradicting and blaſpheming, *Acts* 13. 45. the ſecond thoſe that, though they blaſpheme not, yet by the impurity of their lives, ſhew the ſecret contempt of their heart. This ſacred Exhortation of not judging or cenſuring is ſuch, as they are not to expect any benefit from; this act of Chriſtian Charity is too holy and ſacred a thing to be caſt away on ſuch Swine and Dogs, who are firſt uncapable of it, and then will make ſuch ill uſe of it: and if in ſtead of judging the offender, you go about to exhort with never ſo much Mildneſs (which is the wiſeſt and moſt charitable Chriſtian way in this matter) they will contemn your Exhortations, and repay them with Contumelies in ſtead of Thanks.

The dogs and ſwine are not concern'd in it.

S. *But what, may I never paſs judgment on another man, unleſs it be ſuch a notorious offender?*

Cenſures which are not unmerciful.

C. Yes, 1. If that which you judge in him be (though neither habitual nor incorrigible, yet) notorious, and evidence of fact make it ſubject to no miſtake of yours. 2. If you extend that Cenſure no farther than that fact, or no farther than what may from that fact be neceſſarily inferred. 3. If you expreſs your Judgment or Cenſure in words no farther than may agree with rules of Charity: As firſt, Charity to him, either in telling it him your ſelf, and ſeaſonably [a] reproving him, or telling it ſome body elſe, to that end that he may reprove him: or ſecondly, Charity to others, that they may be warned and armed, not to be deceiv'd and enſnared by him: or thirdly, Charity to the community, that he may not by concealment of ſome great faults, get into ſuch place of judicature, *&c.* where that ravenous humour of his, entring in a diſguiſe of ſheeps cloathing, may be arm'd with power to do more miſchief. In all which yet I muſt be very wary, that under this cloak of Charity I do not carry along a malicious, or proud, or wanton, petulant humour of my own, or even an habit of defaming, and flatter my ſelf that Charity is the only mover in me all this while.

[a] Vide *Fratern. corrept.*

S. *But can my judgment be forced? My aſſent or belief follows, and is proportioned to the motives that induce it: As Knowledge cannot chuſe but follow demonſtrative Premiſſes, ſo Belief cannot chuſe but follow thoſe that appear moſt probable; and if I ſee that by a man, by which my diſcourſe leads me to conclude him drunk, &c. can I offend in judging him?*

Many other caſes of judging.

C. If my Concluſion be rightly inferred by due Premiſſes, and offend not againſt rules of Diſcourſe, I do not offend in ſo concluding, or in ſo judging, ſo that I keep it within my own breaſt, and do mix mercy with judgment, *i. e.* take the more favourable part in judging; for no man is bound not to know what he ſees, or not to believe what ſeems to him (judging in ſimplicity) ſtrongly probable. Nay, ſecondly, if he expreſs his judgment to him whom he thus judgeth, on purpoſe to be ſatisfied of the truth of his judgment, or (in caſe it ſhall prove true) to admoniſh, it is ſtill not only lawful, but commendable. Nay, to tell it another to either of theſe purpoſes, it will be ſo alſo.

S. *But what if I tell it another, not on either of theſe purpoſes, and yet not on any defamatory malicious deſign neither?*

C. Though it be not out of any malicious deſign, or flowing from any ſtitch or grudge which I have to that man, yet it may be a defamatory deſign; for I may have that general habitual humour of Pride or Vain-glory, that for the illuſtrating and ſetting out my ſelf in more grandeur, I may think fit to blaſt and defame every man I meet with; and then that will be ſin enough, though I have no particular malice to that perſon. But if it be not from any ſuch deſign neither, yet ſome of this may mingle with it in the action. Or if neither, then ſtill ſome other evil may; as that of whiſpering, [b] curioſity, meddling with other mens matters, wantonneſs, vain deſire of tatling, telling news, *&c.* And if any of theſe be it, then will it be ſo far ſinful as the motive or cauſe of it is.

[b] περιεργία, ἀλλοτριοεπισκοπία.

S. *But if ſtill it be ſeparated from all ſuch ſinful motive or adherent, and be only produced by ſomewhat neither good nor evil, (as I conceive it poſſible that many words of my mouth, as well as thoughts of my heart, and motions of my body, may be neither morally nor Chriſtianly good nor evil; and that it is not neceſſary for them to be deſigned to any particular Chriſtian end, if only this general care be had, that they be not againſt Charity or Edification:) What is to be ſaid of ſuch judging?*

[c] πᾶν ἀργὸν ῥῆμα.

C. Though ſome other words may perhaps be of this nature, as indifferent as Motions, or Turns, or Geſtures of the Body, (and therefore it is not without reaſon thought, that by [c *every idle word*] *Matth.* 12. 36. is meant only *every falſe word*, as hath been ſaid) yet perhaps this of judging *another* will not be of that nature, being ſubject to more defaults and taints than moſt other things, and that which is here indefinitely forbidden; and if it break forth into words, it is yet more ſubject to evil. But if ſtill it be mentioned only as a Relation (entire and ſimple) of what I ſaw, leaving the concluſion to others judgments, and not interpoſing mine, or only ſo far interpoſing it as to relate truly what concluſion I did then make of it, and what moved me to that concluſion, abſtaining ſtill moſt ſtrictly from adding or concealing ought, or doing or ſaying any thing that hath any tincture from my own pride, cenſorioufneſs, *&c.* it may ſtill be as harmleſs and blameleſs in me as writing of the honeſteſt hiſtory; or, if not, will yet hardly appear to be prohibited under this of *not judging*, in this place. But however, becauſe this is the moſt that can be lawful, and ſtill is no more than lawful, (or not ſinful) not arrived to any degree of moral goodneſs; and becauſe it is very apt

to

to fall into evil, and withal, becauſe of the ſcandal that others may take, who by ſeeing a godly man take this liberty, may miſtake it, and go farther, and fall into ſin; and yet farther, becauſe it may be a breach, although not of this, yet of another prohibition, *viz.* that [*of not doing to others what I would not have others do to me*] (it being preſumed of all men, that they would not willingly have every fault of theirs made matter of diſcourſe to other men) it will therefore, I ſay, (for theſe conſiderations) concern him to deny himſelf that liberty, if it be but by way of revenge for the unlawful liberty which he hath ſo often taken: and though this he ſhould not be too forward to judge a ſin in others, (leſt he thus fall into the fool's ſnare, cenſure others of cenſoriouſneſs) yet ought he in this matter to be very *watchful* over himſelf, that he *offend not with his tongue.*

S. *This Precept of not judging I cannot without tears and hearty confeſſion of mine own great guilt in this kind bear home with me; and I fear there are few in this laſt and moſt uncharitable age of ours who have not had their part in it. I beſeech God to reform it in all our hearts, and join this laſt act of Prudence, which this ſixth verſe hath mentioned, with that ſimplicity which in the former five was required of us.*

You told me that after one particular Precept, which you have now explained, there followed ſome general Precepts. What is the ſubject of the firſt of them?

Sect. II. *Of the power of Prayer.*

C. It is concerning that great buſineſs of Prayer, in the five next Verſes 7, 8, 9, 10, 11. conſidered now not as a duty of ours towards God, or an act of worſhip (as it was conſidered, *Chap.* 6.) but as an Engine or Artifice to fetch down from Heaven the greateſt treaſures that are there, even that of grace it ſelf, or the holy Spirit, as appeareth by the comparing this place with *Luke* 11: 13. and the ſum of it is this, That Prayer is the Key of entrance into the Father's houſe; that no man ſhall ever fail of finding and *receiving good things* (particularly Grace, the greateſt good) that *asks*, and *ſeeks*, and *knocks*, *i. e.* uſeth importunity in Prayer, as a child to a Father, depending wholly on him, and if he be once or twice repelled, returning unto him (with humility, and ſubmiſſion, and dependence, and confidence) again, and never giving over petitioning till he obtains.

S. *What is the next general Precept?*

C. It is that famous one that I told you was the improving of the Eighth Commandment of the Law, and which the * Heathen Emperour is ſaid to have reverenced Chriſt and Chriſtianity for, and which all the wiſeſt men of the Nations have admired for the beſt and higheſt rule of Juſtice and Charity to our Neighbours, in theſe words, Verſe 12. [*All things whatſoever you would that men ſhould do to you, do you even ſo to them.*] *Which* (ſaith he) *is the Law and the Prophets, i. e.* on which all my duty towards my Neighbour depends, or wherein the whole Law concerning that is fulfilled.

* *Severus.*

S. *How is that the improving of the Eighth Commandment?*

C. The Eighth Commandment [*Thou ſhalt not ſteal*] doth firſt forbid all kind of Robbery, Piracy, Burglary, Stealth, Pilfering, and in a word all invading of any other mans poſſeſſion or propriety, whatſoever moſt ſpecious colour or cauſe can be pretended for ſo doing. Of theſe colours I have formerly touched on one, That of thoſe who found all propriety in, or right to, the good things of this world, not in the Laws of Nations and of Men, but in the favour of God; and by ſo doing, offer all men that are ſo preſumptuous as to think well of themſelves and ill of others, a juſtification for all their rapines, and invading of thoſe whom they malign, or will but pretend to think ill of, that they may devour them. Contrary to which vile and diabolical pretence is not only the profeſt truth of Scripture in this Sermon, that God beſtows the Rain and the Sun-ſhine, (and under thoſe emblems the poſſeſſions of the Earth) upon the wicked and ungodly, but that other known Maxim alſo, That Chriſt's *Kingdom is not of this world*, that he came not to interpoſe in ſecular affairs (ſuch are the proprieties of men) but diſclaimed having any thing to do to be a Judge, or divider among men; and himſelf pays tribute to *Cæſar*, though an Heathen, and commands that thoſe *things that are Cæſars ſhall be given*, or *rendered*, *unto him*; ſuppoſing that ſome things there were, and particularly the tribute there, which that heathen-Prince did duly poſſeſs and enjoy. And it is a ſad *omen* to ſee this doctrine (which is ſo directly contrary to the teaching and practice of Chriſt) to be entertained among Chriſtians, and owned by thoſe (and never by any but by thoſe) who take themſelves to be the deareſt children and friends of God. To this Commandment is reducible alſo the prohibition of all Oppreſſion and Injuſtice, all withholding the hire of the poor labourer, or generally, the borrowing and not paying again. But the higher pitches of this kind are reſerved for this higher precept of Chriſt, of *doing as we would be done to*, which you will perceive when we proceed to the opening of that.

Of the Eighth Commandment.

Dominion founded in God's favour.

Oppreſſion. Injuſtice.

S. *What then is the meaning of this Precept?*

C. To *love my Neighbour as my Self*; or not to ſuffer my ſelf-love to interpoſe or make me partial in judging of my duty to others; but thus to caſt whenſoever I do any thing to my Brother, Would I be well pleaſed to be ſo dealt with by any other? or, If I might have mine own choice, would not I deſire to be otherwiſe uſed by other men? or yet farther, that whatſoever uſage I deſire to meet with at God's hands, (which is certainly undeſerved mercy, pardon of treſpaſſes, and doing good to enemies or treſpaſſers) the ſame I muſt perform to others; for ſo this phraſe [*Whatſoever you would that men ſhould do to you*] doth by an Hebraiſm import [*whatſoever you would have done unto you*] which is the [d] ſtyle that this precept is ordinarily read in, and then extends to whatever I deſire that God or Chriſt Jeſus ſhould do to me, *i. e.* not only all the Juſtice, but all the mercy, and goodneſs, and bounty in the world.

Of doing as we would be done to.

[d] *Quod tibi fieri vis, &c.*

S. *I acknowledge the reaſonableneſs of your collection and interpretation, and ſhall from thence ſuppoſe that this great Rule of* doing as we would be done to, *is the foundation of all Juſtice and Mercy toward men. Now the latter of theſe you have inſiſted on already in the* Beatitudes, *and therefore I ſhall not importune you again in that matter: but for the firſt, though that be ſuppoſed and pre-required by Chriſt in his precepts of Mercifulneſs and Almſgiving, and conſequently hath been ſuppoſed in your handling them; yet have you not as yet ſpoken ſo diſtinctly of it, but that your more particular deſcending to it may be uſeful to me. Pleaſe you therefore to ſatisfie me in theſe few Queſtions; Firſt, Whether I may make this advantage of this Rule, that whatſoever I ſhall reſolve to bear contentedly from others, I may lawfully do to them; and ſo that if I would*

would resolve to be content to stand to the injuries another man can do to me, I may then lawfully injure him.

Submitting to injuries, that one may do injuries, unlawful.

C. No man in his right mind can be supposed simply to be willing that injury should do done unto him, and therefore no man is to do any injury to another: and if any man be as you suppose him, it is then to be resolved, that it is for some advantage or gain which he designs to himself thereby; as for example (that which you seem to intimate) that by living by rapine and injustice he hopes to get more than he fears to lose: and then that treacherous contentment is but an artifice of eluding, not of obeying this Rule, an invention of sinning securely, and will be far from being accepted by God or by any reasonable man for an excuse of his injustice. And therefore, secondly, the interpretation of the Rule must be (without any such deceit) that I do nothing to any man, but what I or any honest-minded man would be content to have done to him, if it were put to his choice or option; or, if you please to take it more intelligibly, you must never do that to another, which, if you were that other, you would think to be injustice; or again, you must never seek to advance any gain of your own by the loss or lessening of another man's.

Gaining by anothers loss unlawful.

S. *I receive your answer as satisfactory to my first question, which shews me that this rule is not too loose: But then my next and more serious question will be, whether it be not too strict. I demand, therefore, May I not endeavour to gain to my self by anothers loss?*

C. I answer positively, you may not; for that is the thing forbidden in the last Commandment of the Decalogue, as it is explicated in the New Testament, sometimes by *not defrauding*, *Mark* 10. 19. (where the word in the original signifies the [e] *depriving* of another, the lessening of his possessions;) sometimes by [f] *not desiring* or *not lusting*, *Rom.* 13. 9. (*i. e.* not desiring to get from any other man that which is his;) sometimes by *not coveting*, § 2 *Cor.* 12. 17. and *Luke* 12. 15. *abstaining from covetousness*, (where the word signifies a *desire of getting* that which is [h] above my portion;) but especially (as will appear by comparing the two parallel places, *Matth.* 19. 19. with *Mark* 10. 19.) *by loving thy Neighbour as thy self*, which is there clearly set, not as the great Precept to contain all the other under it, (as in other places it is the sum of the Second Table) but as the particular importance of the last Commandment. From whence it follows, that it is not lawful to design the gaining of any thing to my self by the diminution or loss of another, for that is clearly to covet his (contrary to the duty of contentment with my own) and to love my self, and to do good to my self by the hurting of him, and that which is called in *Ecclesiasticus*, chap. 41. 19. [i] *deceit in giving and taking*, *i. e.* in bargaining.

[e] μὴ ἁπερπάσῃ.
[f] οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις.
[g] οὐκ ἐπιλειονεκτήσω.
[h] As the word is opposed to ἰσότης *equality*, and εὐσύμβολον ἐν τοῖς συναλλάγμασι, *just proportion in bargains.* Simp. in Ar. Phys. f. 1. c.
[i] σκοραχισμὸς δόσεως καὶ λήψεως.

Of just dealing in buying and selling.

S. *But if I may not thus gain by another, this will take away all buying and selling, especially all trading, wherein the tradesman sells dearer than he bought, and whose very living is by what he gains.*

C. It will take away all unjust dealing in buying and selling, all Extortion, Monopolies, Forestalling, Enhansing of Merchandise, Lying, Falsifying, *&c.* and it is very fit it should do so: but for honest ordinary lawful gains, such as a man may plentifully and comfortably live by, and such as all men will be well content that all others should make by their trades, as a fit proportionable reward both for their present pains and charge, and for their industry and expences in acquiring such a skill or craft, and for the hazard they are subject to, it will not at all lessen them. For 'tis among all men resolved, that every mans art and his pains, and the charges and the hazards he is put to, are ratable, and may be sold, and that it is profitable to each single man, and to Common-wealths that some men of skill and honesty should traffick. and provide those things which are commonly wanted, and make a moderate gain by the selling of them; and the Rule which we are now upon hath nothing contrary to that: for any man would be content, that he that brings him home to his door those things which he wants, and which would cost him much more to provide for himself, should gain one penny in twelve, or the like proportion, which the Masters of every trade know to be moderate on both sides, neither too little nor too much. But if this moderation be not observed, if the gain be any thing considerably either less or more, then it is that the Rule is broken.

S. *I conceive that the gaining too little will not break the Rule; and for the too much, I must yet desire more punctual directions.*

Selling too low.

C. It is possible you may be mistaken in the former; not only because he that sells too low, may offend against himself and his own Family, and a man is to love himself, (and not his Neighbour only;) but especially because a man may by selling at too low a price get away the custom from, and consequently defraud and injure all others of the same trade with him: as for example; If ten men in a City may all of them live by their (some way of) Merchandise, by the gaining of one penny in every twelve pence which they lay out, it will be possible for one of these men by taking but one half-penny in a shilling to get all the custom from the other nine, and so to sell ten times as much as would otherwise be his share, and by that means to get far more by that under-selling than otherwise he could do; which though it be no injury but advantage to the Buyers, is yet the defrauding of all those other Merchants in that City.

S. *I perceive my error, but still conceive that the most ordinary way of offending is in the excess, (and indeed that other way was but an artifice tending to the same end by a different way, by gaining too little to gain too much; by losing one penny, to get nine, and so an excess in another kind also; but I say the ordinary way of offending is in the direct excess) in the gaining too much, or exceeding the rule of moderation: will you now give me some rules to know my duty in that?*

Rules to regulate gains.

C. This one rule will serve your turn, Never to endeavour to enhaunse the price of any commodity above the value of it.

S. *What way is there to know the value of any thing?*

C. That known one, that [k] every thing is valuable for as much as it may be sold.

[k] *Tanti valet quanti vendi potest.*

S. *If that be the rule, the Merchant will be safe enough, for if he sell a thing at never so dear a rate, it seems it is worth it, because it was (which supposes that it can be) sold for it, and therefore hath not done amiss.*

C. You mistake the Rule: for unless he that bought it, can sell it at that price again which he was made to pay, or unless he that sold it him, could have sold it to other prudent men at that rate, or unless

unleſs that be the ordinary rate of the commodity, that rule was not obſerved: for the meaning of it was not, that any thing is valuable according as any one ſubtil Merchant can have ſold it to any one weak or paſſionate Chapman, but according to what is the ordinary rate of it when it is ſold.

S. *But if a man will give me ſuch a ſum for a commodity, do I do him wrong to take it?*

C. If you are a Tradeſman, whoſe calling is to furniſh thoſe that want with ſuch commodities, you are not to demand more than thoſe moderate gains: And if you demand no more, it cannot be imagined that he will give you more for it; or if voluntarily he will on his own free motion, not only without any art of yours to raiſe him to it, but even when you tell him it is worth no more, and you are ready and willing to afford it thus, if, I ſay, he will then in bounty, or voluntarily upon any other fit conſideration, give you more, it will in that caſe be perfectly lawful for you to take it.

S. *But what if it be a thing which my calling doth not ſo engage me to ſell; if it be my Houſe, or Land, or the like, which I may moſt lawfully keep; may I not ſell that for as great a ſum as I can poſſibly get for it?*

C. Though I am not obliged to ſell theſe at any rate, yet if I do ſell them, I muſt ſet a moderate rate upon them, and if I ſell them to one at a higher rate than either any man will give him again, or then I could have had of others, I ſhall for the preſent ſuppoſe that it was by one or more of theſe means that I was enabled to do it; either firſt, that the Buyer was unskilful and weak; or ſecondly, that there was ſome undiſcovered fault or weakneſs in that which I ſold (I mean, which the Buyer diſcerned not) which moved him to be willing to pay that for it, which if he had known thoſe faults he would not have done. And then that concealment again might be wrought, either firſt, by ſome poſitive falſity of mine in down-right denying it, when I knew it was ſo; or ſecondly, by my denying it again, when I thought really that it was not ſo, though it were; or thirdly, by my refuſing to anſwer to any ſuch queſtion about it; or fourthly, by his not making any ſuch queſtion to me. Or elſe thirdly, that the Buyer had ſome ſpecial liking or phancy, or vehement deſire to that poſſeſſion of mine; or fourthly, that it was more convenient and beneficial to him than to any man elſe. And every one of theſe circumſtances will ſomewhat vary the caſe, perhaps it may be worth your pains to ſee how.

Moderate rates of all things.

S. *I ſhall therefore call upon you for your reſolution to the ſeveral caſes: And firſt, what is it, if his weakneſs and unskilfulneſs were made uſe of to get from him an higher price?*

Impoſing on the weakneſs of another.

C. It is acknowledged by all that this is cheating, or circumventing, taking advantage of another mans weakneſs, and very near the guilt of robbing on the high-way, (which is but the making uſe of another mans weakneſs to deprive him of his goods) nay, of that grand Piracy ſo common unto many abroad in the world, when the *ſtronger devour the weaker*, upon no other title of right but becauſe they are ſo; and every man thinks he may lawfully do whatever he is able to do, (ſaying with the Atheiſt, *Wiſd.* 2. *Our ſtrength is the law of juſtice, and that which is feeble is found to be nothing worth*:) and this is moſt directly contrary to the firſt fundamental Rule; for no man would be willing to be ſo over-reacht, it being (beſides the injury) a moſt contumelious thing to be out-witted, (as to be over-powered) and nothing is counted more unſupportable than ſuch a contumely.

Concealment of faults in a Commodity.

S. *For the ſecond, if there were in the Buyer ſome particular deception proceeding from ſome concealment of ſome fault in the commodity: And firſt, if that concealment were wrought by ſome falſity of the Seller in down-right* denying *it, then if that were knowingly done, I conceive at firſt thought of it, that that muſt needs be a double ſin in the Seller,* 1. *of lying,* 2. *of robbing or cheating the other man of ſo much of the price as the conſideration of that fault would have taken off from it. And this is the greateſt meanneſs in the world, to ſacrifice any of my truth to ſo baſe a thing as a little gain of money is. But what if his* denying *it was upon an errour in himſelf, the fault being unknown to him, (which was the ſecond caſe of concealment)?*

C. Though that may have excuſed him from the firſt guilt, that of a *lie*, becauſe he ſpake as much as he knew, and went not againſt his Conſcience; yet it is clear that by this means he hath made an immoderate gain (though perhaps againſt his will) and the other hath loſt, having not that for his money which he thought he had bought, and might reaſonably be allowed to think ſo, becauſe he might in prudence think the Seller knew, (and yet if there were any imprudence in it, the Seller ought not to gain by that, the folly of the other being not an ingredient valuable in his Commodity, or giving him any title to the others goods, as before:) and therefore I ſhall conclude, that in that caſe, ſo much of the price muſt be paid back again, as came in through that (though involuntary) falſity; and he that doth not think fit to do ſo, may well be preſumed to have falſified wittingly; for he that hath once erred, will be ſorry for his errour, and he that is ſo, will be deſirous to redeem it even with ſome loſs, but will never think fit to gain by it, to be the richer for his ſin, which yet he muſt be, if he reſtore not. And if in either of theſe two caſes it be interpoſed, that it is an old Rule, that the [1] Buyer *muſt ſtand to hazards*, and conſequently muſt *look to himſelf*, which would conclude that the Seller is ſafe in ſuch caſes: I anſwer, That that is a Rule of Humane Law, and accordingly that he may be ſafe from the Penalties of the Law, (which looks not any farther than the outſide of the action, (as it is a contract legally paſt) and cannot poſſibly dive into the ſecrets of Conſcience, nor conſequently puniſh what it is not preſumed able to ſee;) but then he ſhall not therefore be ſafe from God, who looks to the heart: and beſides, if all other Laws ſhould allow ſuch Liberty, and free men not only in the Court, but from Obligation of Conſcience as far as concerns that Law, *i. e.* not command ſuch ſtrictneſs to the Buyer, yet Chriſt may be allowed to improve Laws, even the Civil, Imperial, and the Municipal Engliſh, as well as the Natural and Moſaical Law; and I ſhall here ſuppoſe him to have done it, by this Rule of [*doing as I would be done to*] which certainly comes home to theſe caſes, no man being ſuppoſed willing to be cheated by anothers falſity, whether voluntary or involuntary; or if he be content to forgive it, when he knows it was involuntary, yet will not he be pleaſed that he ſhould ſuffer or pay for the others errour. This ſame anſwer may alſo be given to (that which is the only ſecond thing which I conceive may

[1] *Caveat emptor.* Humane Law no ſecurity to Conſcience in this matter.

Nor Univerſal Cuſtom.

may make this resolution of the case to be thought too severe, *viz.*) the common, if not universal, custom of men to do otherwise. For sure there is no prescribing against Christ's Rule. If former Laws might be heightened by Christ, and so former Permissions evacuated, then sure former Customs, be they never so universal or popular, may well be superseded by so great a Presence as of Christ, who among other things came to redeem us from this errour, (and to stir us up on the other side to oppose it the more, because it was a popular one, being by that very consideration evidenced to be a part of the World, which in our Baptism we abjured) and to shew us that Abundance was not so precious a thing, but that a little well gotten were as great, nay, a far greater wealth, a richer matter of content in this life, than all the vastest Treasures or Revenues. And I pray mark how powerfully Christ hath delivered this, as an Aphorism, to perswade any prudent man to *abstain* [m] *from covetousness*, Luke 12. 15. (the word signifies *desire* (or *endeavour*) to *get more* than what belongs to one, the contrary to *contentment* with the *present estate* what-ever it is) *Because*, saith he, [n] *the life that any man hath* by his *possessions* (be it life it self, or chearfulness and felicity in life) [o] *consists not in having superfluity*; he that hath enough, (and that may be had without coveting, without gaining by another mans loss, by ordinary moderate gains) is as happy even for this world (if there were never another) as he that hath the greatest abundance or superfluity: for the very nature of those words tells us, that that is needless, (so *abundant* and *superfluous* signifies) and then what is it but burthen that we gain by it?

[m] ἀπὸ πλεονεξίας.

[n] ἡ ζωὴ αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ὑπαρχόντων αὐτοῦ.

[o] οὐκ ἐν τῷ περισσεύειν τινί ἐστιν.

S. *You have by this superaddition to your answer made that doctrine, which did begin to seem a little strict, appear now most perfectly reasonable, and I hope it shall render me the more capable of what you shall farther add to the other cases. To proceed then, What if that deception proceeding still from concealment, that concealment were by the Sellers refusing to answer to such question concerning any such fault or defect in the commodity?*

Two sorts of concealment. The first.

C. That refusing to answer must in all likelihood be insidious, and on design to gain more than was due, and that is very gross; though there be not the *lie*, there is every thing else that was in either part of the last case, and must be condemned accordingly.

S. *But what if it was by the Buyer's not making any such question?*

The second.

C. Even then the Laws of Justice, as they were known even to natural men, would decry it as unjust in him that sells, in case he knew ought by the commodity which he could believe did really, or would in the Buyers opinion (if it were known) lessen the value of it: for then it is clear, that man means to make advantage of that concealment, and receive somewhat for that which is really nothing, and by him known to be so, though for covetousness he conceal it. This case to this purpose hath been put by a natural [p] man before Christ's time in this form: There was a famine in one City built on the Sea-side, whereupon the Inhabitants of another hearing of it, provided to send out a fleet laden with Corn to relieve them; which consisting of ten or eleven ships, and being all prepar'd, one ship gets out a day before the rest, and comes to the Haven, and straight sells the burden of Corn at what rate was demanded; and that being done, the whole Fleet comes in, and so fully furnishes the City, that it was sold at an ordinary price, perhaps but the third part of the rate for which the first ship had sold. The case being argued in behalf of the owner of that ship, and all the fairer circumstances being considered, (as, that they of the City never ask'd him whether there were more ships a coming, nor stayed to beat the price with him, but gave willingly what he demanded) the resolution is at last, That this was an indirect action, and that this Artifice of his was merely designed to gain from the Citizens that which he had no right to, and which they would not have given had they known that which he knew, and none but he could tell them. And what (saith he) did that man get by this? Forsooth, a little money, and was counted a Knave; encreased his Treasure, and lost his Reputation: and that he conceives sufficient to fright any from the like. And sure, if Christ's Command may not prevail with us as much as sense of honour among them, or if that be counted honourable now, which was infamous and reproachful then, if now it be a creditable thing to circumvent and cheat my Fellow-Christian, to grow rich by tricks and artifices, when *Socrates* an honest Heathen would venture a Martyrdom in *Athens* to beat down these and the like vitious customs among his Countrey-men, and resolve that such a death was better than any kind of life; then sure Christianity is ill bestowed on us: We have little considered that he came to make us more like Doves, not more like Serpents, more just, not more cunning, more upright, sincere, unconcerned, despisers of the world, not more shrew'd, deceitful adorers of it, than Jews or Heathens had been before.

[p] *Cicero de Offic.*

S. *Will you proceed then to the third case? Suppose the Buyer have a great liking to my commodity, a vehement desire to buy it, may I not then make him pay dearer for it than otherwise it was worth?*

The Buyers fancy valuable in some case.

C. His fancy adds no real worth to the thing; only it is true, that it may be more grateful to him than otherwise it would be; and that I confess is a benefit to him, and if I have really the same fancy to it, or some degree of it, I may value that: and upon these two conditions, (1. That for my fancy I do really prize it at that rate that I demand, and I would not to any other man part with it under; 2. That I deal openly with the Buyer, tell him what I conceive is the real worth, and what my fancy or special liking hath set more upon it) I doubt not but I may demand, and receive a valuable price for it, rating my fancy at so much as I really value it: wherein I must be very careful that I do not deceive my self, and pretend fancy when I mean covetousness. But then secondly, if I cannot truly say this, if it be only that the Buyer is delighted with it, fansies it, not I, then sure it will be worth remembring, that Christian Charity, of which Christian Justice must be always thought to have some mixture, requires me to do that kindness (be it that which is profitable, or only that which is grateful) to any Fellow-Christian, which I can do without any detriment to my self, and so do good to all men without hoping to receive any advantage to my self by so doing, according to the notion which our English translation hath of *Luke* 6. 35. which yet if the Buyers gratitude make him acknowledge, and repay with some other good turn, the Seller may lawfully receive it.

In some case not.

S. *The last case is, If it be more convenient to him that buyes than to any man else, and so more beneficial also, what think you of that?*

C. I

C. I doubt not but convenience is a valuable thing, and that a poſſeſſion may be far more convenient to one than to another, and that there is no reaſon but that he to whom it is more convenient ſhould value it higher than any other; and if it be rated by the Seller but according to this proportion, ſo much dearer to him than to another as it will be more beneficial to him, and this be made clear to him, and openly profeſt, if he upon that reaſon of the real benefit which the convenience brings him, and not only upon fanſie again, be truly content to give ſo much for it, it is lawful for the Seller ſo to rate it to him. And yet becauſe that convenience was not the ſame to him that it is to the Buyer, (by which means it falls out, that he that ſhall be paid as much as to him it was worth, though he receive nothing for that caſual advantage to that other) it may very well become the Seller to ſhew kindneſs and friendlineſs in this matter alſo, as before, though I cannot ſay he is unjuſt if he do not; there being this difference betwixt this and the former caſe, that there the fanſie of another was not ſo reaſonably valuable as here the ſuppoſed convenience is, becauſe this will bring him in ſome real gain, that only an imaginary one. All that I ſhall bind you to in this particular (becauſe to make the Buyer pay more for the convenience than otherwiſe I would have ſold it for, is the niceſt caſe, and that, which if it be not, is yet the neareſt being unlawful) is to deal as openly and clearly as you can with the Buyer, and by reaſonable Arguments ſatisfie his Reaſon, that it is reaſonable for him to pay more for this than another, becauſe it will be more advantageous really to him than to any; and that you may be ſure that your covetouſneſs deceive you not in this matter of ſome ſcruple and difficulty, (as it is eaſieſt to ſlip and fall for him that ſtands on a narrow place, and eaſier yet for him that hath a weight on one ſide, and ſuch is covetouſneſs) you may do well to put that (whatever it is) that that man gives more than another would give, into the Corban or poor mans purſe, that ſo what is gained by that [q] happy bargain, having more of Gods bleſſing in it than ordinary, ſhould yield God this acknowledgment by enriching his poor children.

The convenience of the Buyer truly valuable.

[q] εὐσθλα. 1 Cor. 16. 2.

S. *But can you allow me no greater liberty than this in buying and ſelling? And if you do not, will this be agreeable with publick weal? Beſides, if you impoſe theſe ſtrict rules of indifference on the Seller, you muſt do the like on the Buyer too; and if he by any indirect means have over-reacht me, he is bound to as much reſtitution as I ſhould have been.*

C. I make no queſtion but the ſame exactneſs is required of one as of the other; and I ſhall think it very neceſſary that all the rules that have here been ſet the Seller ſhall be matter of obligation alſo to the Buyer, ſo far as belongs to him, *i. e.* as far as the rule of doing as he would be done to, doth belong to him: But for any farther liberty to either, you muſt not expect it from Chriſt, who will think you rich enough and happy enough (even beyond the moſt laden worldling, that Mule under a burthen, not a treaſure of Gold, to gall, but not to bleſs him) if you have good food and rayment, and contentment with it. And for the concernments of the Commonwealth in this matter; firſt, it is clear that if the practice of theſe rules ſhould prove inconvenient to any Commonwealth as now it ſtands, this might rather be imputed to the generality of the contrary cuſtom, which will not without ſome difficulty, and perhaps preſent incommodation, be changed: and the ſame might alſo be obſerved of moſt other ſins, which have had the luck to become cuſtomary. But then ſecondly, for the new conſtituting of a Commonwealth, and ſo likewiſe for the prudent well-weighed reforming of any vice in the old, it will be found moſt true, That the rules that Chriſt hath ſet, if they were embraced, would be univerſally moſt gainful; or if they did hinder ſome particular advantages, either of ſome men, or ſociety of men, this would be repaired by other more valuable benefits. More eſpecially theſe Rules would keep the world moſt quiet, and ſo moſt worth living in; and on the contrary, the deſiring more than this, is it that makes the world ſuch a Stage or Theatre of none but Wreſtlers and Fencers, each labouring to ſupplant and wound the other, till at laſt the world is become but a kind of hoſpital of poor and maimed, every man undoing himſelf and his Neighbour too by deſiring to be richer than he. And beſide, you may conſider that the wealth of this world being God's (only God's) peculiar, in his hand to diſpoſe and preſerve and bleſs to whom he pleaſe, and his bleſſing more gainful to us than our own crafts, it is not likely that he will deny it to them that uſe and depend on his Rules in acquiring of it, or give and continue it to thoſe that ſet themſelves againſt him, that [r] *will be rich* in * ſpight of him: Or if he do, this is an infallible Argument that riches are not the greateſt bleſſings, for then thoſe whom God beſt loves would have moſt of them.

The objection againſt this ſtrictneſs anſwered.

[r] οἱ βυλόμενοι πλυτεῖν. * τὰχὺ ἀδίκως ὄικυς ἱσπλεύσονθ' ὡς ἔχει σωτηρίαν. *Eurip.*

S. *But the reaſon why I ſaid theſe Rules were inconvenient to Commonweals, was, Becauſe they would hinder merchandiſe; and the reaſon for that again ſomewhat elſe,* viz. *Becauſe the hazards peculiar to Merchants are ſo great, that if they have not leave to make uſe of ſuch advantages as you have ſpoken of, and ſeemed to deny them, they will not be able to ſubſiſt at all.*

C. You muſt know that all Merchants are (in paſſing a judgment what is moderate and lawful gain) ſuppoſed to take into conſideration thoſe hazards that you ſpeak of, thoſe, I mean, that are univerſally annext to their trade, and ſo are all men of all other callings alſo; and therefore when I ſpeak of a lawful moderate gain, you muſt know, that I count that but a moderate gain which ſufficiently provides for hazards, nay, which takes in farther the conſideration of all other things (which before I named to you, and) which are fit to be conſidered; the charges and pains they are at, and the rate that may be ſet upon their craft or skill, and that heightned more and more according to the difficulty of acquiring it, and the uſefulneſs when it is acquired. Nay, when the skill is in ſuch matters, or in that kind, that it brings in ſome real commodity to others without their doing or paying any thing toward it, it will be more reaſonable for thoſe men in theſe reſpects to value their Trades or Crafts very high, and to expect great gains by them, becauſe what comes in to them is ſuppoſed to be taken away from no body, but withal to bring ſome advantage to others, without any detriment or hazard to them. But then all this being ſuppoſed to be already provided for in the ſeveral Rules that the honeſt intelligent men of every Trade ſet themſelves, it will not be reaſon that the ſame conſiderations of hazards, *&c.* ſhall be taken in again to heighten the gains yet higher, nor indeed may particular extraordinary loſſes be excuſes to any man for ſo doing: for thoſe, whatſoever

Merchandiſe and the hazards thereof conſiderable.

they are, were contained in the former mentioned hazards, and every man must resolve to bear his lot, be it worse or better, with patience; or if he be impoverished by such heavy accidents, it will be fitter to seek a subsistence by a *Brief*, or demand of mens charity, than by enhaunsing the price of what is left, no misadventure being excuse for me to be unjust. And because I now have mentioned mens charity, as a lawful relief for him who cannot thrive by lawful Trading, I shall also add, That if upon helping any man to a good penny-worth, or selling upon bare moderate gains, the Buyer think fit to reward my Justice and Diligence with some reward above the price he pays, (which may be very Christian for him to do in this case, if it were but to encourage upright dealing) there will be no need to make scruple of receiving what is so freely given; but to grow rich by that which is fetcht out of anothers throat, extorted and forced from him, will never tend much to the Comfort or Reputation of any man, nor have much reason to hope for any blessing from Heaven upon it.

S. *You have now been sufficiently detained by a view of this Rule as it looks on acts of Justice betwixt men; and for the other branch, the extent of it to acts of Mercy, I told you I should not expect that to be again repeated to me. Only in stead of it, I shall take leave to put you in mind of one thing which may perhaps cost you some time; and yet, belonging directly to this matter of just dealing betwixt man and man, I cannot but think it seasonable for me to demand, and for you to give your judgment of it.*

C. What is that?

Of Usury.

S. *The known famous business of* Usury, *of which there are various and distinct opinions, and perhaps the Reasons given for any of them not very satisfactory: I shall expect your opinion of it.*

C. You shall have it as clearly and briefly as I can: And first, I must tell you, that the business of Usury is not so clearly stated in the New Testament (and for that among the Jews in the Old, it is both obscure, and only to a fellow-Jew, and so belongs not unto Christians, who are not obliged by their Judicial Laws any further than the equity of them is imitable by us) as that I can set strict and certain Laws to any mans actions from thence, which you will believe with me, when I tell you the one only ground of Objection I have against Usury from the New Testament. It is from an Observation which I made in comparing the Hebrew with the Septuagints Interpretation of the Book of *Nehemiah*: in which generally the phrase which we render [t] [*to exact Usury*] is rendred by the Greek, * [*to exact*] simply, without any Substantive added to it; and so the Greek Noun for *requiring* or † *exacting*, signifies there *requiring of use*: and so 2 *Mac.* 4. 27. that which is rendred [*required* it] most probably signifies this *receiving of use*, the Period being best rendred thus, *As for the money*, &c. *he put it not into any good course, but* Sostratus, &c. *took the use of it; for unto him belonged the managing of the moneys.* From whence (knowing what sympathy or concent there is between the Greek of the New Testament and of the Old) I presently thought that that place of the Gospel, *Luke* 6. 30. might be explained; where Christ speaking of Acts of Mercy, *(giving to every one that asketh)* addeth in our translation, [y] *And from him that taketh away thy goods, ask them not again:* Where I conceive the most proper and commodious sence, (and that which will be most agreeable to the context concerning Giving) will be this, *From him that* [z] *receiveth,* (not taketh by force, but all one with the word which we render [a] *receiving*) by way of Loan any of thy Goods, [b] *require no usury* (according to that Notion in *Nehemiah*, of *requiring*, for *exacting of usury*) *of him.* Which being, as I said, joined with [*giving to them that ask*] denoteth a work of Mercy, as indeed lending is a prime way of Mercy; *The good man is merciful and lendeth*, and, *he that is merciful will lend to his Neighbour*, *Eccles.* 29. 1. and many the like. And I remember a most excellent obliging [c] *Roman* exercised himself especially in this kind of Mercy, lending, and strictly requiring the payment on the day. And *Cornelius Nepos* saith, he did more good that way, than by giving he could have done; teaching men to be Thrifty and Laborious, whereas giving or suffering them not to repay would have made them sluggish and beggers. Which being supposed, it will follow, that this of not requiring of use, being an Act of Mercy, must, I conceive, be extended no farther than the former Precept of giving was to be extended. Now though the words are in an unlimited latitude, [*Give to every one that asketh*;] yet ordinary prudence will interpret them so, that if a covetous rich man ask of me, I am not bound to give to him, but only to him whose wants set him on asking. And so consequently in like manner the prohibition or forbidding to exact, take, or require use of him that borrows, belongs not again to the poor or mean Creditor, when a rich man borrows of him, but only when the rich lends to the poor man, to whom a free Loan is a seasonable Mercy. From whence as I should conclude without any demur, that when I lend a poor man, I must not require use (any more than I must deny alms to him that wants it, when I have it to spare;) so I cannot conclude it unlawful from hence to receive from a rich man (I mean, who wants not that alms) what interest or increase he is willing to give me, which is, I suppose, the question resolved. All I conceive necessary to be added by way of Caution is, First, that I take care, that such lending to the rich do not disable me from assisting the poor. Secondly, that I am (as far as morally I can be) sure, that he who pays me this use, is able to do it without eating out or hurting himself, but that he makes greater gain of it by trading or the like. Thirdly, that it be not so done as that it may bring reproach or censure of worldly-mindedness or illiberality upon me, (especially if I be a Clergy-man; for, by the Canons of Antient Councils they are forbidden many things of this nature, which were permitted others) much more that it be not an act of a covetous mind, but only a way of subsisting on that small portion my friends have left me.

The one Christian Precept against it considered.

[t] משא נשאים *Usuram exigentes.*

* Απαιτεῖν.

† Απαίτησις.

[y] καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ αἴροντός σου τὰ σὰ, μὴ ἀπαίτει.

[z] αἴροντος not ἁρπάζοντος.

[a] λαβόντος.

[b] μὴ ἀπαίτει.

Lending an act of mercy.

[c] *Pomponius Atticus. In vita Pomp. Attici.*

Usury from a rich man not unlawful universally.

S. *But what must I do, in case the person to whom I thus lent upon use (and in so doing observed, as well as I could, the second Caution, conceived him very probable to make gain by that loan) either by misadventure, or by his own neglects, lose by my loan, or be eaten out by paying me interest?*

A caution to this.

C. I answer, That in that case it is the safest course to forbear the interest, and in matters of this nature I conceive it is my duty to take the safest course; and the thinking my self obliged to do so, will make me more circumspect than perhaps otherwise I should be, in examining the condition of the person (of whom I adventure to take use) and being as sure as I can, that I take it not from any

that

that could need my charity, *i. e.* my lending without uſe. In all this you muſt not think that I am ſo poſitive as in other things I have been, but only, that I ſet you down my opinion, and the grounds on which I build it, and ſhall expect your aſſent no farther than my grounds convince you. For the truth is, after all this which I have ſaid upon that ground, from that paſſage of Saint *Luke* ſo interpreted, I muſt confeſs that the word which I render [*requiring of uſe*] may ſignifie ſomewhat elſe, *viz.* to exact or require back the loan (when it is lent without uſe) for ſo the word to *require back that which is lent* (contrary to Releaſe) is rendred, *Deut.* 15. 2. and 3. and ſo *Wiſd.* 15. 8. and *Eccluſ.* 20. 15. the Greek word is uſed for calling back a Loan, and ſo indeed the word more uſual is [d] to lend ſimply, as well as to lend upon uſe And then the meaning of the verſe in *Luke* will be, that as I muſt *give to him that asketh*, ſo of *him that borroweth of me, I muſt not exact repayment*, when he is not (through Poverty) able to do it, (for that were an Act of Oppreſſion, or very contrary to Charity; and therefore *Iſaiah* 9. 4. the [e] word ſignifies Oppreſſors, and *Eccluſ.* 20. 15. it is ſet down as the character of an illiberal fool, [*To day he lendeth, and to morrow he asketh again.*]) And if this be the ſence, then it will be ſtill pertinent to the buſineſs of Liberality or Charity in giving and lending, and ſo no farther belong to the matter of Uſury than by Analogy may be inferr'd from thence, *viz.* That if from a poor man I muſt not haſten or exact the repayment of his debt, but continue the loan to him as long as his diſtreſs requires, then ſurely I muſt not ſell that loan, *i. e.* take uſe of him. But this ſtill muſt belong only to the rich man's lending to the poor. As for the caſe of the rich man's lending to the rich, there hath appeared nothing in either of theſe interpretations which will oblige to it, or (if he do) which will prohibite the taking intereſt of him: And there is as little to that purpoſe in a third poſſible interpretation of the words (according to the ſound of our Engliſh) of not requiring the legal fourfold of him that hath rob'd me; which though it be not the importance of the word [*taketh*] which notes only receiving, not rapine, yet is no very improbable rendring of the word [*Require*] if we compare it with a place in an ancient humane [f] Author. But, as this ſtill belongs not to Uſury at all by any Analogy, but only concludes that the not requiring the legal fourfold of the thief, will by analogy with the former part of the Verſe be reſtrained only to the caſe of the poor (not rich) thief, that by neceſſity is enforc'd to take away ought from thee; ſo do I not know any other ſo much as colour of Text in the New Teſtament which forbids it, nor indeed reaſon nor analogy, either from that great Rule in hand, of *doing as I would be done to* (for, if I were a rich man, I would, in caſe of convenience or advantage that a Loan would probably bring in to me, be willing to pay uſe for it) or of *loving my Neighbour as my ſelf*; nor conſequently can I yet affirm it unlawful, ſtill ſuppoſing that the Cautions which I mentioned be obſerved uprightly.

[d] δανοίζειν.

[e] ἀπαιτοῦντες.

[f] *Vide Anon. Scholiaſt. in Ariſt. Rhet. l. 1. f. 26. l. 20.* ὁ νόμος δοείζεται ἀλλ' ἀντὶ ἀλλότριον ἀπαιτῆσαι τὸ τετραπλάσιον· ὁ δὲ ὅπως δοείζεται, ἀπαιτῆσαι εἰς τὸ διπλοῦν.

S. *I ſhall reſt in your preſent directions, and draw you on no farther in this buſineſs of Juſtice, becauſe I conceive the prime thing deſigned in the Rule on which we have built theſe diſcourſes, is indeed that duty of* Mercifulneſs.

C. It is ſo, for in this ſence it will beſt agree with the precept of liberality to enemies, (with which it is joined, *Luke* 6. 31.) and the promiſe of God here to give to every asker, (of which bounty of God's we that are partakers, ought to do the like for our Brethren) and be a fit introduction to the exhortation that follows of Chriſtian ſtrictneſs, which ſeems to be built on this, and to be but a branch of this great precept, and not a ſeveral from it.

S. *What is that Exhortation you mean?*

C. That of a great ſuperlative ſtrictneſs in the ways of Godlineſs; not being content to walk in the broad rode that Jews and Heathens have contented themſelves with, (not willing to undertake any thing of difficulty for Chriſt's ſake, and ſo by that means falling into deſtruction) but *entring in at the ſtreight gate and narrow way that leadeth unto life*, that way which theſe elevated precepts have chalked out to us; and which here, it ſeems, are not propoſed as counſels of perfection, but as commands of duty, without which there is no entring into life, no avoiding deſtruction. Of Strictneſs.

S. *What now is the third general Precept?*

C. It is a Precept of warineſs and prudence, to beware of Errours, and thoſe whoſe trade it is to ſeduce us to them, and this in the ſix next verſes, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20. and it belongs not to all deceivers of any kind, but particularly to ſuch as profeſs to follow Chriſt, and yet teach falſe and damnable doctrines; which that they may put off to their Auditors or followers the better, they pretend a great deal of holineſs in ſome other particulars. And the ſum of that which he here ſaith to this purpoſe may be reduced to this, Whenſoever any falſe Teacher comes to diſſeminate his doctrine, the ſureſt way to diſcern him will be to obſerve the effects and actions diſcernible in him, or which are the fruits of his doctrine. If all his actions and all the deſigns and conſequents of his doctrine be the advancing of piety and charity of all kinds, then you may reſolve that he is no ſuch (falſe, at leaſt dangerous) falſe Teacher. For firſt, the Devil will never aſſiſt him or put him upon falſe doctrines to ſuch an end, to bring more holineſs and Chriſtian practice into the world. Secondly, ſuch holy Chriſtian practice is not eaſily built upon any falſe doctrine. Thirdly, if the doctrine ſhould chance to be falſe that bringeth forth ſuch wholſom effects, then to him that receiveth it for thoſe effects ſake, and otherwiſe diſcerneth not the doctrine to be falſe, it may be hoped, (through God's mercy in Chriſt to our infirmities) it ſhall not prove dangerous or deſtructive. But if the conſequence or effects that flow naturally from the doctrines which he brings, be either againſt rules of piety or Chriſtian vertue; As 1. if they tend to the leſſening of our love of God, or (under that head) to the aliening our hearts from him, by giving us mean and unworthy notions of him, (contrary to thoſe Attributes of infinite Power, Juſtice and Goodneſs which we ought to believe of him) if they tend to the begetting of preſumption and ſecurity in our hearts, by giving us any ground of hope without purifying and amending our wicked lives, by leaving no place for fear, whatſoever we do, by making us conceit highly of our ſelves, rely and truſt on, and boaſt of our own merits; if they lead us to Idolatry, to the worſhip of ſomewhat elſe beſide the only true God, or to a bare formal out-ſide worſhip of him; if they open the door to falſe or needleſs ſwearing, or to profaneneſs, and neglect of God's ſervice: Or 2. if they tend to injuſtice or uncharitableneſs towards men, or (under that head)

Of warineſs and Prudence.

Marks of falſe Teachers.

Fruits of their doctrine.

head) to disobedience, sedition, rebellion, faction, speaking evil of dignities, acts of Jewish zelots, &c. to the favouring or authorizing of any kind of lust, of divorces forbidden by Christ, &c. to the nourishing of rash anger, uncharitable (either temerarious or unmerciful) censuring, envy, emulation, variance, strife, malice, revenge, contumelious speaking, whispering, backbiting, &c. to the excusing or justifying of piracy, rapine, oppression, fraud, violence, any kind of injustice, &c. to the spreading of lies, slanders, defamations, &c. to covetousness, unsatisfiedness, uncontentedness in our present condition, desire of change, casting the cross on other mens shoulders that we may free our own from it, to dealing with others as we would not be well pleased to be dealt with our selves: or, in a word, if they tend to the discouraging or discountenancing any Christian vertue set down in this or any other Sermon of Christ, or by his Apostles, or to the granting any dispensation or liberty from that Christian strictness in these duties, or in those other of repentance, self-denial, meekness, mercifulness, peaceableness, &c. Then by these marks and characters you may know this to be a false Teacher. Yet not so far this, as that whosoever is guilty himself of any of these sins, shall be (if he be a Teacher) a false one; for it is possible his doctrine and actions may be contrary: but that, if these be the fruits and natural effects of his doctrine, then shall his doctrine be thus condemned; otherwise an ill man he may be, and yet a Teacher of truth; a wicked person, but not a false Prophet.

S. *But is it not said of these false Prophets, that they come in* sheeps clothing? *which sure signifies their outward actions to be innocent. How then can they be discerned by their fruits?*

C. I answer first, That the fruits of their doctrine may be discerned, though their own evil actions be disguised and varnished over. Secondly, That though their actions most conspicuous and apparent be good, yet their closer actions (which may also be discerned by a strict observer) are of the making of the Wolf, ravenous and evil. Thirdly, that though they begin with some good shews to get authority, though they enter as sheep, do some specious acts of piety at first, yet they continue not constant in so doing, within a while they put off the disguise and are discernible.

S. *What now is the fourth or last general Precept?*

C. The sum of it is, that it is not the outer profession of Christianity or Discipleship, (though that set off by propheſying, doing miracles, &c. in Christ's name, *i. e.* professing whatsoever they do to be done by Christ's power) which will avail any man towards his account at that great day, without the real, faithful, sincere, universal, impartial performing of obedience to the Laws of Christ.

S. *But can, or doth God permit any wicked man to do such miracles,* &c?

C. Yes, he may; For, the end of miracles and preaching, &c. being to convince men of the truth of the doctrine of Christ, that may well enough be done by those that acknowledge that truth, though they live not accordingly: The miracles done by them being not designed by God to the commendation of the instruments, but to the perswading of the spectators.

Sect. III.

S. *Having received from you the full tale of the Precepts you proposed, there now remains only the conclusion of the whole Sermon to be discharged, and then you have paid me all that your promise hath yet obliged you to.*

Of Profession of Christianity without action.

C. It is this, (occasioned by the last Precept of doing as well as professing God's will) That the profession of Christianity, lending a patient ear to those doctrines, will, (if it be (as oft it is) trusted to, and depended on to render us acceptable to Christ) prove a very fallacious and deceitful hope. Whensoever any storm comes, any shaking disease or affliction, which gives us occasion to awake throughly, and examine our selves to the bottom, we are not then able to retain any hope or comfortable opinion of our selves, although in time of quiet and tranquillity, before we were thus shaken, we could entertain our selves with such flattering glozes. Hearing of Sermons, and professing of love to, and zeal for Christ, may pass for piety a while; but in the end it will not be so. It is true Christian practice that will hold out in time of trial, and that hope of ours which is thus grounded will stand firm and stable in time of affliction and temptation, at the hour of death and the day of Judgment. This doctrine of Christian duty and obedience is such as can never deceive any man that is content to build upon it. Nor infirmity, nor sin, (committed, but repented of, and forsaken) nor Devil, shall ever shake any man's hold that is thus built, endanger any man's salvation that lives according to the rule of this Sermon; nor shall all the flattering deceitful comforters of the world bring in any true gain or advantage or substantial ground of hope to any other.

And it came to pass when Jesus had ended these sayings, the people were astonished at his doctrine. For he taught them as one having authority, and not as the Scribes.

LIB. V.

S. *HAving profited somewhat by your advertisements in that part of knowledge which is most useful to me, I shall endeavour now to give you some account of my proficiency, though it be but in taking notice of my farther wants, (which till you thus opened my eyes I discerned not) and in desiring your help to assist me yet farther, to discern what influence on my life or practice may be had from those very* Articles of my Creed *which you supposed me to have learnt in my* Catechism: *But having no otherwise learnt them than to say by rote, and perhaps to understand the words and meaning of them, though I had formerly contented my self with that superficial knowledge, and thought that to be all that was required of me, yet I have now altered my opinion, and by the tasts you have given me, I find my appetite raised to receive what (in order to* practice) *you shall please to teach me from thence, being strongly perswaded that the bare* speculative *knowledge of these doctrines, sunk no farther than into my brain, will avail but little to my salvation.* Sect. 1. *Of the Creed.*

C. You have made a right conjecture, and will be confirmed in it, when in your conversing with holy Writings, especially those of the Apostles in their Epistles, you observe how the Articles of our Creed are seldom or never mentioned but as obligations and pledges of our amendment of life; Christ's death, of our Mortification; his Resurrection, of our New life, *&c.* I shall therefore be perswaded by you to proceed a while on this theme, insisting only (unless it be in passage) on that which is practical.

S. *Be pleased then to set out on this journey, and first to tell me once for all, what is the full importance of the word* [believe.]

C. To [*believe*] is (as many other in Scripture) a pregnant word, and contains under it all that is or should be consequent to it. To [*know*] signifies in Scripture, not only what the word sounds, but also to *love*, and to *do*; knowing of God is the whole service of God: and so proportionably to [*believe.*] And in brief, it hath two parts, a speculative, and a practical; the one but of a piece, the other of the whole heart; or if you will, the one in the brain, the other in the heart; and this latter superadded to the former, it seems, is it that alone is likely to stand us in stead, *Rom.* 10. 9. *If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved.* Of Belief.

S. *What do you mean by a* speculative belief? Speculative belief.

C. An assent or acknowledgment of the truth of any thing affirmed in the word of God; as to acknowledge and assent to this truth, that there is a God, that he is our Father, *&c.* that he sent his only eternal Son into the World to be born of a Virgin, *&c.*

S. *What is the* practical Belief, *or that of the heart?* Practical.

C. The Heart is the principle of Practice, (as appears, *Deut.* 30. 14. *My word is in thy heart* [*that thou maist do it,*] and Verse 16. [*to keep his Commandments, &c.* and that by Analogy with a ground in nature, the Heart being there the principle of life and motion, moving always, (to which *Solomon* oft alludeth) and digesting and applying every thing that comes into it, to that end) the Principle, I say, of action, of ordering and directing our wills, and so our lives accordingly; and so the belief in the heart contains in it (in general) all kind of practical Christian Vertues, peculiarly those that according to the nature of the object believed, and the several considerations of it, are most proper to be produced or exercised. Thus to believe there is a God, is to live and behave my self in a godly manner, and so signifies Piety; to believe he is maker of all things, is to *commit our souls to him in well doing, as to a faithful Creator*, 1 Pet. 4. 19. to believe he is a Father, is to love him with a filial love, to fear him with a filial fear, to honour him as a son his father, *Mal.* 1. 6. to obey him with a filial obedience, to trust in him, to depend on him, as children on fathers, for all things needful to our souls or bodies. And this you are proportionably to apply to all the severals in our Creed, or objects of our Belief.

S. *But is there not some peculiar notation in the Phrase* [Believe in?] *is not that more than to Believe?* Believing in.

C. Some subtil wits have observed such a distinction between *believing* [a] *God, believing in God*, and *believing on God*; but it is not sure that the Word of God hath owned any such distinction or constant difference between them, taking indeed all these promiscuously, and meaning oft-times the same thing by all of them. The distinction which I gave you will, I conceive, do the same work, for which the Schoolmen designed this other, and the several notions of believing in Scripture will be most properly referred to the severals mentioned; either a speculative believing, as in the Devil and wicked Professors, or a practical, in all Saints: and that differenced again according to the notion wherein the Object is considered, as even now was specified; sometimes a terrifying assent, or an assent accompanied with fear, when it looks on the threats, *Heb.* 11. 7. *By Faith Noah moved with fear*, &c. sometimes an obediential assent, when it looks on the commands, *Psalm* 119. 66. *I have believed thy Commandments*; sometimes a fiducial assent, when on the promises of the Gospel, *thy word wherein thou hast caused me to put my trust*, Psalm 119. 49. [a] τῷ θεῷ, ἐν τῷ θεῷ, εἰς τὸν θεὸν, ἐπὶ τὸν θεόν.

S. *I conceive my self to understand the notion you have given me of* believing, *and shall labour to apply it carefully to all that follows. You may now please to proceed to the several parts or objects of our* Belief. *What then is the* Speculative belief of God?

C. The firm undoubted acknowledgment, 1. That there is a God; 2. That there is but one God. Of believing in God.

S. *What is it to acknowledge him to be God?*

C. To acknowledge him in his Essence and in his Attributes. In his Essence, that he is the eternal, immortal, immutable, invisible, incomprehensible, glorious Being, giving being to all, but himself receiving from none; the Being of Beings, the (*which was, and is, and shall be*) the Lord God *Jehovah.* His Essence.

His Attributes.

vah. In his Attributes, of infinite goodness, and mercy, and veracity, and wisdom, and providence, and power, and all-sufficiency, his creating, preserving, and just governing and dispensing of all things. All which together make up the severals contained in that which follows in the Creed [*In God the Father Almighty, maker of Heaven and Earth.*]

S. *I shall not trouble you to prove all or any of these particulars to me, because you say they are matter of* belief; *which although they have grounds in nature, which also would be means of proving every of them, yet shall they by me be received without that kind of argument, being more willing to* believe *than* dispute *what from the Scripture, the Apostles and the ensuing Universal Church of God have thought fit to comprise in those* Articles; *all that I shall now demand of you is, your direction how these severals which you have now named may be reduced to those words of the* Creed.

C. Those of his Essence, to the word [*God*] whose name (proper to him from all others) is [*Jehovah*] which includes [*being*] and giving of Being, *immortal, immutable*, and (by consequence from them) *invisible, incomprehensible*, and *glorious*. All which being unexpressible by any positive definition, is best described by (those which I gave you, which are most of them) negative epithets. Those of his Attributes to the word [*God*] and to the following words; that of his infinite Goodness and Mercy and Providence, to his title of *Father*; that of his Veracity, both to his being *God*, who in his nature hath by all men (even Heathens) been conceived free from lying, [*Let God be true, and every man a Liar*] (absolute veracity belonging to no Creature, but only to God) and to his name *Jehovah*, which is set in *Exodus* to note his constancy in performing of promises, his *Establishing his Covenant*, *Exodus* 6. 3. and also to the word [*believe*] which supposes God the great object of our belief, and so true in all his affirmations; that of his Wisdom, and Power, and All-sufficiency, his Creating and preserving of all, to his title of *Maker of Heaven and Earth*, in which all those severals are expresst: the word [*Maker*] containing under it not only the beginning, but continuance of all Being; and so first, the disposal, wherein the Wisdom was shewed; secondly, the strangeness of the composure first, and since of daily productions both ordinary and extraordinary, wherein the Power; thirdly, the sustaining, wherein the All-sufficiency; and in all together, the creating and preserving. As for that of his just governing and dispensing of all things, that belongs most peculiarly to the word which we render [b] *Almighty*, but signifies peculiarly his being Governour, Ruler of all things; which being added to the word *Father*, signifies that eminent natural right that belongs to all Fathers, paternal dominion, the root of all Power and Government among men, and being in a transcendent manner applied to God, the transcendent Father, contains under it all manner of dominion over the Creature. This title indeed contains his *Almightiness* and infinity of power over all his Subjects, but withal superadds that other relation of a King and Lord over them. To all which may be added his *Omnipresence* and *Omniscience*, of which his very deity and infinity are a ground, his creating and governing all things a proof, and the evident daily footsteps of the former in the whole Creation are sure and manifest evidences and testimonies of it: and of the latter, his delivering, and the exact fulfilling of Prophecies, wherein God hath oft foretold future contingent words and actions of men, which being many times evil and sinful (as particularly the words of the by-standers at the Cross against Christ, punctually foretold, *Psalm* 22. 8.) he could not be the author or designer of them, or consequently foretel or foresee them in his decree of producing or causing them, but only by vertue of his Omniscience.

[b] παντοκράτωρ. πάντων κράτος, that hath dominion of all, *Hesych.* παντοκρατεία, παντάρχία, *Phavor.*

S. *What now is the* Practical *part of this* Belief *of God?*

The practical belief in God.

C. The influence that each of these Assents is apt to have upon our lives, (there being a practical as well as speculative Atheism) the living like those that in earnest believe all this: and that is in effect the practice of all those duties which the Church Catechism told you were contained in the First Commandment, which you will remember to have been Faith, Hope, Love, Fear, Trust, Honour, Worship, Prayer, and Thanksgiving to him. That all these are the uses and duties of the first Article of the Creed, will be easily discerned, if you but apply them to the severals in God's Essence and Attributes before mentioned. His veracity is the ground of our Faith; and he that cordially is perswaded of that, cannot chuse but believe in him, *Hebr.* 11. 11. The same again, when his Promise hath intervened, being backed with his Omnipotence, is the ground of our Hope; and he that knows God hath promised, and resolves that he can neither lie, nor be overpowered with difficulties, will hope on him even in the midst of all temptations to the contrary. And so again, the word [*Father*] implying his preparing for us an inheritance, 1 *Pet.* 1. 4. his glorious Excellence, and after that his paternal Goodness and Mercy to us, in feeding us and disposing all (even the saddest) Accidents to our greatest good, is a sufficient motive and ground of Love. His Omnipotence, and his Justice, and again paternal Relation to us, is our ground of Fear: His All-sufficiency, (and the Eternity that is peculiar to him, when all other things are so frail and mutable) of our Trust and dependence on him, and him only: His Regal Power, of our honouring him: His very Deity, of our Worship; and his Goodness, and All-sufficience, and Providence, and Wisdom, of our Prayer and Praises, of all our Petitions and Thanksgivings.

S. *The good God of Heaven and Earth so fill my heart with a sense of his* infinite Attributes, *and the short fading temporary emptiness and* nothingness *of all Creatures, that I may with a sincere heart and ardent affections*, love, fear, obey, worship, and depend on him.

I perceive you have by this means taught me one most useful truth of Practical Divinity *(which may well have an influence on all my life after, and fortify me against the dangerous mistakes either of the* Solifidian, *or the* Fiduciary) *that I must not be thought to say the first* Article *of my* Creed *in earnest, unless my heart be possest sincerely with the power, and my life go on uniformly in the practice of all these Christian Vertues. Will you now proceed to the next Articles?*

C. I will.

Sect. II. *Of believing in Jesus Christ.*

S. *That of* Jesus Christ *(which is next) so far as those pregnant rich titles of the* Son of God *do import, you have formerly opened to me, and in effect, what it is to* believe in Jesus Christ, *both to acknowledge the truth of what the new Testament saith of his designation to those three great* Offices *which denominated him* Christ *or* Anointed, *and were the means by which he wrought our Salvation, and so became* Jesus;

Jesus; *and also to make our vital acknowledgments of all these, depending and relying on this alone* Saviour, *and by Repentance and new Life making our selves capable of the Salvation wrought conditionally by him, loving, and hoping on him; so again receiving his* Kingdom *into our hearts, and making those other particular returns mentioned in that former discourse, to which I am content to be referred.* [c] Lib. 1. *Of the offices of Christ.*

The other passages and Articles concerning Christ *are so plain and intelligible, that I will not trouble you to interpret them one after another, but content my self with what in general you will observe to me of them.*

C. This I shall wish you to observe, That all those Articles of Christ, are by our Catechism brought into this one Summary, *That Jesus Christ redeemed me and all mankind:* and that not only from the guilt of sin, but, in St. *Peter*'s interpretation, *from our vain conversation, i. e.* Heathenish wicked living: which is, in effect, The one great necessary to be known of him, is, That he was *born, crucified, continued* under the power of *death, rose again, ascended* to, and now *sits at the right hand of God*, and shall again *come to judge the world*; all, and each of this on purpose to work Redemption for mankind: which if it be faithfully believed, and applied to the regulating and reforming of our lives, this belief will doubtless be sufficient to the salvation of any who is not able to attain to the understanding of many other difficulties. Thus doth S. *Paul* resolve to *know nothing among* his Corinthians *but Jesus Christ and him crucified*, 1 Cor. 2. 2. (under which head it seems the reprehending of all their carnal sins, *Chap.* 3. 1, *&c.* of Incest, *Chap.* 5. 1. Contentiousness, *Chap.* 6, *&c.* comes in very pertinently, each of those being oppositions to the crucified Saviour, who died for us, that he might purify us, and that we might die unto sin) and *Rom.* 10. 9. pronounces, *That he that believes in the heart that God hath raised Jesus from the dead* (and that, we told you, contains our rising from dead works by the power of that same Spirit) *shall be saved.* So 1 John 5. 1. *Every one that believeth that Jesus is the Christ*, (and piously submits to those offices of his) *is born of God:* And *Chap.* 4. 2. *Every spirit that confesses Jesus to be come in the flesh is of God*, (if that place be taken in the full extent of the words, and not, as indeed the context restrains it, to the spirit of Prophecy) because all Christianity depends on that one belief, if it be cordial; which, beside the great practical doctrines which the several articles will furnish us with, will in the gross read us a Lecture of a most sovereign charity, not to condemn or remove from our Communion any Christian that shall join with us in the acknowledgment of these and those other few necessaries, and live in all manner of duty toward God and man peaceably, and piously, and conscionably, according to this profession; all other less necessary truths, though precious in their kind, being not so valuable as Christian charity and peace, and comunion with all who are fellow-members of our Christ.

S. *I shall labour to possess my heart with this charitable lesson: but you mentioned some great* practical Doctrines *which the several articles would furnish us with: which be they?*

C. First, from the birth of Christ, to recount the infinite dignation and bounty of our God, that, to redeem us from the thraldom which our own sins had brought upon us, not only submitted himself to all diminutions and meannesses, and at last mortality of our flesh, but came into the world on no other errand but for this very purpose, *that he might die for us*, Heb. 2. 14. and *John* 12. 27. Secondly, from the same again and the necessity of it to our redemption, to consider the justice first, then necessity of our new birth or regeneration: justice, by way of retribution, that if he would for our salvation be born in our flesh of a woman, we should in any reason be born anew in the Spirit, or of God; and then the necessity also, resolving that, (as if he had not been thus born, so) *if we be not born again, we shall in no wise enter into the Kingdom of Heaven.* Thirdly, from the manner of his conception and birth, to learn the manner of his second birth in our hearts: 1. That as our humane flesh could no way deserve, or by so much as any congruity expect, that Christ should assume it, or be born in it; so could not our souls deserve or expect that Christ should thus spiritually be born in us. 2. As his conception was wrought by the Overshadowing of the Holy Ghost, so no conception of Christ in our hearts is to be had without it. 3. We must prepare Virgin hearts for Christ to be born in, and for that Holy Ghost to overshadow: by Virgin hearts meaning no absolute sinless purity and innocence, which only Paradise could yield; but that renewed purity and recovered Virginity of true Repentance, and sincere resolutions of amendment, which with the humility of that blessed Virgin, expresst by the *lowliness of the hand-maid* in her *Magnificat*, and typified in that temper of the new-born Babes, which are of all others fittest for Christ to be born in, both for innocence and humility, (and also with the faith so remarkable in her, *Luke* 1. 38.) is the only temper which can fit the Soul to be over-shadowed by the Spirit, and for Christ to be formed in it.

Of the Practical Doctrines from thence. From the birth of Christ. From the Manner of it.

S. *What from the suffering under* Pontius Pilate?

C. A Passive obedience even to death, without any kind of hostile resistance (though, as Christ was, so we should be never so well furnished with armies and legions) against the powers that are by God set over us.

From his suffering under *Pilate.*

S. *What from the death of Christ?*

C. First, That great doctrine of *Mortification, Putting off the body of the sins of the flesh*, Col. 2. 11. and *destroying the body of sin*, Rom. 6. 6. and putting our sinful habits to a contumelious death, or *crucifying the flesh with the affections and lusts*, most strictly required by God to our Salvation. And in this you may take in, if you please, a parallel through all the gradations that brought him to his death, that so we may, as the Apostle saith, *be planted with him in the likeness of his death.* For you see in the story, there was first a consultation held, then he was apprehended, examined, accused condemned, shamed, and crucified. Thus must we deal with our old man, our whole body of sin; first, deliberate and consult about the execution, and to that end chuse our sobereſt Senate-like seasons, when the heat and passions of youth and sin are over, and in the cool of the day, in the calmest temper of our souls, take this weighty business into our most serious consideration: then secondly, as soon as we have consulted, proceed to act, presently apprehend (stop in the career) every course or habit of sin: thirdly, examine it by the Word of God, the commands of Christ, in all the variations from and oppositions to them: fourthly, accuse, and therein aggravate it with all the heightning

From his death.

ning circumstances of guilt and danger: then fifthly, by a solemn full consent of all the faculties condemn this so dangerous a malefactor: then sixthly, spit upon it with all contempt and scorn: and at last give it up to be crucified, never to recover again to any vital actions. And all this, as for any one single habit of sin, so for the whole body, which contains all limbs and severals under it. Besides this, a second practice that Christ's death obliges us to, is, our voluntary chearful taking up of our Cross, and following him, really conforming our selves to the image of the crucified Saviour, and resolving, that if we suffer with him, we shall also be glorified with him. Thirdly, the putting our sinful habits like dead bodies out of the way, lest they offend or infect others, which will be answerable to the burial. Fourthly, the reality and continuance of our mortified state, (answerable to the adjuncts of Christ's crucifixion, death, burial, descent) not only once for all to repent and mortify, but to continue in the soul that death unto sin, sincere and unfeigned, till we in soul rise again to that other diviner life, never to die any more, *i. e.* never to relapse to our sinful habits, but to persevere in that mortified estate.

S. *But before you part with these Articles concerning* Christ's death, *I must take lieve to put you in mind of one difficulty, which though it may seem to be a speculative difficulty, yet because the explicite* belief (*or faith it self*) *of those few things that are contained in this* Creed *may seem to be a* Christians duty, *and so a piece of necessary* Christian practice, *it may perhaps be my duty to enquire, and a culpable omission, if I neglect to ask instruction in it, now that I may hope to receive it from you; and that is, What is meant by* [Christ's descending into Hell?]

Of Christ's descent into Hell.

C. Though it be a Christian's duty to believe every part and Article of this Creed delivered down to us by the Church from the Apostles, as a form or summary of sound doctrine, and either the first copy, or an extract (and transcript, as it were) of that tradition, or oral doctrine (*That faith which was once delivered unto the Saints, Jude v.* 3.) which the Apostles agreed on at the time of their parting from one another to preach the Gospel to all Nations; yet I conceive the agreeing on some one sence, wherein to interpret every Article of it, is not so absolutely necessary, but that some one of them (as this of Christ's descent) may be taken in a latitude, and either not determined to any one interpretation, or resolved to be capable of more; and so the words be received, the particular sence, one way or other, will be indifferent to them that sincerely follow that light which is offered to them: and therefore I conceive it is, that the Article of our Church sets it down in that large indefinite form, [*We believe that Christ descended into Hell*] adding no other words of binding interpretation to it.

S. *But what is your opinion of the sence of that* Article?

Two opinions.

C. Among divers others I shall pitch on two opinions, and either of them may be piously believed, having good grounds whereon each of them may be built: the one taken from the opinion and interpretation of many ancient and modern Worthies of the Church, That Christ in the space betwixt his death and resurrection went down locally into Hell, as that signifies the place of the damned, not to suffer there, (for all was finished upon the Cross) but to triumph over Satan in his own quarters, and openly to shew him the victory that by death Christ had gotten over him, over death it self, and over all the powers of darkness. This sence being sufficiently explicated, I shall not enlarge on. The second opinion I shall more at large shew you, and leave you to judge of the truth of it.

The first.

The second.

S. *I shall patiently attend while you do so.*

[d] καθῆλθεν εἰς ᾅδου.

C. These words [[d] *He descended into Hell*] being affirmed of Christ in the Creed, but not found in words in the New Testament, will not necessarily signify any farther than either, first, the places of the New Testament (from whence the Compilers of the Creed may seem to have collected it) will import; or secondly, the use of the phrase among either profane or Scripture-writers will require; or thirdly, the Context, or Circumstances in the Creed will inforce. And all these will not necessarily extend its sence any farther than this, That for the *space of three days he was, and truly continued to be, deprived of his natural life.* For the first, the Scriptures from whence this Article seems to have been taken are not many, indeed but one, that in the Acts out of the Psalmist, [*Thou shalt not leave my soul in Hell, nor suffer thy Holy One to see corruption,*] (as for *Ephes.* 4. 9. *He descended into the lower parts of the earth,* it belongs clearly either to the Incarnation, or descent to the Mother's womb, which is expresst by that phrase, *Psal.* 139. 15. *When I was made in secret, and curiously wrought in the lowest parts of the earth*; or else possibly to the grave (called the Mother's womb also, *Job* 1. 21.) so styled *Psal.* 63. 9.) Now in that place the word which we render [*Hell*] may signifie the common state of the dead; the word [[e] *Soul*] the * living soul, or that faculty by which we live; and the [*not leaving this in that*] is the not suffering him so long to continue deprived of life, as that *his body* (as it follows) *should see corruption, i. e.* above the space of three days; which term, consisting of seventy two hours, is the space required for the Revolution of humours, after which Physicians observe, that the body that continues so long dead, naturally putrifies, which is implied by that speech concerning *Lazarus,* Joh. 11. 39. *By this time he stinketh,* [g] *for he hath been dead four dayes:* So that that place distinctly affirms, that he should not be deprived of his natural life above the space of three dayes, that death should no longer have dominion over him; (which if it be not the importance of that Prophecy in the Psalmist, I conceive it will be hard to find any convincing Prophecy concerning Christ's rising again the third day; (for that of *Jonah* related in the Gospel, and others which by the Fathers are applied to that purpose, *Lev.* 7. 17. and *Gen.* 22. 4. were but Types, not Prophecies) and yet it is said, *Matth.* 16. 21. *That Jesus began to shew his Disciples,* (which sure is more than to tell; [h] to shew, demonstrate out of Scripture) [i] that *it behoveth him, i. e.* that he must for the fulfilling of the Prophecies, *rise the third day.*) If this be not necessarily the meaning of those words in the Acts and the Psalm, yet I conceive no man can shew convincingly that any other is. Now secondly, for the use of the phrase among Writers of the [k] first sort, it is clear that the [l] word signifies not with them the place of the damned, (no not any peculiar place of happy souls neither) but the common state of the dead. I will give you in the Margent some instances, by which, when you are skilled in those Authors, you may be able to judge.

[e] Ψυχή.

* נֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה

[g] τεταρταῖος γάρ ἐστι.

[h] ἀποκαλύψαι.

[i] ὅτι δεῖ αὐτὸν.

[k] *Attical,* or prophane.

[l] Ἅιδης.

judge. [m] Many other places might be added, but the Writers which conduce moſt to the explaining of the New Teſtament are the *Greek* Tranſlators of the Old Teſtament, and therefore among them it will be more pertinent to enquire. Look on the 37. of *Geneſis*, verſe 35. We render it out of the *Hebrew* literally, [n] *I will go down to the grave to my Son mourning*, ſave only that the [o] word which we render [*to the grave*] cannot in that place be properly ſo rendred; becauſe *Jacob* believed that his ſon was torn in pieces with wild beaſts, and not buried: and therefore the addition of thoſe words [*to my ſon*] make it neceſſary to render it in that place thus, *I will go mourning out of this life*, I will live no longer, ſeeing my ſon is dead; and the [p] phraſe [*I will go down to Hades*] is meant exactly parallel to this in the Creed [* *he went down to Hades*] and may very well be thought the fitteſt to interpret it, being the neareſt to it of any in the Scripture. For as to the word which is rendred to *go down*, it ſignifies in the Original ſometimes to *go up*, *Judges* 15. 11. (where yet the *Greek* Tranſlators uſe the very word which in *Greek* is rendred *to go down*) ſometimes to go neither *up* nor *down*, as in that place of *Geneſis* it is clear, *Jacob* knowing *Verſ.* 33. that he was not buried, but devoured by wild beaſts. Now for the context in the Creed, compare it with the ſtory of Chriſt's death in the Goſpel, and you will ſee how well it will bear this ſence. To which purpoſe I muſt premiſe this one thing, that a man conſiſts of three parts, a Body, a living Soul, an immortal ſpirit. S. *Paul* divides [r] the whole man into thoſe three parts, 1 *Theſ.* 5. 23. and in the Creation of man there is mention of all theſe. The Body is called † *the duſt of the earth*, of which he was formed; [t] the Soul is called the * *living Soul*; the [s] Spirit is called the † *breath of life*, and in other places [r] *breath and life*. Of theſe three parts Chriſt as man conſiſted, and at his death all theſe three are ſeverally diſpoſed of. His Spirit (that immortal ſoul, which I conceive to be mentioned *Luk.* 2. 40.) he *commended into the hands of his Father*, *Luke* 23. 46. In reſpect of which he is ſaid to be [x] *that day in Paradiſe*, for ſure *Paradiſe* and *God's hands* are all one. His body, that was put in the Grave; and ſo all of him diſpoſed of but the [y] *living ſoul*, and in reſpect of that, ſaith the Creed, [b] *He went into Hades:* perhaps not into the place of Hell, as B. *Bilſon*, nor into Paradiſe, as *Broughton*, nor into the Grave, for that was ſaid before in the word Buried, (though [c] ſome would have the [d] *Greek* word which is ſo rendred, refer only to his embalming,) but he was three days deprived of his natural life, (which is properly his [e] *living ſoul*,) he continued really without exerciſe, or power of exerciſing his vital faculty, taſted that [f] common ſtate of the dead for us; but then, before he was putrefied, *i. e. The third day*, *he roſe again from the dead*, &c.

[m] Take this of *Fornutus* or *Cornutus*, in his Book called Θεολογία περὶ τῶν θεῶν φύσεως, p. 4. Ἅιδης with him goes for a *God*, and, ſaith he, is called (Πλάτων, ὅτι μυθόν ἐστιν, ὃ μὴ τελευτᾶον εἰς αὐτὸν, κατάγλαι, ἢ αὐτῷ τὸ κτῆμα γίνεται) *Pluto, becauſe there is nothing but at laſt comes to him, and becomes his poſſeſſion*: and again towards the end of his Book, Ἅιδης ὁ ἀνχόμενος τὰς ψυχὰς ἀπὸ τελευτᾶον, *Hades is the laſt region of the air which receives Souls*, and is called ἥυελος, ſaith he, and ἰυελεὺς, *a good friend or Counſellor, becauſe it befriends men,* διὰ τὸ παύειν ἀνθρώπους ποτὲ τῶν πόνων καὶ φροντίδων, *in giving them ceſſation from labours and cares*; which is the very thing that the Spirit affirms of the *dead that dye in the Lord*, *They are bleſſed, for they reſt from their labours*, *Rev.* 14. 13. So p. 10. (ὁπόταν ἀφανὴς οἰκῶν) he interprets by ἐν ἀσαφεῖ κεῖσθαι, *to be no body knows where*, according to the etymology of ᾅδης *quaſi* ἀειδὴς, *an inviſible ſtate*, (agreeable to which it is that in the ancient *Rhetors*, *Severus Sophiſta*, &c. it is called not Ἅιδης but Ἀΐδης ὕδωρ. ά, & γ'.) And again, ſhewing the original of that Fable, that *Hades* ſtole away *Ceres* Daughter, It is, ſaith he, διὰ τὸ ἡδύσμοτον εἶναι χεῖρον τινὰ τῶν σπερμάτων καὶ γῆς ἀφανισμὸν, where again *Hades* it ſeems ſignifies ἀφανισμὸς, which is uſed abſolutely for death, 2 *Mac.* 5. 12. and is the very deſcription of death that the Pſalmiſt uſeth, *Pſal.* 39. 13. *Before I go hence, and be no more ſeen*, and *Heb.* 8. 13. γηράσκον ἐγγὺς ἀφανισμοῦ, *that which is old is near to vaniſhing* or *diſappearing*: and ſo *Heraclitus* περὶ ἀπίστων κζ'. ſpeaking of the Helmet of *Hades* which makes men inviſible, he ſaith, it is τὸ τέλος, the *end* or *death* of every one, ὃς ὁ ἀπειλῶν τετελευτηκὼς ἀόρατος γίνεται, *to which he that comes, i. e.* he that is dead, *becomes inviſible*. And the Author of the Book of *Wiſdom* hath a like phraſe, *Our ſpirit ſhall vaniſh as the ſoft Air*; where ſpeaking in the perſon of the Atheiſt, who acknowledged not the immortality of the Soul, the word *ſpirit* is taken for ψυχὴ *living ſoul*. And *Bar.* 3. 11. καταβηναι εἰς ᾅδην is joyned with ἠφανίσθημεν. [n] καταβήσομαι πρὸς τὸν υἱόν μου πενθῶν εἰς ᾅδην. So *Eſth.* 13. 7. εἰς τὸ ᾅδιον καταβῆναι; ſignifies only to *dye*, Ver. 6. (to be killed) being ſpoken by an heathen King, which we are not ſure imagined any Hell. So clearly, *Bar.* 3. 19. (καταβῆναν εἰς ᾅδην) cannot be imagined to belong to Hell, but only to the vaniſhing tranſitory eſtate of men, who dye, and are ſucceeded by others: and 3 *Mac.* πλησίον ᾅδου, μᾶλλον δ' ἐπ' αὐτῷ βιβηκότες, [o] לשאלה [p] καταβήσομαι εἰς ᾅδην. [x] καταλύειν εἰς ᾅδην. [t] ὁλόκληρον ὑμῶν, *integrum veſtri*. † האדמה עפר מן [t] Ψυχὴ. [x] πνεῦμα. † נשמת היום [y] πνεῦμα καὶ ζωὴ, 2 Mac. 7. 22. ζωὴ καὶ πνοὴ. Acts 17. 4, 5. [s] σήμερον. [t] Ψυχὴ. [b] καταλύειν εἰς ᾅδην. [c] P. *Ramus de Rel.* [d] τάφον. [e] Ψυχὴ or נפש [f] To which purpoſe it will be obſervable what *Heraclitus in Clem. Al. Str. l.* 1. ſets down out of *Sibylla* an antient Poet, ſpeaking of *Sibylla*, and undertaking to ſhew how ſhe propheſied even after her death. For, ſaith he, Τὸ μὲν εἰς ἀέρα χωρῆσαν αὐτῆς, *that part of her body which went into the air did propheſie*, ἐν φήμαις καὶ κλήδοσι, *by voices heard in the air*, (for ſo φήμη is defined by *Varinus*, λόγος ἀκλατικὸς μέλλοντός τινος ἐξ αὐτομάτου ἀκουόμενος, & κλήδων μαντεῖα, or θεῖα φήμη, ſuch as was that *voice* which *Plutarch* mentions to have been heard by the Mariners, Πὰν μέγας τέθνηκε) *The body*, or that part which was changed into the earth, *bringeth forth* πόαν, *herb or graſs, and the beaſts that fed exactly on that place, did, by their bowels or entrails, when they were killed, declare to men what was to come.* Τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν αὐτῆς δὴ τὸ ἐν τῇ σελήνῃ φαινόμενον περίσωμον οἴεται, *As for her ſoul*, he conceived that to be that *face that appears in the Moon*, and that helped the *Aſtrologers to divine alſo. Three parts* you ſee of a woman, according to that ſo ancient Philoſophy. Of which three, by Death, one, ſaith he, was ſent to the Earth, another to Heaven, a third, εἰς ἀέρα χωρῆσαν, *went into the Air*; that third I conceive the ſame that the Atheiſt in the Book of *wiſdom*, *Chap.* 2. 3. affirms, that it ſhall *vaniſh* (at death) διαχυθήσεται, ſhall be *diſſolved* or *powred* abroad, ὡς χαυνὸς ἀὴρ, *as the ſoft* (or moiſt) *Air*, which is there πνεῦμα the *breath* or *ſpirit*, *viz.* that *mortal ſpirit* in the Atheiſt's Philoſophy, all one with the *breath in the noſtrils*, ver. 2. but much differing from the immortal ſpirit among Chriſtians. And that which (he thus ſaith) went into the Air, is it which in Chriſt is ſaid κατελθεῖν εἰς ᾅδην, to have *gone* (or *deſcended*, though not locally yet from a ſuperiour to an inferiour ſtate) to *Hades* that ſtate of ſeparation of ſoul from body, which doth not by any neceſſity imply or import the place of the damned in Hell. So in *Nicodemus* his Goſpel there is mention of the Saints that are in Ἅιδης, and rejoyce there.

Thus *Apoc.* 6. 8. after the mention of [g] *death*, is added in our Tranſlation, [h] [*and Hell*] (but it ſignifies this ſtate of ſeparation, or inviſible ſtate, or continuance in death) was a [i] follower of it, and a [k] companion with it. And that it refers not to that which we call [*Hell*] (much leſs to Paradiſe) but only to that temporal ſeparation of ſoul and body, may farther appear by the effects there mentioned of it, [*There was given them power to kill*, &c. *with the ſword*, *with famine*, *and with death*, *and with the beaſts of the earth.*] And ſo Chap. 20. 14. [l] *Death and Hades are caſt into the lake of fire*; and Verſe 13. *gave up thoſe that were in it*. So *Eccluſ.* 48. 5. *He that raiſeth the dead* * *from death and from Hades*, ſure raiſes not out of Hell; and in the Song of the three Children, verſe 65. God's delivering them from *Hades* will not be extended to Hell, but only to death, as follows in the next words. And ſure *Eleazar*, that deſires his friend † *to bring him on his way to Hades*, 2 *Maccab.* 6. 23. doth not deſire to be diſpatcht to Hell. And that the Antient Writers of the Church (ſome of them at leaſt, of the moſt Antient) meant no other than this by the Article of *Chriſt's deſcent* ° *to Hades*, may be gheſt by two antient Paſſages, the one in * *Thaddeus* Creed, affirmed to be given by him unto the King of *Edeſſa*; the other in the Primitive Martyr † *Ignatius*; both agreeing in this, that *Chriſt aſcended with many*, *but deſcended alone:* where though the deſcent were (in their words) to *Hades*, yet *Hades* cannot there be thought to ſignify the place of the damned, unleſs Chriſt ſhall be conceived

[g] θάνατος. [h] καὶ ὁ Ἅιδης. [i] ἀκολουθεῖ. [k] μετ' αὐτοῦ. [l] ὁ θάνατος καὶ ὁ ᾅδης. * ἐκ θανάτου καὶ ἐξ ᾅδου. † προπέμπειν εἰς ᾅδου. ° εἰς ᾅδου. * *Euſeb. Eccleſ. hiſt. l.* 1. † *Ep. ad Tral.*

to have returned from thence also with a great multitude; which though it were perhaps agreeable with some mens [r] fancies, yet cannot easily be resolved to be the meaning of those Antient Writers, or of that Text to which they refer, *That the bodies of many that had slept arose*, &c. For I conceive out of * *Hell* there was not in their opinion any such possibility of rising.

[r] As of those that teach that Christ going to Hell, was met and believed on by the Heathen Philosophers there, and particularly by *Plato* in the front; and brought them out along with him.

* Some Books there are called the *Sibylline* Oracles, in all probability written by some Christian, and that an antient one, (about the Emperour *Commodus* his time, it is by many circumstances most probable.) In the first Book of these, after the Creation and Fall of man, there is mention of his death and mortal state, and (upon occasion of this close, πᾶν δ' ἔθ ὑπεδέξατο ᾅδης, *Hades received them all*) this account is given of the word Ἅιδης,

Ἅιδην δ' ἄυτε κάλεσσαν, ἐπὶ πρῶτον μόλεν Ἅιδαν,
Τευσάμενοι θανάτου, γαῖα δέ μιν ἀμφεκάλυψε.
Τοὔνεκα δὴ πάντες οἱ ὀπιχθόνιοι γεγαῶτες
Ἀνέρες εἰν Ἀΐδαο δόμοις εἶναι καλέονται.

Where it is clear what is meant by that word [Ἅιδης] *The common state of the dead*, when their bodies are laid in the grave, the condition not only of the wicked, nor only of the godly, but of the πάντες ὀπιχθόνιοι ἄνθρες, *all mortal men*, who, as follows there,

——Εἰν Ἀΐδαο μολοῦντες Τιμὴν ἴσχηκαν,

When they were gone to Hades, were honoured by us: whereas the Giants had their ταρτάρειον δόμον γαιηνὸν, which is *Hell* indeed, there being no so proper notion of *Hell* in the Old Testament, as the place of the *Rephaim* or Giants, *Prov.* 21. 16. and 9. 18. and 2. 18. in the Hebrew and Greek reading. So in *Philmon*, Καὶ γὰρ καθ' ᾅδου δύο τείχεις νομίζομεν, Μιὰν δικαίων, χωρίον ἀσεβῶν ἑτέραν.

* *In inferno, promptuaria animarum matrici assimilata sunt.*

So in the second book of *Esdras*, Chap. 4. 41. * *In the grave, the chambers of souls are like the womb of a woman:* where though we render [*in the grave*] yet without question the *Greek* was ἐν Ἅιδῃ *in Hades*; and so *Hades* is that state of souls in the separation, wherein we conceived there were divers *Cells*, which all desired to return (and pour back) the souls which were in them to the bodies again, as a woman when she comes to time of Child-birth, desires to bring forth. I have now wearied you sufficiently with an account of this second interpretation and the grounds of it; and I shall add but this, That as it may piously be believed, that Christ did in the space of those three days locally descend, to shew himself triumphantly to the Devils: so they that on the premised grounds resolve it possible, that there may be no more concluded from this Article, but only that Christ being *crucified, dead, and buried*, continued in the state of the dead, his soul really separated from the body for some space, but not so long till his body should putrefy in the grave, (to which it follows aptly, That *the third day he rose again*, or was restored from that state) may be pious believers also, and offend nothing against the Creeds or Doctrine of our (or of the Antient) Church, so they do not condemn those others that are contrary-minded. I meant not to have insisted on any such speculative difficulty, yet upon your demand I have given you an account of it.

S. *I acknowledge it somewhat distant from your designed method, yet conceive my self to have profited by it, if in nothing else, yet in knowing my duty to my self and others in matters of this nature, which may piously be believed on either side. The Lord grant me the spirit of Meekness and Charity in all things. You will now proceed to that which follows after the Articles of Christ's death, to wit, that of his Resurrection.*

The practical belief of Christ's Resurrection.

C. The Practical Belief of Christ's Resurrection is, 1. Our actual rising to new life, as necessary as that of Mortification premised. 2. Our appearing (as he did) to men, and walking exemplarily before them in all heavenly living. 3. Our continuing in a sanctified state of Perseverance, (noted, as I conceive, *Rom.* 6. 8. by [*we shall live with him,*] *i. e.* live this new life, if we do not treacherously ruine our selves again) as Christ did, *who being raised from the dead, died no more, death had no more dominion over him*, Ver. 9. till by God's mercy we be taken up to bliss. 4. Our depending upon Christ for our Justification, which as well as our Sanctification is an effect of his rising, *Col.* 3. 3. *Rom.* 4. 25. and 8. 33, 34. 5. Our hastening this Resurrection, (parallel to Christ's rising the third day) not so wholly immersing our selves with sorrow and humiliation (that grave, as it were, of the mortified soul) as to hinder action and vital performances, but by the power of that *Spirit that raised Jesus from the grave*, immediately to rise to new life.

S. *What is the practical belief of his* Ascension?

Of his Ascension.

C. Ascending after, and dwelling with him in divine Meditation, being heavenly-minded, seeking and minding, and savouring of those *things that are above*, the duty of all those that are *risen with Christ*, Col. 3. 1.

S. *What of his* sitting at the right hand of God, *the Father Almighty?*

Of his sitting at the right hand of God.

C. That phrase of *sitting*, &c. signifies Christ's reigning, his having all Power given to him: you may see it by comparing *Psalm* 110. 1. with 1 *Cor.* 15. 25. In one place it is, *The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool*; in the other, *He must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet.* This you have formerly learned to be an union of his Regal and Priestly Office; his giving Commands to his Church, and his interceding with God for his Church, and that so powerfully, as actually to bestow that Grace, that Pardon which he intercedes for. And this is farther noted by those titles there repeated of [*God the Father Almighty*] that Intercession of his to God being as to a Father (both of him and us) who will, and to a *Father Almighty*, who is able to grant whatsoever he prays for. And then the practical Belief of this Article will be, First, to give my self up obediently to be ruled by him (in all his Institutions and Commands) and by all those that he hath set in the Church under him to rule over me. Secondly, to depend on his Intercession, to offer up all our Prayers to God in and through him. Thirdly, to receive (and make the holiest use and advantages of) all Grace that shall flow from him. And fourthly, when he is so ready at hand to our Relief, to resolve to look to him in all temptations, and count it our wretchless abuse of his goodness, if we do not persevere in despight of all assaults to the contrary.

Of his coming to judge.

S. *What of his Coming from that right hand in Heaven,* to judge both the quick and the dead?

C. Our

C. Our conſtant making up our accounts againſt his Coming, as daily expecting a righteous, though a gracious, Judge to ſit upon us, according to thoſe many titles we have of him in holy Writ: as *Iſa.* 33. 22. *The Lord, i. e.* Chriſt, (as appears Ver. 17, 18.) *is our Judge, our Law-giver, our King,* and then our Saviour; 2 *Theſ.* 1. 8. *The Lord Jeſus taking vengeance in flaming fire*; ſo *the wrath of the Lamb*, Apoc. 6. 16. and the *ſearcher of the reins and heart* (the expreſſion of a Judge) *Apoc.* 2. 23. A notion which of all others will bring us to a pious awe of him, as of one which will not ſuffer any one ſin to be carried along under the diſguiſe of Religion, or on confidence of his favour; but (againſt all provokers) ſhall come from his Throne (though it be of mercy) in Heaven, to judge us here: one that is not to be moved with paſſions, with bribes, with flatteries, to puniſh or reward according to any other method or rule, but only that of [*Every man according to his works.*]

S. Will you now proceed to thoſe other Articles, and firſt, that of the Holy Ghoſt?

Sect. III. *Of the Holy Ghoſt.*

C. The word *Ghoſt* ſignifies *Spirit*; which being, by way of Excellence, a title of God's, (*God is a Spirit*) and ſo here attributed to him, and denoting the Third Perſon in the Trinity, (which is alſo the Fountain and Spring of all Spiritual life in us) is here called Holy: not ſo principally, becauſe he is holy in himſelf, *i. e.* pure without all mixture or compoſition, either of ſin, or corruption, or pollution, or hypocriſy, or partiality, (and all this in a moſt eminent degree, nothing in the world being thus beſide;) but more punctually, becauſe he is the Author of all Holineſs and Purity in us; that little weak degree of Sanctity that the moſt regenerate among us do attain to, being a Ray and Effuſion of that ſanctifying Spirit, which worketh in us by his preventing, ſanctifying and aſſiſting grace, both to *will and to do of his good pleaſure.* This the Holy Ghoſt doth by two ways of diſpenſation, 1. Outward, 2. Inward. The outward way was his viſible deſcending upon the Apoſtles, and fitting them with Graces, and inſtating them with Powers to plant and preſerve and govern the Church of Chriſt over the World.

His way of ſanctifying. The outward.

S. What were thoſe Powers?

C. 1. To Preach, and Baptize thoſe that received their Doctrine, and ſo to plant a Chriſtian Church. 2. To confirm thoſe whom they had baptized, and to adminiſter the Sacrament of Chriſt's Body and Blood, and ſo to preſerve or eſtabliſh thoſe whom they had planted. 3. To exerciſe the Power of the Keyes in Cenſures, puniſhing the pertinacious, caſting them out of the Church, that they may be aſhamed, and ſo think fit to reform their wicked lives; and upon approbation of their Repentance and Reformation, abſolving, and receiving them into the Church again; and all this to govern thoſe whom they had planted and confirmed in the Faith. And 4. to ordain others, and commit the ſame power to thoſe which the Holy Ghoſt had ſetled in themſelves, and ſo to provide a Miniſtery of his holy celeſtial Calling, (ſent by Chriſt, as he was by his Father, *John* 20. 21.) to continue by Succeſſion from one to the other, to the end of the world. All which donations and inſtatings were the acts of the Holy Ghoſt's deſcent, (beſide the extraordinary gifts of Tongues and Miracles, *&c.* needful for thoſe firſt times, to *preach to all Nations* intelligibly, and to gain Belief to their Preaching, but not ſo neceſſary after:) and in reſpect of theſe he is ſtyled the *Paraclete*, which is a word of a larger ſignificancy than any one Engliſh word can expreſs, and therefore is thought fit not to be tranſlated, but retained in other Languages, *Syriack* and *Latine*, and will beſt be rendred by theſe three ſeverals, (according to the notation of that word in *Greek*,) firſt, *Advocate*, ſecondly, *Comforter* yea, and thirdly, *Exhorter* too.

The powers inſtated on the Apoſtles.

ὁ παράκλητος.

S. What do you mean by the Holy Ghoſt *being an* Advocate?

C. Two things: he came to be an Advocate both of Chriſt, and of us: Of Chriſt, in pleading his cauſe againſt the incredulous World, which is ſet down *John* 16. 8. and expreſt by a three-fold Conviction (it being the Advocate's part to [a] convince and confute, ſhame and ſilence the adverſary, *Tit.* 1. 9.) 1. of *Sin.* 2. of *Righteouſneſs*, 3. of *Judgment.*

His office of Advocate to Chriſt.

[a] ἐλέγχειν.

S. What is the meaning of thoſe three Convictions?

The three Convictions.

C. Among the *Jews* there were three ſorts of Cauſes or Actions: Firſt, * In criminal matters, which here word for word is rendred [[c] of Sin.] Secondly, for the defending and vindicating of the Juſt and Innocent, called in † *Hebrew* by a phraſe which is again literally rendred [of [e] Righteouſneſs.] Thirdly, for the condemning of the wicked, which is as literally that which we there read [of * Judgment] Now theſe three Actions the Holy Ghoſt was to manage on Chriſt's behalf, as an Advocate for a Client, againſt the incredulous gain-ſaying world. Firſt, he ſhould convince the world of that great crime committed in not believing, but rejecting of Chriſt, and that by legal evidence of that Law, *Deut.* 18. 22. (which was on purpoſe to diſcriminate the true Meſſias from all falſe pretenders, Ver. 18.) where it is reſolved, That if the Prophecies of a Prophet come not to paſs, then he is a falſe Prophet; but if they do, he is a true one. And therefore the very coming of the Spirit, after the Aſcenſion of Chriſt, being the thing propheſied by Chriſt in this place, (and ſo his prophecy fulfilled) ſhall be a legal proof of this crime of theirs, in not receiving Chriſt thus teſtified and demonſtrated to be a true Prophet; which ſure was the reaſon why it was not (as Chriſt ſaith) ſo dangerous or irremiſſible to oppoſe Chriſt at his preſence on the Earth, as it would be to blaſpheme or oppoſe the Holy Ghoſt, *Matth.* 12. 31. Secondly, he ſhould convince the world that Chriſt was a moſt righteous perſon, and moſt unjuſtly crucified, (and ſo vindicate and defend his innocent Client) by his aſſumption to Heaven, and participation of his Fathers glory, (which aſſumption of his is expreſt by that phraſe [* *you ſee me no more*] both here and elſewhere, becauſe at his Aſcenſion it is ſaid, *A cloud received him out of their ſight*, Acts 1. 9.) which was a certain argument of his Righteouſneſs, or Innocence. Under which alſo may be contained that imputed righteouſneſs of his to us by way of ſatisfaction, together with thoſe imperfect beginnings of Sanctification wrought in our hearts by the Power of his Reſurrection, and a moſt proper effect of his Aſcenſion, Interceſſion, and exerciſe of his Kingly power in Heaven. Thirdly, he ſhould uſe a third argument to convince the world, to wit, that taken from the judging, condemning, ſentencing, and executing his adverſary, even the Prince of this world, the Devil, who being the firſt contriver of Chriſts death, is now repayed in his kind by way of retaliation, in a manner deſtroyed and ſlain, turned out of his Kingdom,

The three Convictions.
* לחטא. περὶ ἁμαρτίας.
† לצדקה περὶ δικαιοσύνης.
* למשפט περὶ κρίσεως.
Of theſe two laſt, *vide Schindl. Pent. tagl. p.* 1521. *C.*

* ὅτι ὑπάγω πρὸς τὸν πατέρα μου.

[h] Πᾶν μὲν γὰρ τεθνηκέναι. Plut. περὶ ἐκλείψεως χρησμῶν.

(which is a kind of civil death to him, and so called by the [h] voice in *Plutarch*) by the silencing of his Oracles, turning out of Idolatry and Heathenish vices, which before without controll had reigned in the world. To which it was also consequent, that all Satans instruments should pay very dear for their infidel rebellious actions, in like manner as Satan himself was used for his riotous behaviour against our Christ.

S. *You have shewed me how he was* Christ's Advocate, *you said also that he was* ours: *how is he so?*

To us.

C. In setting a Ministery to pray and intercede for their several Congregations, (and enabling them in the very Apostles time to form a Liturgy (of which several passages remain unto us at this day) to continue in the Church to that end) and thereby *helping our infirmities*, and *teaching us to pray as we ought.*

S. *How is he a* Comforter?

His Office of Comforter.

C. In divulging that excellent comfortable news of the Gospel, the Promises of pardon and Grace to them that want comfort.

Exhorter.

S. *How is he an* Exhorter?

C. In the doctrine of Repentance, and of flying from the wrath to come, and walking worthy of that great calling. And in the exercise of all these Titles and Offices (as by a first external means) the Holy Ghost is said to work all manner of Sanctity in our hearts. Besides this, there is an inward means, the secret preventions, excitations, over-shadowings, and assistances of that Spirit, all absolutely necessary to beget and continue Holiness in the heart; and all these attending those outward Administrations (just now mentioned) and constantly going along with them (as breath goes along with words) and hallowing them to the worthy receiver, the obedient Disciple.

Belief in the Holy Ghost.

S. *What is it now to* believe in this Holy Ghost?

C. 1. To acknowledge the truth of all this, That it is (as from the Word of God it might more particularly appear) as here hath been explained. 2. To accommodate our practice accordingly, to conform it to this Faith. As first, to submit to those Spiritual Pastors, *&c.* whom the Holy Ghost hath set over us, and for them again to be careful of that flock of which the Holy Ghost hath made them Overseers. Secondly, not to intrude upon or usurp that holy calling without a lawful vocation, and such as may justify it self to be from Heaven. Thirdly, to obey all those several Powers, to come in to the Preaching of the Word, to fit my self for the Sacrament of Initiation, and bring others to it; so again, for Confirmation, and the Sacrament of Christs Body, to examine and shrive our selves, and so eat of that Bread, *&c.* to fear the Censures, and (if we are under them) by confession, contrition, works of mercy, and all kind of reformation to labour for absolution. And in all these, fourthly, humbly to invoke God's special grace, that it may go along with these outward Ordinances, and to watch and observe, and receive it in the use of them, and lay it up in an honest heart, and bring forth fruit with patience, and neither to resist, repel, nor grieve, nor *quench* that *holy Spirit of God, whereby we are sealed* (if we do not betray our selves) *unto the day of redemption.*

Sect. IV. *Of the Holy Catholick Church.*

S. *What is the meaning of the* Holy Catholick Church?

Catholick.

C. The word *Catholick* signifies *Universal*, dispersed or extended all the world over; in opposition to the former state of the *Jewish* Church, which was an incloſure divided from all the world beside, in time of the Law; whereas now the Gospel is preached to all the world, and (by those powers of the Holy Ghost forementioned) a Church with all those ministrations in it is constituted over all the world. This Church is a society of Believers, ruled and continued according to those Ordinances, with the use of the Sacraments, Preaching of the Word, Censures, *&c.* under Bishops or Pastors, succeeding those on whom the Holy Ghost came down, and (by receiving Ordination of those that had that power before them, *i. e.* of the Bishops of the Church, the continued Successors of the Apostles) lawfully called to those offices. And in respect, first, of these holy powers and offices; and secondly, of the Holy Ghost, the Author and Founder of them; thirdly, of the sanctity of life that ought to be in these, and all Christian Professors; and fourthly, of the end, the begetting and encrease of holiness, to which the very constituting of a Church was designed; in these four respects, I say, it is that this Catholick Church is called *holy*.

Holy.

Believing the Holy Catholick Church.

S. *What is it* to Believe the Holy Catholick Church?

C. To acknowledge that all the world over, by the Ministry of the Apostles such a Church was gathered, and by the Holy Ghost endued with those foresaid powers, (and so shall in some measure continue unto the end of the world; the *gates of Hell*, *i. e.* the most fatal dangers, destruction and death it self, being not *able to prevail against it*) within which whosoever lives and dies (a faithful obedient son of it) shall be eternally rewarded by the great Husband of his Church, our Saviour in Heaven.

The Practical part of it.

S. *What is the practical part of this belief?*

C. The living peaceably, charitably, faithfully and obediently within this fold of the universal Church, yielding all reverence to the decrees and doctrines of it, and in every particular or national Church *obeying them that have the rule over us*, labouring to preserve both unity of faith and charity with all our fellow-brethren, both in that and all other particular Churches; and not breaking into factions, parties, divisions, subdivisions, but labouring our utmost to approve our selves holy members of that Holy Catholick Church, by unity, charity, brotherly love, ensuing and contending for peace, and all other branches of Christian purity.

† Of the Communion of Saints.

S. *Now follows the* Communion of Saints; *what do you mean by that?*

* κοινωνεῖν. † τῆς φθονήσει κοινωνοῦντι καὶ δόντι; Lucian. Ὄνος. Καν. p. 774. Εὐποιεῖν καὶ κοινωνεῖν, Heb. 13. 16.

† *C.* I conceive that the word rendred *Communion*, doth most properly and usually signify *Communication*, (in that sence as to * communicate signifies to † give, to impart or distribute to others, to make others partakers of any spiritual or corporal gift,) beneficence and liberality: and that either to the bodily indigencies of the poor Saints, as many times in the

the † New Testament the word signifies; or else by any other way of charity and mercy, which you know is then greatest when it is exprest to mens souls, by advice, counsel, reprehension, spiritual conference betwixt man and man, and in any kind of effusion of grace from God to us. Thus in S. *Paul's* solemn form of benediction, after the mention of the *grace of our Lord Jesus Christ*, (*i. e.* his bounty and goodness) *and the love of God*, (*i. e.* the same again in another word) is added, * *the Communication of the Holy Ghost*, (*i. e.* the liberal distribution of all those gifts which flow from him, the Conduit of all grace) *be with you all evermore.*

† So κοινωνίαν ποιήσασθαι. Rom 15. 26. *To make a contribution or gathering for the poor*; τινὶ χάριν, καὶ τινὶ κοινωνίαν δια-

χαρίτος † εἰς τοὺς ἁγίους, *Charity and liberality of administring towards the Saints*, 2 Cor. 8. 4. ἁπλότης † κοινωνίας, *liberal distribution*, 2 Cor. 9. 13. κοινωνία εἰς εὐαγγέλιον, *liberality toward the Gospel*, i. e. *toward the Ministers and propagation of it*, Phil. 1. 5. κοινωνία † πίστεως, Philem. 6. *liberality to the poor Saints*, proceeding from his faith, expreſt, ver. 5, *by love and faith to the Lord Jesus, and toward all Saints*; *faith to the Lord Jesus, and love or charity toward all Saints, by which their bowels were refreshed*, ver. 7. συμμέτοχοι, κοινωνικοί, 1 Tim. 6. 18. * κοινωνία πνεύματος ἁγίου.

S. *But how do you apply this notion of the word to the matter in hand, I mean to the interpreting of this Article of the Creed?*

C. Thus, that it shall contain in it two things especially, according to the two kinds of liberality mentioned, corporal and spiritual. For the first, we find in many passages of the *Acts*, that at the first Preaching of the Apostles, many came in and believed, and they that did so, *sold their goods and possessions, and distributed them to all, as every one had need*, *Acts* 2. 45. and *had all things common*, vers. 44. *and* [a] *exertised liberality* (or charity) *toward all the people*, vers. 47. And this is called by this very word which we render [b] *Communion*, but signifies *Communication*, vers. 42. And then the most literal importance of the phrase, [[c] *Communication of Saints*, or *of the Saints*] will be this matter of fact, set down in that Apostolical story, *viz.* the general practice of all believers in the first age of Christianity, to live together in that most liberal, charitable manner, every man communicating what he had to the others wants, and to that purpose, *bringing the price of their estates, and laying it at the Apostles feet*, and making them the stewards of their liberality. This was so eminent an act of Christian charity, so lively a character of Primitive Saints, so immediately and remarkably consequent to the Preaching of the Gospel to the *Gentiles*, that it may well deserve to be put into our [d] Creed, next after the Article of the Holy Ghost, and as a branch of that of the *Holy Catholick Church*, meaning that of the Apostles age; and accordingly the *Nicene* Creed joineth them both in one, *the Holy Catholick and Apostolick Church*: and then you will presently know what it is to believe this Article, *viz.* to assent to that relation of Scripture, and from those examples to learn that most excellent Christian grace of Charity and liberality to all the fellow-members of our Christ, and at least to retain some considerable degree of it in the actions of our future lives, remembring that it is the part of the faith of Christ to loosen the misers hand, to enlarge his heart, to melt him into that soft temper, and incline him to make others partakers of that plenty which he hath received from God, to practise that bounty toward all, which we see so hugely exemplified by Christ to mankind.

Two parts of it. Liberality.

[a] χάριν ἴσχοντες.
[b] κοινωνία.
[c] κοινωνία τῶν ἁγίων.

[d] This interpretation I now see to have been accepted by the learned *Hugo Grotius* on 2 Cor. 8. 14. Where speaking of the rich mens liberality, *Quâ sustentabantur pauperiores*, he saith, *spectat & hue ea, quam in symbolo profitemur, sanctorum communio, The Communion of Saints in the Creed belongs to this matter.* I only wonder why having fain upon this notion, he did not in those Notes apply it to *Acts* 2. 42. (where the very word κοινωνία in this sence is observable;) and am by that, and some other κεστήεια in those Annot. of his on the *Acts* and *Epistles*, inclined to conjecture, That that Volume had not received his last care and survey before his death.

S. *What else is contained in this Article?*

C. I told you there was another kind of charity and communicativeness, the spiritual expressions of love, which have been, are, and ought still to be among all holy men, all Saints, all Christians. And this is of many sorts, but may briefly be contained in this, The performing all Christian offices of love one to another: first, praying with and for one another, (and he that separates himself from other Christians, and hath not charity enough to pray with them, or that is so proud or malicious, that he will not pray for all men, especially all Christians, when Christ did pray for his very crucifiers, is far enough from this charity;) secondly, praising God with and for one another, a duty continued mutually betwixt us and the very glorified Saints in Heaven, so far as is most commodious to the condition of each, the Saints in rest and joy daily praying for their younger brethren, the Church and the Saints in the camp on Earth praising God for those revelations of his grace and glory to their elder brethren in Heaven. And the very believing this, as a duty that Christianity hath made us to be so much concerned in, will have a full influence on our practice. I need not insist to shew you how.

Spiritual expressions of love.

S. *What is the meaning of the Article* [Remission of sins?] *The words I understand, and conceive them to signifie God's pardon of all trespasses committed against him, the same which you interpreted to me in the* Lord's Prayer; *but what is to be my meaning when I say, I believe it? Is every man bound to believe that his sins are pardoned?*

Of Remission of sins.

C. That the sins of any particular man are actually pardoned to him is not the meaning of this Article, there being no revelation of God's in Scripture (which alone can be the Object of Faith) concerning the state of any particular person, any further than, from the general Promises of pardon to all true Penitents, he shall (upon examination of himself, and finding that he is of that number) be able to pronounce unto himself; or than another, a Minister especially, whose office it is, having a clear view of his Conscience, can pronounce unto him: neither of which being infallible in their pronouncings, it cannot yet be matter of Faith to him. That which is the Article of Faith here, is, That by the death and sufferings of Christ there is pardon and remission to be had for sinners, (which all the legal performances could not help any man to, those being only a remembrance, or [e] commemoration of sins, *Heb.* 10. 3. no means of power or efficacy to work remission) that the having forfeited our perfect unsinning innocence in Paradise, shall not (on condition we return to God sincerely) be able to exclude us from God's favour and grace here, nor from Heaven hereafter. This Article is so near of kin to the doctrine of the second Covenant, set down in the first part of our conference, that I shall need only to refer you to that place, and not to enlarge any farther on it.

What belief of it is required.

[e] ἀνάμνησις ἁμαρτιῶν.

S. *But*

S. *But what is the* practical belief *of this Article?*

The practical belief of it.

C. 1. To ſet our ſelves ſincerely to the performance of that condition, on which the remiſſion of ſins in the Goſpel is promiſed and purchaſed for us. 2. To continue in full aſſurance of hope toward God, that if we perform our part, God in Chriſt will never fail in his. 3. To pray to God in Chriſt daily for his mercy. 4. To continue in the moſt melting ſtate of Humility and Meekneſs, as remembring that all our good that we do, or can attain to in this life or another (Sanctification, or Glorification) is utterly unimputable to us, or any thing in us, and wholly to be acknowledged the purchaſe of Chriſt, who alone hath delivered us from the puniſhment of our ſins, both as that is a deprivation of the viſion of God hereafter, and of his grace here; all the ſtrength that any Chriſtian hath to reſiſt any ſin, being a conſequent of this remiſſion of ſins, *i. e.* of God's being reconciled unto us in Chriſt, not imputing our treſpaſſes.

S. *I ſhall now invite you on to the next Article,* The Reſurrection of the body: *What is the thing profeſt to be believed in that Article?*

Of the Reſurrection of the Body.

C. The certainly future reſtauration or riſing again of this very ſame fleſh of ours out of the grave, which by the curſe of God inflicted on ſin doth go down thither. The puniſhment on all mankind upon *Adam*'s fall, was [*Duſt thou art, and to duſt thou ſhalt return*] mortality, or a *decree for all men once to die.* This being an heavy puniſhment indeed, if it had not been allayed or removed by Chriſt, is now by him extremely ſoftned, that though it do ſtill conſtantly befal the univerſality of men, (*Death paſſing on all, in that all have ſinned*) yet all the bitter noxious part of death ſhall be taken away, as far as concerns the faithful ſervants of Chriſt, the ſting of death being by him pluck'd out, and ſo the Grave turn'd into a Dormitory or retiring-room, a place where the bodies reſt in a ſound ſleep, till they be awakened unto bliſs.

S. *But how will it be poſſible for dead bodies (mouldred to aſhes, and then blown over the face of the earth, or devoured by wild beaſts, and thoſe again devoured by worms, or by other men) to riſe again, or return to their former eſtate.*

The poſſibility of it.

C. That power that *raiſed Jeſus from the dead, will alſo quicken our dead bodies,* the laſt trump will call all men out of the duſt, and God, that made all out of nothing, can ſurely reſtore our bodies again to us, however tranſmuted: and that he will do ſo, you have both the plain affirmations of the Scripture, (*Chriſt is the firſt-fruits of them that ſleep,* and then all the heap muſt one day follow; the head being riſen, the body cannot remain long behind; and at large you have it aſſerted, 1 *Cor.* 15.) and the judgment of reaſon it ſelf, though not telling us how, yet making it reaſonable to believe that it will be ſo, becauſe otherwiſe our bodies, which are both the inſtruments and copartners of all ſin and all righteous actions and ſufferings, will be left unpuniſhed and unrewarded.

S. *What is the* Practical belief *of this Article?*

The practical belief of it.

C. The keeping our bodies in a riſing condition: neither by uncleanneſs, nor drunkenneſs, nor worldly-mindedneſs, nor ſloth, nailing our ſelves to the earth, or mire, or dung-hill; but in Purity, and Sobriety, and Heavenly-mindedneſs, and Induſtry, fitting our bodies for that heavenly, divine condition, to which after the Grave we expect to be advanced. Secondly, the praying to God for this perfection of bliſs, not only to our ſelves, but alſo to thoſe who in ſoul are already entred into God's reſt, that their bodies being joined to their ſouls, they may continually dwell together (like *Brethren in unity*) that good and joyful life.

S. *But what kind of bodies ſhall thoſe be after they be raiſed?*

The quality of the bodies raiſed.

C. Spiritual bodies (1 *Cor.* 15. 44. Firſt, in reſpect of the qualities, ſpiritualized into a high Agility, Rarity, Clarity, and ſuch as will render them moſt commodious habitations for the ſoul, made partaker of that divine viſion. Secondly, in reſpect of the principle of life and motion, which in natural bodies is ſome natural principle; but in theſe is the Spirit of God which ſhall ſuſtain them without eating or drinking, *&c.*

S. *What is the practical belief of this?*

The practical belief of that.

C. 1. Endeavouring toward theſe Excellencies here, mortifying and ſubduing the carnal principle, and making it as tame and tractable as may be, and altogether complying with the Spirit. Secondly, raiſing up our ſouls, *i. e.* labouring that they be, and continue in a regenerate ſtate, and not burying them in that worſt kind of grave, the carnal affections and luſts, which is the moſt dangerous death imaginable.

S. *You are now come to the laſt Article,* The life everlaſting: *What will you afford me to that ſubject?*

Of the Life everlaſting.

C. Only this, that the life which we lead here is a finite, ſhort, feeble life, for ſome ſeventy years, if neither enemy, nor diſeaſe, nor diſtemper caſt down this brittle building ſooner; but the life that follows that Reſurrection of the Body is an infinite, everlaſting, endleſs ſtate, in endleſs joys to every true penitent believer, but in endleſs wo to every contumacious provoker.

S. *What is the practical belief of this?*

The practical belief of it.

C. To weigh and ponder theſe two ſo diſtant ſtates together, and never to think fit to forfeit that eternal bliſs, and incur that eternal wo, for any tranſitory joy, or honour, or gain, or eaſe, or relief from the Croſs, (the companion of the godly in this life) for thoſe few minutes that are allowed us here. Secondly, to uſe and improve that moment here ſo as it may be a foundation of eternity.

S. *Before you leave the Article of* Everlaſting life, *(which I ſee belongs to an eternity of bliſs on one ſide, and of woes on the other) I beſeech you ſatisfy me in one difficulty, which is ready to ſhake my faith, and it is this, How it can agree with God's juſtice and goodneſs, with any kind of equity in him, that the ſins and pleaſures of a* few years *of ours, that brings us in ſo poor a preſent income of delights and joys, ſhould be paid for ſo dear, with endleſs woes; there being no proportion indeed betwixt this ſo* finite *and that* infinite. *Some anſwers I have heard given to this doubt: as firſt, That our ſins are againſt an* infinite Deity; *and ſecondly, That if we ſhould live* infinitely, *we would ſin* infinitely. *But me-thinks theſe are but niceties, which ſatisfie not at all: I believe, I could by ordinary reaſon, and the grounds which you have given me, ſhew you how.*

The endleſs puniſhment of ſinners.

C. You

C. You shall not need, for I shall render you another account of your scruple; and first, tell you that the right understanding of it will prove a piece of Divinity, which as it is a foundation of all good practice, so may chance to stand you in stead for all your future consultations concerning your soul. The true ground of it.

S. What then is the ground of this judgment of God?

C. The choice and option that God hath given all men in his word, either to return and live, or to go on and perish everlastingly: The two kinds of Retributions, two Eternities, which are put into our hands by God, (by way of Covenant) to have our parts in one of them, which soever we shall chuse; the compact being so made between God and us, that they which are offered one, if they will not accept of those terms on which that is offered, do, for that despising, by the tenure of the same Covenant, fall into the other. *Indignation and anger and wrath to them that work evil*, that go on unreformed in any such course; but *to them who by patient continuance in well-doing seek for glory, eternal life*, Rom. 2. 7. Had there been nothing but Happiness created, and all men decreed to that blissful state, Heaven had been our fate, but not our Crown, our destiny, but not our reward; and a rational man would perhaps have been a disputing, why man should be so eternally happy, why such a short weak practice of Piety should be so hugely and so everlastingly rewarded: And so on the other side, if Hell had opened her mouth wide, and enclosed all, had all men absolutely been decreed to those fatal chains, a rational man would have been ready to tell you, That this [f] were to make men innocent, but to lay blame enough on God: and so there had been little of reason on either side. But God that hath made us rational men, hath provided rational rewards for us, a rational Tribunal and Judicature, a rational bliss and wo; not only every man repaid according to his works, (adjudged to Hell by a righteous Judge, and to Heaven by a righteous Judge also) but even allowed satisfaction to all his scruples; if he come not to bliss, he shall see it is his own wretchless contempt which hath kept him from it. *Behold*, (saith he by *Moses*) *I set before you life and death, blessing and cursing*; eternity of joys in the hand of an easy obedience, a * gracious blessed *yoke*, (which he that takes upon him cheerfully shall find *rest to his soul*, live the most admirable joyous life of felicities here, and pass from a Paradise to a Throne) and eternity of miseries to him that will fall in love with them, and to no man else. *For God made not death*, at least made it not for man, (Paradise was created for him) the *everlasting fire* was prepared *for the Devil and his Angels: but ungodly men with their words and works called it to them*, Wisd. 1. 16. committed a kind of riot upon Hell, invaded *Lucifer*'s peculiar, and, if you mark, strive more vehemently for their portion in that Lake of Brimstone, endure more temporal hardship in their passage thither, than any Martyr in his fiery chariot of ascent toward Heaven. And then, I hope, you would, if you were an Atheist, confess, That he that takes such pains for it, is worthy [h] *to take his portion* with it, to have that pay which he hath merited so dearly. The Choice given us by God to live or perish.

[f] ἡμᾶς μὲν ἀναθοὺς, τὸν δὲ θεὸν κακὸν, *Salust.* περὶ θεῶν.

* χρηστὸς ζυγός.

[h] λαχεῖν μερίδα. Wisd. 1. 16.

S. I acknowledge my scruple satisfied, and my self obliged (if it be but for the honour and awe I owe to my own soul, if but to save my reputation in the world, that I be not such an abject stupid fool) to retract my choice, to call back the hostages I have given to Satan, those pledges of my soul (whatever faculty hath at any time been sent out to him, in design or hope to bring me in some slight joy) and for the future to set out a more rational, more justifiable voyage.

C. The Lord confirm and prosper you in that resolution, and bring all other imprudent men timely into the same thoughts.

S. But may there not be place for some farther doubt and question in this matter? especially this which I shall now propound to you: How can it be truly said, That the eternity of the sinner's punishment is founded on the choice and option given him by God, when man, in his nature, as now he is, hath not liberty of choice, at least, no indifferency to good and evil, but an invincible proneness and inclination to evil.

C. You have proposed a Question of some intricacy and difficulty, yet shall I give you account of it, so far as may seem of use to you: and I shall do it by laying this Foundation, That the nature of man, created after the Image of God, I mean, his Reasonable nature, hath such an agreement and liking to all that is substantially and really good, (such are all the commands of the Natural and Christian Law) that it still canvaseth on that side, and solicites the will to embrace the good, and prefer it before the pleasurable evil; and generally thus it doth, but when some distemper or disease is upon it: Only the will, which being a free, is not always a regular and obedient faculty, that doth not always hearken to the advice and inclinations of the Reasonable nature, but (the truth is) doth very often very contrary to Reason, and so doth most frequently chuse ill; yet doth it not constantly so, but sometimes it hears Reason, and chuses good. And indeed, this very disobeying of Reason, the not hearing the dictates of the understanding, is an evidence concerning the will of man, that it is no natural or necessary, but a spontaneous, arbitrary, free agent. And it were happy, if Experience did not give us this proof of it. Of Free will.

S. But have you not let fall a passage, which being taken up, will keep this arguing of yours from concluding to your advantage? For when you said, That diseased nature *doth* chuse *that which is ill, is not that also appliable to the will; which since the fall of man is diseased, and so may desire ill, and necessarily desire it, (and be no more blameable for doing so, than the sick man for having a sickly distempered palate and appetite) though Nature,* i. e. *healthy nature, always desires good?*

C. The advantage you have laid hold on against my arguing was purposely let fall that you might lay hold on it; and therefore I shall readily acknowledge the will of man since the fall to be, as you say, diseased, and, as an effect of that disease, so strongly inclined to ill, that, unless it be by the Spirit of God drawn and converted to good, it is not imaginable that it will chuse it. To this purpose therefore it is that Christ, who came to cure the diseased, sent also the Spirit to perfect their cures: and then there is as little doubt, but that the will being by the grace of God recovered to some tolerable health, it may (being thus set at liberty) by the strength of that grace, chuse that good which the Spirit inclines it to, and to which eternal reward is promised by God on purpose to take part with the understanding, and with the vertuous object in the canvase against the sensitive,

sitive, and to fit and qualify the good to be chosen by the will, before the evil.

S. *It is reasonable which you say; but, Doth not there arise from hence another difficulty? For, if there be an eternal reward proposed by God to the vertuous liver, will not this, to him that doth believe it, become so prevalent a weight, that it must necessarily sink it down that way; and so, first, deprive the will of its liberty to the contrary evil, (and that is as contrary to the judgment to come) and secondly, make the vertuous liver uncapable of reward, who, it appears, doth all for the love of that reward, and not for the love of vertue?*

C. Your objection consists of two parts; one presses against the liberty of the will to do evil, the other against the rewardableness of the good which is chosen upon intuition of the reward. The first will be easily answered by experience: for how oft doth he that verily believeth the unchangeable truth of all the promises of the Gospel, and so that eternal reward to vertuous living, permit himself nevertheless to be seduced by worldly or carnal temptations to vicious actions, and so demonstrate that the most pretious reward of eternal bliss doth not so violently weigh down the scale for vertue, but that vice may still possibly carry against it? As for the other difficulty, though it be greater, and withal less necessary for the clearing of the point now in hand; yet because it will not be unprofitable to be considered apart, I will give you my thoughts of it, thus; To add some strength and vigour to the love of vertue, which is not always so strong in man as to incline him to undertake all the difficulties that that course of constant vertue is liable to, God thought fit to propose an eternal reward to him that should persevere in well doing, counting it necessary to do so, because sometimes life it self must be lost in the pursuit. And doing thus, it was a work of his wisdom (for the preventing the force of your present objection, and to accommodate his œconomy to the nature of man, as a rational agent) to take care so to dispose this matter, that as he offered a high reward to excite us to the love of vertue, so the desireableness of this reward might be so qualified as not to extinguish the love of vertue, and so make it unrewardable. And the way to do this, was, First, to propose such a reward as might be most desireable to vertuous minds, *viz.* a state either distinctly defined to be a state of continual beholding God, of purity, and obeying him for ever, without any temptation to the contrary; so that the desiring that reward pre-requires or includes the love of vertue, (whereas if a carnal paradise had been it, vertue might have been pursued for ends most contrary to vertue, and so have been followed unwillingly; followed, but not loved:) or else, a satisfaction to the mind of man, happiness in general, without defining the manner how, or wherein it particularly consists, save only, that it is the satisfaction of the most excellent part of us, the filling of all our rational thirsts, the gratifying of the man, and not of the beast in us: which kind of reward, as it will be foolishness to the carnal man, (never valued by those that are immersed in the world or flesh, or indeed by any that are not raised to some gust of vertue) so when it attracts such as those to begin the Christian course, and set out in the ways of vertue (as we know fear of torments, and even worldly inconveniences sometimes do) and perhaps renders them for that present (that state of beginners) acceptable, or not unacceptable, to God, supposing that when they come to know vertue, they will love and follow it for it self; yet it never stands them in stead for God's final acceptance, unless they are by him discern'd to be so qualified and inclined, as that they will love and pursue vertue it self when they come to taste of it, and proceed to practise it voluntarily and chearfully (and not only mercenarily) when opportunities are offered for it. Secondly, (as another allay to the desireableness of it) this reward was to be proposed at a distance, and not here to be enjoyed, but hereafter, and the matter of it not evidently to be known (as that twice two make four) but only proposed to and received by Faith, that so the greatness and valuableness of it being certain to attract (and nothing being to be taken off from that; because, 1. being infinite, infinite must be taken from it to make it finite, and 2. being rendred finite, it would then be unsufficient to satisfie the mind of man, which desires to be always happy, and had not that desire put in it in vain, and would lose the sense of present happiness if it should apprehend it would ever cease to be happy,) the want of perfect evidence and place of doubting might take off from that infinite greatness, and so from the force of the argument, to pursue it, and leave it so equally ballanced with arguments on both sides, that none but a vertuous person that apprehends pleasure in present vertue, and hath his love of vertue for it self, to assist the arguments on that side, would ever part with all carnal pleasures and profits (and life it self) in pursuit of it: and accordingly this is observable in the world, that as we easily believe that which we wish, and more hardly that which we have less mind to; so the lover of vertue doth easily come to believe that eternal promise of a spiritual holy life, whereas they that are lovers of pleasures, *&c.* do either not believe, or not consider it. Thirdly, this reward was to be proposed so immensly great, that no body that thought God wise, could think he would bestow it on any thing that were not extremely good; and so none but he that loved vertue, and consequently thought that that was the greatest good, should be able to believe that God would thus reward them. And so by this way of infinitely-wise œconomy, these two great provisions were made; first, that humane weakness and imbecillity should receive some relief; and secondly, that vertuous performances should be capable of reward, and the contrary of punishment. If this suffice not to answer that difficulty, I have then this farther to adde to it; 1. That God, that hath thought fit to chuse promises as an instrument to attract to vertuous living, will accept and reward him that by the use of that means is brought to that end; and therefore that there is no fear that the desiring or loving of the promises which God hath proposed to us to be desired, and is so useful to add alacrity to the pursuit of dry vertue, which oft brings sufferings along with it, and again to extend the love of vertue to every command of Gods, which other lovers of vertue might possibly confine to some few vertues, charity, liberality, *&c.* which have most taste in them, will ever rob the love and practice of vertue to which it is joined, as a means to advance and cherish it, of that reward which would belong to it, if it were not by this means thus improved: and 2. That however, he that loves vertue for its own sake, and would do so though there were never an Heaven hereafter, hath nothing to be objected against him, and yet must be acknowledged to do what he doth for the sake of the present pleasure in vertue, satisfaction of conscience, *&c.* the preferring of which before more vigorous sensitive

The use of God's proposing reward to man.

pleasures

pleasures is the vertue in him rewardable, and not the no-pleasantness of it. And consequently, there will be no more reason to prejudge the love of vertue in him that loves it for Heavens sake. The greatness of God's rewards hereafter, as the graciousness of Christ's yoke here, being both arguments of God's infinite mercy to us in rewarding that vertue to which we have from him such assistances and invitations, and which is in it self so eligible for it self; but no way Objections against his judging men according to works; wherein it is acknowledged there is infinite mercy to the vertuous, and perfect justice, and nothing of extreme severity, to any. Or lastly, if (to acknowledge the utmost imaginable) the loving vertue for the reward be less excellent, and less rewardable, than loving it for it self, yet being still good and rewardable in a lower degree, it was still fit for God to propose these promises to men, because by that means many are and will be attracted and brought in love with vertue, which would not otherwise have been attracted; and so that infinite number of Christians so attracted will recompence that defect of perfection which arises from the hope of the reward. And this withal tends much to the glory of God (which may justly be designed the end of all) which is most illustrated by this means, That men acknowledge to owe to him the all that ever they receive.

The inevidence of the Promises.

S. *I have yet one question more, occasioned by what you have said, and it is this, Why, if the Promises of that eternal reward be so made as to be unevident to men, and to leave them place of doubting, it should be so great a Crime in wicked men not to believe those Promises, or not to embrace Vertue, which their nature gives them so weak a desire to, that they want the assistance of that Belief to incite them to the pursuit of it.*

C. To this I answer, That though there is, I acknowledge, in this matter some place of doubting, as in all things that are not demonstrative there is; yet I must farther tell you what doubting I mean, only an unjust, irrational doubting, and such as no prudent man would be moved with, or think sufficient to keep him from pursuing any thing that he would otherwise pursue. For, when probable arguments are highly probable, and have no other reason to incline any to doubt of them, but only that it is possible it may be otherwise, this is the next degree to necessary, and being the highest that the matter is capable of (for there is no demonstrating in morality) any prudent man will be content to build upon it; and he that, upon no stronger grounds to the contrary, will refuse to believe, and by doing so, to pursue his own good, will be accounted extremely imprudent. Where it will be necessary to distinguish of the word *doubting:* for if by that be meant, (what truly and properly it signifies) that which is founded in an equilibration of Arguments on both sides, then I never thought or said that there was any place of doubting in this matter; for sure the Arguments to prove that Christian Religion is true, and consequently that that eternal reward that is promised to the Lover of Vertue shall be performed, are far greater than any arguments that are or can be brought against it: but the doubting which I speak of is another weaker and more imperfect sort of doubting, which may remain in a man when the Reasons on one side are acknowledged infinitely stronger than on the other, and only do not demonstrate or give evidence, or exclude all possibility (and so doubting) of the contrary. And from hence comes the sin of Unbelief: for when wicked men, having no prevailing Reason to disbelieve, do yet without any just cause (upon this one occasion, that they have not evidence for what they are required to believe, though yet they have no reason to doubt of it) not only not believe and practise what Belief would incite them to, but do act directly the contrary, even that that no prudent man that had but equal Reasons on both sides would ever venture to do; by this it appears, that their love to vice is very vigorous in them, so vigorous, as to make the Assent to the Arguments which are offered to invite us to a vertuous life, not to answer or bear proportion with, but to be much weaker than the Arguments: and that must needs be a great fault in any man, and an argument that he neither cares for Vertue, nor for the reward by God promised to it; for if he did, the infiniteness of the Promise, and the desireableness of it would make abundant recompence for the some kind of uncertainty, *i. e.* inevidence of it: it being certain, that any prudent man would take any ordinary pains, incur any remote and lighter hazard, in pursuit of any thing that were infinitely desireable, and withal but tolerably probable to be obtained. And for a knowing man to do that which is unworthy of such, and which no knowing prudent man would do, as it is an error in it self, so it is a certain evidence that some habitual vice or prevailing temptation hath been the blinding of him; and from thence doth his guilt arise, and his punishment justly follow.

S. *You have now gone over all the Articles; the Lord grant me to live accordingly.*

C. Saint *Augustine* will give you a very considerable saying to this purpose: There be, saith he, two kinds of wicked men, wicked Believers, and wicked Unbelievers. * The wicked infidel believes contrary to the Faith of Christ, the wicked Believer lives contrary to it. *And it shall be more tolerable for the men of Sodom in the day of judgment than for such.*

* *Improbus infidelis credit contra fidem, improbus fidelis vivit.*

LIB. VI.

Sect. I. *Of the word Sacrament.*

HAving thus far enlarged your trouble, I beseech you to explain the Doctrine of the Sacraments *to me, because methought at the learning of the* Church Catechism *there was no part which I could so hardly conquer with my understanding as that.*

C. I conceive it very probable, because those being Institutions of Christ, there is little in them wherein your own reason could assist you any farther than that could collect or conclude from Scriptures, wherein those Institutions are set down, first, by way of story in the Gospels, or secondly, by way of doctrinal discourse by Saint *Paul*, and other Scripture-writers. But yet let me tell you, that there is not a more excellent Breviate or Summary of that which is there scattered to be met with, than those short answers to the questions in that Catechism do afford you. If you please, I will view it over with you. The first Question, you see, is, *(How many Sacraments hath Christ ordained in his Church?]* A *Sacrament* in this place signifies a holy Rite, a sacred Ceremony used in the service of God; of which sort of Ceremonies in general there being many in the Church, (some ordained by Christ, some by the Apostles, some by the following Church of several ages, and now accordingly used among Christians, in obedience to Christ and the Apostles in what they ordained, and in imitation of the laudable Canons or practices of the Primitive or antient Church) some few there are which Christ himself when he was here on earth, did ordain and institute; and of those particularly the question is, How many there are of this nature, of this immediate institution of Christ, because those certainly which are such will deserve more reverence from us, and more care and diligence in the use of them, than any others which any inferiour authority, especially that of the after-Church, hath instituted. And to this question the answer is very exact, that there are [*only two, as generally necessary to Salvation.*] Some other sacred rites Christ did institute for some sorts or cases of particular persons, as *Imposition of hands*, *Heb.* 6. 1, &c. But of this kind, wherein all men to whom Christianity is revealed (or that expect salvation from Christ) should think themselves concerned, to which all Christians are strictly obliged, so far as not to neglect them wilfully, or to omit them when they may be had, of this kind, I say, there be only two; First, *Baptism*, *i. e.* a Ceremony of washing with water, either by going into a Brook and being dowsed over head and ears in it; or by being sprinkled with water on the face or principal part, as hath been used in these colder Countreys in stead of the former. Secondly, the *Supper of the Lord*, *i. e.* the blessing of Bread and Wine, and dividing it among those which are present, in imitation of that which Christ did after his last Supper, and by way of commemoration of that death of his, which immediately followed that Supper, and which (as a special part of his office in working our redemption) we ought frequently to recount and commemorate by way of thanksgiving to him, and present it before his Father, to whose favour we have no claim but through those sufferings.

Two only simply necessary.

S. Will you proceed to the second question [*What meanest thou by this word* Sacrament?] *which is so plain and pertinent to that place wherein it is set, that I shall not need your help, save only to open and clear the answer which is given to it.*

Of the Sacraments in general.

C. The answer is, That in this place the word *Sacrament* is set to signifie an outward visible sign, *i. e.* not only a holy rite or ceremony, as before I told you, but that a significative, not empty rite, a ceremony set to import and denote something visibly and discernibly, and that something, an *inward spiritual grace given unto us*, *i. e.* some special favour and gift of God bestowed upon us, (particularly by the death of Christ;) and this sign or significative rite ordained by Christ himself, of his immediate institution, and designed and consecrated by him to two grand ends; First, *as a means whereby we receive the same*, *i. e.* as a means of conveyance, whereby he is pleased in a peculiar manner to make over that grace or favour to us, as also by the right and due use of which we are interpreted to perform our parts, or the condition required of us to make us capable of receiving it, and so are actually made partakers of so much of the grace as at that time is useful for us (such is pardon of sin, God's reconciliation, or favourable acceptance of us, and strength to do what God requires:) And secondly, *as a pledge to assure us thereof*, *i. e.* a pawn, as it were, delivered us from God by the hand of the Minister, to give us ground of confidence and acquiescence that those graces or favours are now so made over to us by God, that we shall not fail of our part in them, instantly in that degree as they are proper to our present state, (*viz.* pardon of sins past, and acceptance of sincere performance, and also grace or strength so to perform) and hereafter in that other superiour degree, for which we must wait till another world, (such are final acquittance or pardon of sin, and a pure and happy condition in another world.) And all this in the same manner as when some promise is made for the future, and a pawn deposited till the promise be performed.

The Sacrament a means of receiving grace.

A pledge to assure us of it.

S. The next question descends from the general consideration of the nature of a Sacrament, *to a particular view of the parts of it; and first, how many such parts there be.*

The parts of a Sacrament.

C. The answer you have already learn'd, and will be able to tell your self, that as in the notion of a sign or picture (as it is such, *i. e.* as it is a mere relative thing) there are two parts, first, the resemblance, and secondly, the thing resembled, the second as it were the soul to the former, without which it is a fancy, a *chimera*, not an image or picture; so in these holy significative rites there is, first, the sign or outward visible part, and secondly, that which is signified by it, the grace or precious treasure that this image is set to represent, or which is to every intelligent man's understanding conveyed under that veil or semblance.

Sect. II. *Of Baptism.*

S. Having said so much in general of Sacraments, *and of the parts of which all such are compounded, I see the next question descends regularly to the viewing of the former affirmations, in each particular to which they belong: And beginning first with the first Sacrament*, viz. *Baptism, the question is, What is the outward part in that* visible sign *or form, i. e. I conceive, what is the thing in* Baptism *which is set to signifie some such grace of God's?*

C. Water

C. Water is clearly affirmed to be that ſign; that as among the Jews, when any Proſelyte was received in among them, and entred or initiated into their Church, they were wont to uſe waſhings, to denote their forſaking or waſhing off from them all their former profane Heathen practices (nay, as the Jewiſh Writers affirm, not onely [a] Proſelytes, but natural [b] Jews were initiated by three things, Circumciſion, Baptiſm, and Sacrificing;) [c] ſo by Chriſt's appointment, whoſoever ſhould be thus received into his family, ſhould be received with this ceremony of Water, therein to be dipt (*i. e.* according to the Primitive antient cuſtom, to be put under water) three times, or in ſtead of that, to be ſprinkled with it, with this form of words join'd to that action by the Miniſter [*I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt,*] which words being by Chriſt preſcribed to his Diſciples, muſt indiſpenſably be uſed by all in the adminiſtration of that Sacrament. And the meaning of them is double: firſt, on the Miniſters part, that what he doth, he doth not of himſelf, but in the Name or Power of, or by Commiſſion from, the bleſſed Trinity; ſecondly, and more eſpecially, in reſpect of the perſon baptized, 1. That he acknowledgeth theſe three, and by deſiring Baptiſm makes profeſſion of that acknowledgment, which is in effect the ſum of the whole Creed, which that Catechiſm excellently abbreviates by ſaying, That the chief things learnt in thoſe Articles are, firſt, to *believe in God the Father, who hath made me and all the world, i. e.* all the Creatures as well as Men. Secondly, *in God the Son, who hath redeemed me and all mankind, i. e. taſted death for every man*, bought out of that ſad thraldom of ſin and Satan as many as were dead in *Adam, i. e.* every man in the world, though neither Angels nor any other Creature beſide. Thirdly, *in God the Holy Ghoſt, who ſanctifieth me and all the elect people of God, i. e.* worketh grace effectually in the heart of all thoſe who are obedient to his call or working; for thoſe are the elect or choſen in that place of the Goſpel, where it is ſaid, That *many are called, but few choſen*, many invited by God, but few which make uſe of that mercy of his, few that are obedient to that Call. 2. That as he acknowledges theſe three, ſo he delivers himſelf up to them as to three undivided Principles or Authors of Faith or Chriſtian Religion, and acknowledges no other as ſuch, (as to be baptized in the name of *Paul*, ſignifies to ſay, *I am of Paul, i. e.* to pin my faith on him, in oppoſition to *Cephas* and all others) to receive for infallible truth whatſoever is taught by any of theſe, and nothing elſe. 3. That he devotes and delivers himſelf up to be ruled as an obedient ſervant by the directions of this great Maſter, a willing Diſciple of this bleſſed Trinity; and ſo the Greek phraſe *(into the Name)* doth import. And theſe three acts of the perſon baptized, being put together, make up his part, that by way of condition is required of him to make him capable of that grace which the Miniſter from God thus conveys upon and enſures unto him.

Baptiſm among the Jews.

[a] So the *Talmudiſts* ſay of *Jethro, Moſes* father in law, בת גיר במילה ובטבילה בשם *he was made a Proſelyte by circumciſion and immerſion.*

[b] See *Talmud.* Tract. Repudii. *The Iſraelites did not enter into Covenant but by three things,* במילה ובטבילה ובהרציות חקרבן *by Circumciſion and Baptiſm, and by propitiation of Sacrifice; and ſo the Proſelytes in like manner.*

[c] Among Chriſtians.

S. *The next queſtion proceeds regularly to the thing ſignified in Baptiſm under the name of the* inward ſpiritual grace, *which I conceive to denote that favour and ſpecial donative made over from God in that Sacrament; and that ſtiled* ſpiritual, *as belonging to the Soul of man, or his immortal* ſpirit, *and* inward, *as that which is ſignified by the* outward *ſign, in the notion wherein we ſay, There be two parts of a Picture, an inward and an outward: the man himſelf is the inward part of his picture, or that which is inviſible, the outward being the viſible form upon the Table. So that I ſuppoſe my ſelf to conceive the meaning of the Queſtion: But for the anſwer I muſt crave your aſſiſtance.*

C. The anſwer is, That the inward part of Baptiſm, ſignified by, and conferred with that outward Ceremony, is a *death unto ſin and a new birth unto righteouſneſs.* For the full underſtanding of which, I muſt ſhew you theſe three things. Firſt, what is meant by that death and new birth; ſecondly, how theſe are ſignified by Water in Baptiſm; thirdly, how Baptiſm is a means of working this in us, and a pledge of aſſuring us of it. The explaining of theſe three will be neceſſary to a clear underſtanding of this matter. For the firſt, a *death unto ſin*, ſignifies a getting out of the power, and from under the guilt and puniſhment of ſin. *The living unto ſin* is being *a ſlave of ſin, i. e.* ſubject to it both for task and blows, like the *Iſraelites* to the *Egyptian* task-maſters, being in their power to ſet them a drudging in their ſervice, and in their power to beat and oppreſs them. He that *liveth unto ſin*, or in whom *ſin reigns*, is a direct gally-ſlave to drudge under it, and over and above the miſery of that, to be tormented by it alſo; and he that is in that caſe, as long as he continues ſo, can neither by any ſtrength of his own get out of that dominion of ſin, as it ſignifies *working the works of ſin*, (ſinning continually) or as it ſignifies puniſhment due to that ſlave, whoſe very ſervice (*i. e.* his ſins) binds him over to puniſhment. In plain terms, the natural man, or every man living, conſidered without the grace of Chriſt in his natural eſtate, hath neither ſtrength to avoid ſin, nor means to eſcape puniſhment. Proportionably therefore to this, a *death unto ſin* is the getting out of theſe gallies, a being reſcued by Chriſt from this neceſſity of continuing and going on in ſin, and conſequently, a being delivered from thoſe puniſhments which are the reward of an unreformed courſe of ſin: both theſe together are ordinarily called mortification, and as they belong only to the ſins of commiſſion, they are a previous diſpoſition to that *new birth* unto righteouſneſs, (as in every mutation and new production there is a laying aſide the old form, preparatory to the receiving of a new;) but as they belong to ſins of omiſſion alſo (the mortifying of which is the doing what is commanded) ſo are they all one with that new birth.

The inward part of Baptiſm.

A death unto ſin.

S. *What then is that* new birth unto Righteouſneſs?

C. The contrary to the living to ſin; *i. e.* It is Chriſt's giving me ſtrength to walk righteouſly, and means to obtain God's favour, the begetting me to that double righteouſneſs that the young tender Chriſtian *hungers and thirſts after*, the righteouſneſs of Sanctification, to ſatisfy his hunger, (that *bread of life* to ſtrengthen his Soul) and the righteouſneſs of Juſtification, to ſet him right in the favour of God; (that vital refreſhment that the conſcience ſcorcht with the guilt of ſin ſo thirſts after.) Some difficulty there is, and poſſibility of miſtake, in that which I have now delivered, therefore you muſt weigh it diligently, and obſerve that this death and new birth is neither the reſolving to forſake ſin and live godly; for this is ſuppoſed before Baptiſm, to make the perſon capable of it, (as appears by the next queſtion and anſwer in the Catechiſm:) nor, on the other ſide, the actual forſaking of ſin, and living a new life, (*denying ungodlineſs and worldly luſts, and living ſoberly, and juſtly, and godly*, Tit. 2.) for that is the conſequent task of him that makes a right uſe of the grace

New birth unto righteouſneſs.

of Baptism for his whole life after, and both these an act of the man, wrought the one by the preventing, the other by the assisting grace of God. But this grace of Baptism is this strength of Christ, of supernatural ability to forsake sin, and live godly, and proportionably a tender of God's pardon and gracious acceptance, pardon of the forsaken sins, and acceptance of the imperfect (so it be sincere) godliness. And that this is the very intention of the Catechism in these words, and not any gloss of mine, may appear by what here follows as the reason of it; *For being by nature born in sin, and the children of wrath,* (*i. e.* born with strong inclinations and propensions, which would certainly ingage us in a course of sin, and so consequently make us worthy of wrath, as a child or son of perdition is one worthy to be destroyed) *we are thereby made children of grace, i. e.* have in Baptism that strength given us by Christ that will enable us to get out of that servile and dangerous state.

This death and birth signified by dipping.

S. *You have prevented and satisfied my scruples in this particular: I shall now call you to the second thing you promised me, and desire you to shew me how this death and birth, (or that strength to mortify and to raise up to new life, together with God's Tender of pardon and acceptance, which you have shewed me are the importance of that death to sin, and new birth to Righteousness) are signified by the* outward part in Baptism, *by the* dipping *or* sprinkling *in water,* &c.

C. The *Water* here, is set to signify the purifying Spirit of Christ, which hath that double power in it of cleansing from sin and from guilt; and the antient manner of putting the person baptized under water, and then taking him out again, was set to denote the two several acts of this grace; first, by way of dying, then, of rising again: and the antient custom of doing this thrice, signified (not only the Faith in the Trinity into which they were baptized, but peculiarly) the death of Christ, and his rising the third day; which death and resurrection together, are that *Fountain that is opened for sin and for uncleanness,* Zach. 13. 1. the original of strength to die to sin, *i. e.* of new birth, and of the pardon and acceptation proportioned to them.

Baptism the means of working this in us.

A pledge to assure us of it.

S. *I shall now want but little of your help for the third* Quære, *How Baptism is a means of working this in us, and a pledge of assuring us of it. For, if Christ have instituted that Sacrament as a means of conveying both these double graces on us, (as I have already learnt) then is the first part of my* Quære *answered; and if so, then sure will it be a pledge or pawn to ensure us of it, to give us confidence that if we be not wanting to our selves in our part of the Covenant, either by way of preparation before, (necessary to give us a capacity of this mercy) or of making use of it afterward, it shall on Christs part be infallibly bestowed on us. Having saved you this trouble, I shall take confidence to hasten you to the next stage, which is, to proceed to the next question, which comes in here very seasonably:* What is required of persons to be baptized, *to fit them for that Sacrament, and make them capable of these benefits of it?*

The qualifications required to Baptism. Repentance.

C. The answer refers all to two heads, Repentance and Faith, and defines them excellently, [*Repentance whereby they forsake sin*] to shew that it is not sufficient to denominate a Penitent, that he grieve, or confess, or slightly resolve against sin; much less that he only grieve with the apprehension of punishment, or wish that he were penitent, unless he do really, and sincerely, and actually *forsake sin.*

S. *But how can such forsaking be required before* Baptism, *when the strength of forsaking is before affirmed to be given me in* Baptism?

A double forsaking, in the heart, and in the actions.

C. This difficulty will be salved, if you observe that there is a double forsaking, one of the Heart, in a general cordial renouncing; the other of the Actions, in a particular holding out in time of temptation: The one is called God's giving us to will, the other to do: the first, I told you, was an act of God's preventing and exciting Grace; the second, of his sanctifying: And both these, when they are wrought in us by the Grace of Christ, are actual forsaking of sin (and so more than the slight resolution, which I told you was not repentance) and yet one of them is much less so than the other, and so may be looked on, and required as preparatory to it. The forsaking of the heart is here meant in this question by repentance, and the forsaking in the actions is that to which the strength is made over in Baptism.

Faith.

S. *You will now proceed to the second requisite,* Faith, *which I see there described to be that* whereby they stedfastly believe the Promises of God made to them in that Sacrament: *Have you any thing to add to that explication there given of that grace?*

C. Only this, that there is first mentioned the Promises of God; secondly, the peculiarity of them; thirdly, the act of faith, what it is, namely, believing; fourthly, the qualification of that act, stedfast believing. For the first, I have heretofore shewn you, that when Promises are the object of faith, those Promises are (as constantly the Scripture sets them down) general, but conditional Promises; general, wherein all are concerned without exception; but withal conditional, requiring or presuming some performances on our parts, without the due observance of which we have no title to the Promises. As for example, in this of *Baptism,* (which brings me to the second thing here proposed) the promises that are made to us in this Sacrament, (promises of strength and of pardon) require first a pre-disposition in the subject, a resolution of amendment, before God thus obliges himself to give this grace of sanctification or justification; and secondly, the due and diligent use of this grace when it is given: without the first this grace of Baptism is not given; without the second it is forfeited again. As for the act of Faith here called Believing, it is that which is most proper for it, when the object is Promises, as it is here (though when the object is Commands of Christ, the act must be obeying;) and by believing, we mean the relying on and depending confidently on Christ for the performance of his part, *i. e.* of the promise, in case and on condition of our not failing in ours: and the word *stedfast* added to it, argues the radication of this act of Faith in an habitual acknowledgment, that Christ will never falsify his word, or fail in giving what he promiseth. This was required in the miraculous cures, to make the patient capable of the benefit of Christ's power, to believe that he was thus able; and here it is required to make capable of those more sovereign benefits, the Spirit and Grace of Christ, and is indeed a qualification of our prayers, to which, when they are rightly qualified, the Spirit and the Pardon, which are the things promised in this Sacrament, shall be assuredly granted.

S. *All*

S. *All this which hath been said concerning the Qualifications required in the person to be baptized, (those being Graces which cannot be expected of Children which have no understanding) hath raised in me that scruple which in the next question is clearly proposed,* Why then are Infants baptized, when by reason of their tender age they cannot perform them? *i. e.* cannot repent and believe. *To which I perceive the answer accommodated is not that which I have heard some men aver (that the habits of these Graces may be in Infants, or that the faith of their Parents is accounted to them) but by making a plain acknowledgment that they do not at that time themselves perform them, it answers, that they do* perform them by their Sureties, *&c. What is the meaning of that?*

C. You will remember that I told you, that the Repentance here was an act of the heart, *i. e.* a firm Resolution of amendment; and what is that, but a kind of vow that they will do it, (and so believe also) when being fitted by age and abilities of understanding and instruction, they shall be thus enabled and strengthned by Christ? Now this Vow or Oath the Child is supposed to make at the Font, though not with its own mouth, yet by Proxies, by Sureties, who do not so much promise that he shall do so, as answer and speak in his stead, by way of Substitution representing the Infants voice, and taking upon them an Obligation for the Infant (an Act of great charity in them, to get an early interest for the child in those so precious mercies, which cannot be had without signing the Indenture back again, undertaking the condition of the Covenant) which consequently the Infant is ingaged in, and when he comes to understand, must resolve himself by vow and solemn oath to be bound to it, or else solemnly must disclaim all part in the benefits of it. In plain terms, every child that was ever baptized (and so you to whom I now speak) have the option given you, whether you will acknowledge that to be your sence which your Sureties undertook for you at the Font, (which if you do, then do you take that Obligation in your own name, and are perjured for ever after, whensoever you fail in performing any part of it, whensoever you embrace any *worldly lusts*, any *vanity of this wicked world*, &c.) or whether you will disclaim it (as they that have been married being children, have a choice after, whether it shall stand a ratifi'd marriage or no) which if you do, and will not be bound to the duty, you must know you renounce withal all right or claim in the promises of Christ, disclaim that strength that Christ was ready to have given you, and so continue an impotent wretch, not able to resist any the weakest temptation, ready to be carried headlong into all villany, to the very defaming and wasting the reasonable soul within you, to fall from one wickedness to another, and not come to any degree of righteousness, of Christian vertue, or Moral civility, and withal ready to drop into Hell, in minutely danger to be hurried thither to receive the wages of thy unrighteousness. If the conjunction of these two can be allowed to make up a formidable state, if you can either value vertue and strength, or pardon and acceptance from Heaven, you will surely be so well advised as to acknowledge those Sureties your friends, which ingaged you in so gainful an Indenture, and being now come to a sense of it, count your self under vow, and labour not to be sacrilegious as soon as you are come into the Church, to perjure your self, and rob God of a vessel bought by his blood for his Temple, to serve him there *in holiness and righteousness before him all the days of your life.*

The Infants vow by the Sureties.

S. *You have explained that Question and Answer, as they lie in the Church-Catechism, sufficiently; and so in effect have satisfied all my desires in that matter of the Sacrament of Baptism: yet, as every degree of proficiency in knowledge gives the Christian learner some farther sight of his ignorances, and whets him on to grow yet farther in knowledge; so it is with me at this time. Your last enlargement of the Answer in the Catechism, by teaching me many things, hath put me in mind of my ignorance of two things, wherein I must desire your help. I shall first propose the first to you.*

C. What is that?

S. *It is this: By what you have last said, it seems to me, that the qualifications required of the person to be baptized are all one with the vow in Baptism: Which how it can be, I do not yet distinctly conceive, but have this Objection against it, that the matter of the vow seems to be somewhat which must be (and is undertaken in some measure by the Sureties that it shall be) after performed; but the things required in the person to be baptized, seem to be such things as must be first in him, before he is fit to be baptized.*

The difference between the qualifications for Baptism, & the Vow in it.

C. Your scruple is not very weighty, yet I will answer it briefly, by putting you in mind, that Baptism may be administred either to one of full age, or to an Infant. When the person is of full age (as in case he be of some years before he come to hear of Christ, and then hear and believe on him, and desire Baptism) then are these qualifications pre-required in him before he may fitly be admitted to Baptism; and yet when they are so, their being in him is fitly expresst by him in the words of the vow: Repentance it self (which is one part of the qualification) being nothing else but a change of mind, *i. e.* a resolution or vow of forsaking all the sins of the former life, and keeping God's holy will for the future; and so Faith, not only a believing or acknowledging for the present. but also a vow of believing for the future, and confessing constantly all the Articles of the Creed for ever after, especially when storms or tempests shall come to shake that faith, or tempt to renounce that profession or any part of it. But when an Infant is baptized, who can neither believe nor repent himself, but all that he doth, doth it by proxy; then it is most clear, that that which is pre-required in one of age, and must be actually in him before he be admitted to Baptism, is not thus pre-required in the Infant, but only required in the future: for the surety doth not undertake that the child is thus qualifi'd already; but he being the substitute of the child, the child by him promises that he will thus perform hereafter. And this promise that he will, is distinctly the vow of Baptism.

S. *I acknowledge your Answer, and indeed had little other design in putting you to the trouble of it, but only that I might the less impertinently beg of you a little to insist on the words of the vow of Baptism (as they are used at the Font, and set down in the beginning of the Church-Catechism) which may have some difficulty in them, which is likely to remain unexplained (and so to miss that felicity which all other parts of the Catechism have been afforded by you) unless you comply with me in this voluntary digression, which I acknowledge to be affected by me.*

C. I

Sect. III. *Of the vow of Baptism,*

C. I must confess the vow of Baptism to be a thing of so great importance, and so immediately referring and closely tending to practice, that it were a wonder for a *Practical Catechism* to be thought compleat without it: And therefore although, as I told you, it differ little from the two qualifications, *Repentance* and *Faith*, pre-required in the person to be baptized, (which is the reason that I forgot, having spoken of them, to put you in mind of this) yet I will most willingly comply with you, and explain whatever seems difficult in that Vow.

S. I already see that the Creed and the Commandments being severally explained to me (which are the two latter branches of that vow) I can detain you no farther than while you explain the first part of it. In these words, [They, *i. e. my Sureties*, promised and vowed in my name, that I should forsake the devil and all his works, the pomps and vanities of the wicked world, and all the sinful lusts of the flesh,] *What is then meant, first, by* [The Devil and all his works?]

The Devil and all his works.

C. Certainly the principal thing here renounced is the false Gods, *i. e.* devils, which the Heathen world did worship so universally before Christ's time, and against which the Catechists (which prepared all for Baptism) did first labour to fortify their Disciples, and are for that cause called in the antient Church (and known by the title of) *Exorcists*, as those that cast out these Devils. So of the seven precepts of *Noah*, all which every Proselyte which was received or admitted to live among the Jews (and those I told you were admitted by *Baptism* or *Washing*) was bound to embrace, that is known to be the first, which is entitled * *Concerning strange worship*, i. e. their false Idol-worship, their serving those which were devils and not gods, and which endeavoured nothing more, than the taking them off from the true God. But then secondly, as he that acknowledges the true God with his tongue, doth oft deny him in his life; so they that renounce these false gods or devils, that pray not to them, nor believe them to be gods, may yet acknowledge them in their actions, *i. e.* may be supposed (as men are oft found) to live like those Idolatrous Heathens in the midst of Christianity. And therefore after this first sence of renouncing the devil, as that signifies forsaking all Idolatrous worship, you must farther add the renouncing all commerce, or consulting with him; the former being that which Witches and Sorcerers use, the latter that which they are guilty of which repair to such Witches, or receive responses from them, or directions for health or thriving, or acquiring any advantages in the world, or if it be but by way of curiosity to know (by any such black art) any future events, or the like, and all other things wherein the devil's help is called in, through not depending totally upon God: Which, as you meet with them, you will understand, by the proportion or analogy which they hold with these which I have now named to you.

* על עבודה זרה

S. The Lord preserve me from such high provocations of his jealousy, in taking any such detestable rivals of God into my heart. But what is meant by all the works of the devil, which are there annexed?

Lusts especially.

C. Answerably to the first prime notion of *forsaking the devil*, (*i. e.* the Heathen false worships) the works of the devil will primarily signify those abominable sins, first of Idol-worship, then of filthy lusts, which were commonly used in their Heathen worships, and became rites and ceremonies of them, their filthy revelling and abominable uncleannesses required and accepted by the devil or false gods there; as prayer, and fasting, and alms, and the use of the Sacraments are by the true God among us Christians. These are truly the works of the devil, [a] the secrecies and mysteries of the Heathen Religion; and the renouncing of them at the time of receiving of the true God was that which was especially signified by the circumcising of *Abraham*, and all the Jews after him, and is most strictly required of us in our Baptism, and accordingly recommended to the younger Christians, *Tit.* 2. 5, and 6. under the style of *sobriety and chastity*, and by the Primitive Bishop *Polycarp* to the *Philippians*, in these words, *That they may be unblameable in all things*, but before all, *That* [b] *they take care of chastity or purity*. Under that head must be understood all sorts of those foul sins which are not to be named (however used by any, without making them rites of the Idol-worship) whose contrariety to the Christian profession and doctrine, that *truth in Jesus*, *Ephes.* 4. 21. (which so strictly requires the contrary purity, and forbids the very looking on any, to lust, much more the uncleannesses there mentioned, *Ephes.* 4. 19.) and the great danger thereof to our souls, may be judged of by this, That most of the heavy judgments in Scripture that have fallen upon Nations, particularly the utter excision of the seven Nations, the fire and brimstone upon *Sodom* and *Gomorrha*, are expresst to have fallen upon them for that one high abomination: And the greatest reproach that ever was to Christianity, was that of the filthy Gnosticks, those Hereticks in the Primitive Church, who retained and improved this piece of Heathenism, continued those works of the devil among them; and most of the seven Churches of *Asia* in the *Revelation* were destroyed for entertaining, or not vomiting out of these. And though these solemn ways of committing these sins, making them rites of Religion, be not now to be heard of among Christians; yet if the sins themselves, or any degree of them, be still (though never so secretly) retained among men or women, or if they be not utterly detested and abomined, this is a contradiction to this first branch of our Vow of Baptism, and that which, beside the Hell-fire in another world, may be expected to bring down terrible vengeance here, and may justly be feared to be the secret provoker (oft-times) of God's heavy wrath upon a City or Land, when it comes down without any visible, discernible special provocation.

[a] τελεταὶ, ἐποπτεῖαι.

[b] φροντίζητε ἁγνείας.

S. I hope I shall be careful to remember my vow in this particular, now especially that you have shewed me that it belongs so primarily unto it. But is there nothing else contained under this stile, [*The works of the devil?*]

Pride.

C. Yes, in a secondary sence all the sins that have a special character or stamp of Satan on them, all the Luciferian prides and ambitions by prying into God's secret will, desiring to be like him in omniscience, by judging mens hearts, undertaking to be equal to him in that title of his of *Searcher of hearts*, and many the like: next, our diabolical accusing, and lying, and slandering our Brethren: next, our corrupting and tempting them, and delighting to allure or fright them into any unlawful act, and so usurping that title of Tempter that belongs to him: next, our maligning or envying, much more our killing, or destroying our Brethren. All which sins (and others, which it were too long to name) carry much of Satans image, and several of his [c] names about them, and so deserve to be called his works.

False accusing.

[c] Διάβολος, ὁ σατανᾶς, *Satanas*, or ἀχθὲς, or ἀπολλύων, *Abaddon*, or Ἀπολλύων.

S. *I*

S *I had thought that those things which the Devil tempts any one to do, had been the prime, if not only, works of his.*

C. Whensoever it is sure that the devil tempts any man to any sin, if he yield to do it, it is sure that is very properly a work of the devil. But it is so hard to discern that, or when the Devil doth thus immediately tempt any, and it is so ordinary to accuse the Devil of that which comes from our own evil inclinations and customs, (the habitual corruptions of our own hearts, which are our great and daily tempters) and it is so certain that our own hearts must have the main of the guilt, even when Satan doth tempt any, because if we resist, he shall flie from us, (and indeed our not consenting is the evacuating of his temptations, and consequently the sin is a work of our own will which so consents, and not of the temptation, which had no power to work that consent, nay, if it had been resisted, had been matter of victory and vertue to us) therefore I say, for these and other considerations, I did not think fit to name these in the front of the *Works of the devil*, being not sure that they at all belong to that rank of sins, as here they are set down by way of difference from the *pomps of the world* and *desires of the flesh*. Yet shall I not on this occasion neglect to mind you how nearly you are concerned to watch the Devil, that evil spirit, that he do not secretly inspire or infuse any evil thoughts into you: and the rather, because when he doth so, he takes all care that those suggestions may seem not to come from him (knowing that any Christian must needs be averse from hearkning to them then) but he labours to appear an angel of light, a good spirit, the very Spirit of God; and often brings it so about, that his inward whisperings having some specious disguise of Religion or zeal for God put upon them, are taken for the voice of God's Spirit within men: and among those that pretend to *Enthusiasms*, and that they are taught by the Spirit those things which the Word of God (the sure inspired voice of God's Spirit) doth not teach them (nay, which in the conceit and opinion of some of them are to be believ'd, though they seem contrary to that) it will be no wonder if Satan do so prevail as to obtrude his tentations under the disguise of dictates of God's Spirit: and that may be a reason that Saint *Paul* conjures the *Galatians*, that they anathematize that (though seeming) Angel from Heaven, that *teaches any other doctrine* for the doctrine of God, *save that which was then already received by them*; intimating that seeming good Angelical, to be indeed a Diabolical accursed spirit, that so teacheth: and Saint *John*, 1 *John* 4. 1. advises us very friendly *to try the spirits, whether they be of God or no*, signifying (as many false Teachers acted by evil spirits, so sure) many evil spirits also, to put on the outward appearance of God-like spirits, so that they are, or if we beware not, may be by us mistaken for the Spirit of God. And there is no way to secure us from such delusions, but to set up the Word of God as the only plain director of all Christian actions, to account nothing Christian, or dictate of Spirit, but what is taught me immediately from thence, judging my own spirit, or whatever suggestion within me, by that, and not judging, or forcing that to comply with, or bring him in testimony to my spirit. Which I mention because of the danger those men are in who are full of any prepossession, to believe that the Scripture favours or gives testimony to it. As he whose phancy hath been playing with any sound, thinks every thing that he hears to be tunable to that he phansies.

Temptations of the Devil.

S. *After the mention of* [*the Devil and his works*] *the next thing renounced in that Vow is expresst by these words* [*The Pomps and Vanities of the wicked world.*] *What is the meaning of that expression?*

C. The *World* signifies, either, first, the *company*; or, secondly, the *customs*; or thirdly, the *wealth*; or fourthly, *power*; or fifthly, the *glory* which is in the *world*: and [the *wicked world*] is as much of these as hath any sinfulness or contrariety to the Law of God in them, and so restrains the word [*world*] to the two former of these, the three latter being in themselves lawful blessings of God: which though they may be either sought or used unlawfully, yet are not here to be styled wicked, or such as a Christian in his Baptism is to renounce; but if he be lawfully possest of them, he may very Christianly continue the use and enjoyment of them. As for the two former, they are such as may be called wicked. For first, the Company, or popular examples and suggestions of the many, *i.e.* of the Heathen world, (in opposition to which this form of Vow was first framed) or of the greater part of the whole world, as it hath been ever before and since (as it contains the Heathen and Christian, and all others together) these, I say, are generally so contrary to the precepts which Christ prescribes to all his Disciples (that broad way so contrary to his strait gate) that they are very fit to be disclaimed and renounced at a venture, the Christian so far taking himself off from the world, from the practices of the Multitude there, as to forsake the multitude, and betake himself to the Mount, the privacy, the solitude with Christ; chusing rather to go alone in the Paths of Piety and Christian vertue to Heaven, than to have the Company and Jollity of the world to be his tentation to the sins and Hell, which are the way and end of their journey. Mean while this is not again the renouncing of the company of worldly men absolutely, but the resolving not to accompany them in their sins, and to that end fortifying our selves by Vow against yielding to their tentations, and particularly against that very powerful allurement to do evil, the Multitude, and perhaps greatness, and flourishing condition of those which practise sins before us, and which add their Perswasions to their Examples, and perhaps proceed to reproach those that will not go along with them. And the foreseeing and arming our selves against that force of those Examples, that rhetorick of those perswasions, that sharpness of those reproaches, and venturing cheerfully to forfeit our reputation and fame with evil men, (by whom to be well spoken of is the greater curse) rather than to lose the praise of God, is this first part of the Christian valour, or branch of this second part of our vow, in forsaking the wicked world. The second thing which is in this Vow to be forsaken is, as I told you, the wicked Customs of the world; and those primarily, or especially, the Heathen again, (to which the form of this Vow might more particularly relate;) it being common among them for the Laws of Nature to be by the vile customs of their dark hearts so razed out of their Souls, that many practices which right reason and humane nature among Heathens themselves (no farther illuminated than by that natural judicatory, the light of their own understandings, the unwritten law of God within them) would teach them to abandon, as sins and wounds of Conscience, have been by whole Nations at once embraced, and continued in without any check, as innocent sinless qualities; Nature and Reason

The wicked world.

The Company of the world.

The Customes of the world.

Reason it self being so early gagged and silenced by popular custom and vicious education, that many have not known it to be a sin to steal or rob, if they were so dextrous as not to be taken; others to kill and eat their aged Parents, (conceiving that by this means they gave them the most honourable burial;) others to throw themselves murtherously into the flames, to accompany their dead Princes out of the world. Many the like irrational sins through some local custom have gotten the reputation not only of sinless and lawful, but of laudable also. And these, and all that can ever offer to obtrude themselves upon us by the like means, we here renounce under this second notion of the *wicked world*. Of which sort it will not be hard to find some in every Christian Nation still, as among us that of Duelling (formerly enlarged upon) which I shall not now mention any farther than as an instance of the power of popular custom (founded in a mistake of the notion of honour or reputation) even among Christians themselves, so far as to make that pass for a laudable accomplishment in a Christian, a piece of courage, *i.e.* vertue and gallantry, which is indeed a most unchristian sin, a guiltiness both of my own and of my Brothers blood, and so not a single provocation. The like may be said of another custom (which this Nation seems to have admitted) in favour to sins of uncleanness, whereby it is become a more creditable thing among us to have been guilty of defiling and invading another mans bed (that sin of Adultery, punished with death among the Jews, by God's appointment) than to be the innocent person which hath thus been robb'd by the Adulterer; the sin it self being not thought worthy of near so much shame (nay, among ill men seldom at all mentioned without applause, and expressions of kindness) as the having been thus wronged. Which again is an evidence, how easie it would be for the most hellish provoking sin to be naturaliz'd and embraced by a Nation, if it can by the boldness and impudence of wicked men, and by the encouragement, or but impunity allow'd it by those which are in Authority, steal into a good Reputation, and so by being customary first, attain to be creditable also. The resisting of such Customs, be they never so Epidemical, the beating them down by the authority of Christ's Precepts, and bringing obedience to those into a reputation among men, at least contending and endeavouring our utmost to take away all reproach from strict, precise, conscientious Christian walking, or, (if by our endeavour that will not be compast) yet however taking care never to be carried away with that stream of sinful custom, but to approve my self and my Family, and (as far as the power of my example and my counsel can extend) to bring in and engage my acquaintance and neighbours, like *Joshua* and his house, to be the firm, constant Servants of God, in despite of, and defiance to, these most popular Tentations, are the least that can be deemed our Obligation, laid on us by this part of our Vow of Baptism.

Duelling.

Creditableness of some sins.

S. *I beseech God to sanctify this part of my Vow to me, that it may be such an hedge and mound about me, to defend me from the invasions and riots of the wicked company, and customs of the world. But what is the importance of the phrase* [Pomps and Vanities] *which are here disclaimed? Are they the costly attire and attendants, that the great men of the world so constantly use, which seem to be meant by* [Pomps?] *or are they the superfluities of all kinds, which may deserve to be stiled* [Vanities?] *If so, then methinks I shall be obliged to understand that saying of Christ, not only of the rich man, that cannot part with his riches, but also of all noble and great men, that live according to their quality in the world, that this* Vow of Baptism *is so contrary to their whole state and course, that it is impossible for them to enter into the Kingdom of God, as that signifies to become Christians.*

Pomps and Vanities.

C. I shall first, as near as I can, tell you the natural importance of these words in this place, and then satisfy your scruple or difficulty. And first, for the importance of the words here, you have oft been told, that the prime aspect of the several parts of the Vow of Baptism is in reference to the practices of the Heathen which were antiently therein renounced, as they were by Circumcision among the Jews. And in this respect the words [*Pomps* and *Vanities*] being not much distinct, but exegetical one of the other, and signifying the vain pomps or pompous vanities of the Heathen or wicked world, seem most particularly to point at those things which were used among them in their triumphs and games, and times of gallantry and jollity; for those are peculiarly called [a] Pomps, and being very vain and unprofitable (bringing no good to any but the pleasure of the eye to the beholders) were moreover very bloody and wicked. Such were those of the *Gladiators*, which did openly upon the stage combate and wound, and kill and butcher one another: which was so prophane an irreligious thing, that in the first times no Christian was permitted to be a spectator of them. So again in their cuffings and wrestlings in the *Olympick* games, in which they used instruments of lead in their hands to wound, and perhaps slaughter, one another: and these were moreover (generally) accounted [b] sacred among them, as consecrated to their gods, ordered and managed by their chief Priests, (to the appeasing their [c] good deities, as sacrifices and victims to their bad) as we may perceive 2 *Mac.* 4. 7. where *Jason* buying the Pontificate, hath with it the power of instituting and moderating their games. And so *Acts* 19. 31. the [d] *Asian* prefects there mentioned, were the Priests that had the managing of their games in that Province. By all which you perceive the reasonableness of the Christians being bound to renounce these bloody, vain and idolatrous pomps, at his Baptism, they being a solemn part of their Heathen worship, and therefore to be renounced as properly as their Idol-feasts (though they had had no other wickedness in them besides) for the false deities sake, to whose service they were ordained; but then over and above, having a great deal of bloodiness in them, and mixture of many other sins which made them most improper for a Christian to continue in, or not to profess his detestation of them. But beside these (which are the primary notation of the phrase) many other things there are which must be thought to be renounced in these words. 1. All the sinful courses that are used by men in their times of jollity and festivity, the luxury, and riot, and unlawful gaming, and all kind of excesses, which are but the copying out of the Heathen *Bacchanals* and *Saturnals*, those which are turned out of the world by Christ, and by him transformed and changed into spiritual Celebrations, blessing and praising of God, (the Fountain of those mercies) and (proportioned thereunto) Feasts of Charity, *eating our meat with gladness (rejoycing in the Lord always*, chearfully enjoying the good things which God hath given us, and expressing that joy in Psalms and Hymns and spiritual Songs) and withal *in singleness of heart*, Acts 2. 46. *i.e.* with all Bounty and Liberality

Heathen spectacles.

[a] πομπαί.

[b] πάσαις ἱεραῖς. *Anthol. l.* 1.

[c] *Ad pacanda bona numina*, saith *Labeo*.

[d] Ἀσιάρχαι.

Luxury.

Liberality to the poor, in ſtead of thoſe outward, coſtly vain pomps, which the eye of the world is moſt pleaſed with. 2. Here is renounced all the vain oſtentatious Bravery, which idle perſons of this world are ſo apt to admire and dote on. I mean not the external pomp, and ſplendor, and ſolemnities of State, which are by God and nature thought fit to be annext to the Scepter, or Supreme power, (ſuch was the glory of *David*, and of *Solomon*, 1 *Kings* 10. 5.) For theſe are not cenſured, but allowed by Chriſt, *Matth.* 11. 8. and, being very uſeful to maintain the dignity of Princes, (as that is neceſſary to the happy diſcharge of their office, (cannot but be thought lawful and commendable to be practiſed by them. But the bravery which is here abjured, is all thoſe Attires, and Behaviours, and Deckings that proceed from pride in the heart, and tend to the inflaming of luſt in beholders; or but to ſet out our ſelves glorious and admired in the eyes of men. And of this ſort (though God only be able to judge the heart, and define of any man or woman, that what they do, they do from this ſinful principle, or to that worſe end) it is yet much to be ſuſpected are all thoſe braveries that are uſed by any above what the ſoberer and graver ſort of his quality and condition do uſe; and ſuch again the frequent changing and inventing of Faſhions, the being earlieſt in every new Dreſs, or the ſingularity of Apparel, uſed on purpoſe, and on that affectation, becauſe it is ſingular: for all theſe ſeem ſo far to betray the ſinful principle, that, though it is not reaſonable for one man to judge another for every thing of this nature, yet it will be fit for all that do thus, to examine and charge it upon themſelves, and if they cannot perfectly clear themſelves from that evil principle, or worſe end, then to remember, that this is it which they renounced in their Baptiſm. And becauſe every mans heart is apt to deceive himſelf, and judge too favourably in his own cauſe; the way will therefore be in matter of this kind, rather to deny our ſelves ſome part of that lawful Liberty, than to offend in any exceſs. Where yet all this while you may obſerve, that the ſin that is ſpoken of in this kind is not ordinarily to be fetched from the particularity of the attire or faſhion, whatever it be, (there being few faſhions of Garments, uſed among civilized people, which are in themſelves ſinful) but from the Principle from which it ſprings in the heart, and the End to which it is deſigned, which often betrays it in the uſing of thoſe attires unfitly and affectedly, and when they are not uſed by grave Perſons, which after, when they come to be the general mode, have no ſuch ſignificancy in them: and are therefore by vain perſons then wont to be laid aſide, as now no longer agreeable to their deſigns or inclinations. The ſhort of it is, the Rule of Decency is that (and not the law of Nature only) which muſt give Limits to Attires; this Decency is to be taken from that which is uſual and cuſtomary among thoſe with whom we live, and is varied oft by change of times, and of the condition of age, or dignity of each perſon, (that being comely for one age, and ſex, and quality of perſons, which is not for another.) And he and ſhe that reſt contented with thoſe ways of adorning themſelves which are moſt uſual among the more ſober and grave of their Age and Quality, are not by you to be judged guilty of the breach of this Vow, though perhaps there are thoſe things in their Attire, Gold, Jewels, and the like, which might be thought to own this title of *Pomps* and *Vanities*, as thoſe words ſignifie Bravery and Superfluity. The truth is, it were to be wiſhed, that men and women of the higheſt quality would chuſe to diſtinguiſh themſelves from others, rather by that *Ornament of a meek and quiet ſpirit*, (commended to the weaker ſex by S. *Peter*, as a far more amiable ornament than that of gold filletings, *&c.*) and make ſhew of their wealth by thoſe more profitable beneficial expences, for the ſupply of the wants of others. And no doubt this would contribute more to their own ends, (if they be the aims of Chriſtians, or of men) would ſet them out more in the opinion of all wiſe or good perſons. But this being affirmed, will not conclude the uſe of any of thoſe Ornaments which are agreeable to time, and place, and callings, to be ſinful, or of the number of thoſe that are here renounced in our Baptiſm. And ſo I have with the ſame hand anſwered your Queſtion, and I ſuppoſe ſatisfied your Objection and Difficulty alſo.

Bravery.

S. *There remains now but the third and laſt branch of the matter of this Vow* [The ſinful luſts of the fleſh] *which are here diſclaimed. I pray (in a word, becauſe I meant not thus to enlarge your trouble) what is meant by them?*

C. The *fleſh* ſignifies that maſs of body which we carry about with us, that, with all the ſenſes and animal faculties, common to men and other living Creatures: [*The luſts of the fleſh*] are the deſires and affections, or appetites of that fleſh, which generally deſires and craves thoſe things which are pleaſing to it, that is, to any ſenſe, or part, or faculty of the body; and thoſe, till they are regenerate and ſpiritualized, regulated and brought to hand by the Managery of Reaſon and of the Spirit of God, are generally pleaſed with thoſe things which God forbids, or elſe are more extravagant and exceeding in their appetites than Chriſt permits. And whenſoever the fleſh thus faſtens (being allured by this pleaſant bait) on any thing forbidden by God, or deſires immoderately that which (to the moderate uſe) is not forbidden, this is then a *ſinful luſt of the fleſh*, and is here renounced by the Chriſtian in his Baptiſm, who promiſes ſo to moderate his deſires, and ſubordinate them to the will of God, that whenſoever they importune or call for any thing which is not thus regular, he *will not follow, or be led by them.* I ſhall not need to deſcend to particulars of this kind, as *the luſts of the fleſh*, commonly ſo called by way of appropriation, in order to ſins of incontinence and intemperance; *the luſts of the eye*, in order to covetouſneſs and inſatiate deſire of riches. Having named the fleſh, and the ſeveral ſenſes and faculties and appetites of that, you will be able to apply thoſe words to all particulars of this nature, and reſolve, when you are tempted and ſollicited by any thing in your ſelf to any act forbidden by Chriſt, that this then is one of theſe *ſinful deſires*, or *luſts of the fleſh*, which was in the words of your Baptiſmal-Vow abjured by you.

The ſinful luſts of the fleſh.

S. *God grant I may make uſe of your Directions, and Admonitions to this purpoſe, and have accordingly ſuch a watch over my own affections, that ſin gain no entrance by thoſe avenues into my Soul. But having received ſatisfaction fully to one of my propoſed deſires; it remains now that you will allow me the ſame patience and charity, while I propoſe my other difficulty to you, which ſeems to me really to be one, and it was ſuggeſted to me by that explication of the laſt anſwer in the Church-Catechiſm, which gave me occaſion to divert you thus long. And my ſcruple and queſtion is this, not whether it be lawful to baptize Infants,*

as being unable to understand the Baptismal Vow (for that difficulty you have already cleared to me) but whether it be necessary, or any way useful, so to do, or what authority you have from the Scripture for so doing.

Of Baptism of Infants.

The Apostolical practice therein.

C. The answering the last part of your Quære will, I conceive, take away all scruple in the former, there being no reason to doubt of the either usefulness or necessity of that which we see received into the practice of the Apostolical Church in Scripture. And therefore to give you some light in that matter, I shall not fetch my proofs only from the Analogy between Baptism and Circumcision (though that one Analogy were sufficient to satisfy the importunity of those who think Baptizing of Infants unlawful, upon this ground of their not-understanding their vow: For by that reason, it being as sure that the Jewish child of eight days old could not understand his vow, or what that wickedness was which he then renounced, it must follow, that he could as little be capable of Circumcision) nor again from the foot-steps of the Apostles practice taken notice of in some passages of story in the New Testament (as the Apostles baptizing whole households at once, and the like:) but I shall only give you a short view of one place of Scripture, which seems to me to refer to that matter, and it is that of 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. *For the unbelieving husband* [e] *hath been sanctified by the* (believing) *wife, and the unbelieving wife hath been sanctified by the* (believing) *husband; else were your children unclean, but now are they holy.* The thing there insisted on by the Apostle is his judgment, that the Christian husband or wife should not separate from the Heathen wife or husband, as long as the Heathen were content to live with the Christian. And this fourteenth verse is an argument to enforce that advice of his; Because, saith he, by this means it ordinarily comes to pass that the Christian party converts that other (for that sure is the meaning of that phrase [*hath been sanctified*] not that without being converted he shall be saved by the faith of the other) and this hope (repeated in plainer words, *Vers.* 16.) or the intuition of the possibility of that, is (as the reason of that former advice here, so) the ground, saith the Apostle, of a known practice of the Church, which he mentions in the latter end of the verse, *But now are your children holy*; *i. e.* as I conceive, the Infant children of the Christian parents, (which, were it not upon that forementioned ground of hope and presumption, that living with the Christian parents, they will be taught to know their Vow of Baptism, could not in any reason be differenced from the children of Heathens, or allowed any privilege above them) are now hereby holy, *i. e.* are now upon this ground thought fit to be baptized without any scruple, whereas the Heathen children, being to live with those Heathen parents, are not thus holy, *i. e.* are not admitted to Baptism. If this do not sufficiently appear (by this short paraphrase) to be the meaning of the phrase [*But now are your children holy*] you may then farther (besides the clear force of the context) observe the use of the word here rendred [*unclean*] in other places: as in that famous place of *Acts* 10. where *Peter* refuseth to eat any thing that is common or [f] unclean; where it seems by the sequel, that unclean men are those which are not visible members (and so must not be allowed the privileges) of the Church: For God reforming his error, bids him call nothing (*i. e.* no man) common or unclean, when God hath cleansed or sanctified (for so [g] holy and clean are all one, as [h] unclean and common) *i. e.* whom he hath reputed fit to partake of the privilege of preaching there, (in those that were of years, and so capable of that also) or of Baptism here, in those that were capable of no more. By analogy with which place and use of the word, it is most reasonable that [*Now are they holy*] should signify [*Now are your children thought fit to be partakers of the privileges of the Church*] *i. e.* (being capable of no other) of being admitted to Baptism, which the children of Heathens are not. And indeed this is the only difference between them that have thus a Christian parent, and the children of Heathens: For the children of Heathens, if they convert when they come to age, shall then be baptized, and so have that remote capacity now: and there is no imaginable present priviledge for the Christians children above others, upon which one should be said to be holy, and the other unclean, but only this, that these, while they remain children, are admitted to Baptism, the others not. And so this seems to me most naturally to infer (and the rather for the indefiniteness of the speech [*But now are your children holy*] all the children that live with the Christian parents) that it was then in that Apostles time the general practice of the Church to baptize the Christians children (when they would not the children of those parents which were both Heathen) as counting it reasonable to presume, that the Christians child should be educated in Christian knowledge, (which of the Heathen's child they cannot presume, unless he be taken out of the hand of the parents) and (to the confirming of the assurance that it shall be so) requiring besides the parents, in case they should fail or be negligent, the engagement of some other sureties and undertakers; who, as I said, are only the childrens proxies for the making the vow, (not undertaking for them, that they shall perform it, but taking it in their name) and yet in this other business (of making them know what promise they have made) are absolutely † sureties and undertakers. And by that means, the thing which the Church in baptizing of Infants presumes (and which if it be justly presum'd, there is little farther scruple of the fitness to admit them to Baptism) is secured, as well as any future uncertainty of the greatest value or weight among men is thought fit to be secured, and just in the same manner (by sureties) as those things are which are legally secured among us. By this, I conceive, it may be farther resolved (by the parity of reason) that whenever the child of any Heathen is by any Christian thus undertaken for, he may also very fitly be admitted to Baptism. What I have thus said in this matter, may yet receive some farther weight by comparing with it the custom of the Jews before Christ in their receiving and baptizing of Proselytes, (from which without question, *John* and Christ took this rite of Baptism.) For, say they, this Baptism belonged not only to those Heathens which being of years and knowledge came over to the Jewish Religion, but also to their Infant children, if their parents and the Congregation under which they were (in whose name it is that the God-fathers or sureties do the same now among us) did desire it in behalf of their children, promising to let them know and understand (when they came of age) what was required of them by their Proselytism, and (as much as in them lay) undertaking that they should not then renounce the Jewish Religion. And this is the very thing that is now practised in all parts of Christendom, and by the Text now mentioned appears, as I conceive, to have been the practice of the Apostles time, *i. e.* in that age of the first instituting of Baptism, which therefore

[e] ἡγίασται.

[f] ἀκάθαρτον.

[g] ἅγια & καθαρά.

[h] ἀκάθαρτα & κοινά.

† *Sponsores, Susceptores.*

fore may be deemed herein to have complied diſtinctly with the practice of the Jews, as it did in the Ceremony of water alſo. For it is obſervable that the Hebrew * word which ſignifies to *ſanctifie* (and ſo is directly anſwerable to the phraſe [*Now are they holy*] here) is uſed among the Jews [k] for waſhing. To this interpretation of the place I ſhall add no more, but that the notion of *holy* and *unclean* there, referring alſo to the legal uncleanneſſes or pollutions (which made the unclean to be ſeparated from the Congregation, excluded them from enjoying the privileges of the Temple till they were waſhed and ſanctified:) this is exactly proportionable alſo to the notion which I have now given you of the words; and accordingly, thoſe that are by Baptiſm admitted into the Church, made partakers of the privileges thereof, will properly be ſaid to be [l] holy, as holy is oppoſite to [m] unclean. Having thus far enlarged on this one place, (which if it were not too long, might farther be cleared by ſhewing the inconvenience of all other interpretations) I ſhall not think it neceſſary to add any more grounds of ſatisfaction to your *Quære*, laying the whole practice and cuſtom of the preſent Church (for baptizing of Infants) on the practice of the Chriſtian Church in the Apoſtles times, and the continued Canons and practice of the ſucceeding Church in all ages, which required conformity to the Apoſtolical practice, and cenſured all for Hereticks which would not yield conformity therein; which ſure is a competent teſtimony to ſecure us, that this practice or inſtitution of the Apoſtles was not by them meant (as ſome other things) to be but temporary, (the only colour which ſome have made uſe of to aboliſh ſome other eminent Apoſtolick practices or inſtitutions.) To this I might farther add (in anſwer to the former part of your *Quære*) the benefits and advantages of this practice; as that by this means the child is early admitted to be a partaker of the privileges of the Church and benefits of Chriſtianity, and moſt probably aſcertained by this means to be prepoſſeſſed by the true Chriſtian doctrine, before any Heatheniſh or Heretical principles have time to be inſtilled into him, and the like: which are ſure ſo valuable, and ſo unfit to be neglected by thoſe who have true charity to their children, (and know not whether they ſhall ever live to obtain for them admiſſion to theſe privileges, if they deſpiſe it thus when they may have it) that it cannot but ſignify either great unkindneſs in thoſe parents who, conſidering this, do yet not deſire it for their children; or great perverſeneſs and overweening opinion of their own judgments, (preferring them before the practice and doctrine of the Univerſal Church of Chriſt from the Apoſtles (incluſively) to our preſent age) if after this evidence (and the many more which might be produced in this matter) they yet hold out obſtinately againſt this light, and do not ſeek the Baptiſm of the Church for their tender children, who yet, (in charity we hope) ſhall through the mercy of God be ſecured from ſuffering any eternal evil for or through this default of their parents, of which their own age preſerves them wholly guiltleſs and unblameable.

* קדש

[k] *Joma. c. 3. ſect. 3.* where the High Prieſt's waſhing his hands and feet ten times on the day of expiation, is called the *Ten Sanctifications* עשרה קדושין

[l] ἁγια.

[m] ἀκάθαρτα.

The benefits of Infant-Baptiſm.

S. *I have enlarged your trouble too far on this firſt* Sacrament; *I ſhall demonſtrate my willingneſs to leſſen it by haſtening you to the ſecond, in theſe words* [Why was the Sacrament of the Lords Supper inſtituted?] *What courſe will you think fit to take to expound that to me at the beſt advantage?*

Sect. IV. *Of the Lord's Supper.*

C. If you will take my judgment, this muſt be the method, (which will coſt you ſome attendance.) Firſt, to ſurvey the ſtory of Chriſt's inſtitution of this Sacrament in the Goſpel. Secondly, to obſerve what is ſaid of it by way of ſtory of the Apoſtles practice, *Acts* 2.46. and 20.7. Thirdly, what S. *Paul* adds to that in his deſcribing or directing the uſe of it, 1 *Cor.* 11. 20. and by the way in a ſhort paſſage, *Chap.* 12. 13. Then fourthly, to ſuperadd the ſame Apoſtles deſcant on thoſe plain ſongs in one notable place, 1 *Cor.* 16, *&c.* Fifthly, to ſee what will certainly ariſe from theſe three together: And ſixthly, to apply them (by way of illuſtration and confirmation) to what is ſaid of this matter in the Catechiſm.

S. *Be you pleaſed then to obſerve your own geſſes, and begin with your firſt ſtage.*

C. I will. And it will not coſt you much patience. For although in three of the Goſpels the ſtory of Chriſts Inſtitution be repeated, yet is there no conſiderable variation in that variety. Some things only are obſervable as circumſtances in the ſetting down the ſtory, ſomething as eſſential and fundamental to the Inſtitution.

Chriſt's Inſtitution of it.

S. *Be pleaſed to diſpatch firſt thoſe that are* circumſtantial *and* leſs principal.

C. The firſt of them is, That *Jeſus* gave that Sacrament to all the Diſciples, even to *Judas* himſelf, as will appear by all three Goſpels. *Matth.* 26. 20. *He ſate down with the twelve*; and verſ. 25. *Judas* ſpeaks to him; and verſ. 26. *Jeſus gave it to the Diſciples*, the ſame perſons ſure that had all the while been ſpoken of, there being no mention of his going out as yet: and ver. 27. he bids, *Drink ye all of this*, not *Judas* excluded. So *Mark* 14. 20. the betrayer *dipt with him in the diſh*; and verſ. 22. *as they did eat, Jeſus bleſt and gave to them*; and Verſ. 23. *they all drank of it*. But moſt punctually, *Luke* 22. *After he had given the Bread and Wine*, verſ. 19. and 20. it follows verſ. 21. *The hand of him that betrayeth me is with me on the Table*. And that which S. *John* ſaith to this matter is nothing contrary to this, it being only a relation of his going out (when Chriſt had told *John* which it was ſhould betray him,) *Chap.* 13. 30. which was after the delivering the piece of Bread to him, and that ſure was not any part of the Paſchal Supper (which was ſaid to be ended verſ. 2.) but the *Poſt-cœnium*, in which the Sacrament was inſtituted, agreeable to *Luke* 22. 21.

Some things in that Circumſtantial. *Judas* his receiving it.

S. *From this circumſtance what inference do you make?*

C. That thoſe that are Chriſtian Profeſſors may be lawfully admitted to the Sacrament, though their hearts be full of villany. This you muſt take warily: I only ſay (from the example of Chriſt, who knew the heart of *Judas* when he admitted him) that it is lawful to admit ſuch to the Sacrament. It is true, the Chriſtian that ſo comes, eats ruine to himſelf, and ought to reform any ſuch ſin, ſincerely to renounce it, before he thus comes nigh to God in his Sacrament; and if he do not, it is ſo far from doing him good, that it proves his miſchief. Again, it is true that the Governours of the Church, when they ſee any man go on wilfully, ſcandalouſly and impenitently in any ſin, ought to inflict the cenſures of the Church upon him, to withdraw the Sacrament, and uſe other the like means to bring him to a ſenſe and ſhame of himſelf, by way of diſcipline, when they ſee it likely to do good: and in theſe two reſpects it is, that ſuch an one may be juſtly excluded from the Sacrament, by way and out of deſign of Charity to his Soul. But then after all this, if he be not under the cenſures of the Church (which takes off the neceſſity ariſing from the ſecond caſe) and if he will ſtill venture ſo

unworthily to that Table, (which lays the guilt arising from the first case peculiarly upon himself) it will not be any new act of sin, (different from either of these) any pollution to the Minister or Communicants, to communicate with him in that Sacrament. So that the only error that I would from hence admonish you to avoid, is the conceit of some, that the communicating with wicked or carnal men, is a sin in the Communicants, a being polluted by their company. It is possible indeed evil company may draw into an imitating of sin, and so pollute. But if it do not so, the very keeping company with them, even in these sacred meetings, is far from being a sin; it is only an acknowledgment that they are of that number whom Christ redeemed, (and so saith S. *Peter* are *they that are damned*, 2 *Pet.* 2. 1.) a joining with them in profession of Christianity (which sure I may do with those who are only professors) a confederating in a vow of living Christian lives (and that I may sincerely and lawfully do with them who are not sincere;) and all these are charitable and Christian acts, and withal tokens of humility, that we are not of that Pharisees humor, so to condemn and triumph over the Publican. And for this practice I conceive we have the Apostles example toward the *Corinthians*, among whom though there were *fornicators*, *incestuous*, 1 *Cor.* 5. 1. they *that went to law among Infidels*, Ch. 6. 1. *carnal persons*, Chap. 3. 3. some that behaved themselves very unchristianly at the Lord's Table, *Ch.* 11. 21. yet of all these the censure of Excommunication is sent out only against the Incestuous. From whence all that I conclude is, that the communicating with such is not unlawful in a Christian Church. Only he that comes thither, is himself concerned to see that he do it worthily, (which cannot be without leaving all his wilful sins behind him) and the Governour is concerned to exclude him by way of censure, when he thinks that an useful discipline, but is not by that oblig'd never to admit him. First, because the order Christ sets in the eighteenth of *Matthew* is not to deal so rigorously with him, till after three degrees of admonition (which cannot be done just as a man comes to the Table.) Secondly, because we must not judge others but judicially upon legal process and evidence (which cannot then probably be had neither.) Thirdly, because whosoever sees any man come to that Table, whom he knows to have been guilty of such sins, may very reasonably and by the judgment of Charity think he hath repented of those sins, and comes then with new vows of renovation; (though the truth is, if this last case be wanting, yet will not that make it unlawful to admit him, Christ knowing full well that when *Judas* received the Sacrament, he was in the full resolution of betraying his Master;) especially when (as in our Church) every man is by the exhortation before the Sacrament advised of the danger of coming unworthily, and so, if he be such, exhorted not to come to this holy Table. Christ communed with Publicans and sinners, and this was charity and humility in him, and a means by converſing with them to reform them; and so may our communicating with them be also.

Communicating with wicked men.

S. *What other less material observations have you from hence?*

C. This, that it was used by Christ in imitation of the Jews [n] custom after Supper, of distributing bread, and drinking wine about the Table, an argument of Charity and brotherliness among them. And so by instituting it after supper, *Luke* 22. 20. Christ was pleased to signify to us, that it should be a contesseration of charity among all Christians. Yet doth not this circumstance oblige us to do it at the same time after a meal, any more than the fashion of lying along binds us to the using of the same posture. The antient Christians generally ate it fasting and kneeled when they received it.

[n] *Post-cœnium.*

The Sacrament given after Supper.

S. *Is there any third observation of this kind?*

C. There is this, That Christ instituted this after a peculiar Supper, to wit, the Passover, which being a sacrifical feast (of which notion there were many among the Jews and Gentiles, it being common to both those to annex to their sacrifices to God, a feeding with mirth and festivity upon some parts of the sacrifice) and peculiarly commemorative of God's mercy of deliverance to the Israelites out of *Egypt*, and so very fit to signify the Crucifixion of Christ, that Lamb slain by the Jews, and fed on by us with bitter herbs, a mixture of sowrness in this world (whereupon Christ is called our *Passover* or *Paschal Lamb slain for us.*) This Sacrament (which was after the commemorative Passover) is to be conceived a confederation of all Christians one with another, to live piously and charitably, both by commemorating the death of Christ, (who was so good to us, and must expect some return from us, and indeed died for us on purpose that *he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works*) and by making his blood (as it was the fashion in the Eastern Nations) a ceremony of this Covenant, mutual betwixt God and us.

The Sacrament a Federal rite.

S. *Is there yet any fourth observation under this head?*

C. Yes, That Christ's pleasure was, that all that were present should partake of both Elements in the Sacrament, the Wine as well as Bread; as may appear by the plain words, *Drink ye all of this*, *Matth.* 26. 27. and *Mark* 14. 23. *They all drank of it.* And if it should be objected that the [*All*] there, were disciples, and so, that no others have that full priviledge to drink of the Cup, the answer is clear, First, That by this argument the Bread might as well be taken away from all but Disciples too, and so the Laity would have no right to any part of this Sacrament. Secondly, that the practice and writings of the Antient Church, which is the best way to explicate any such difficulty in Scripture, is a clear testimony and proof that both the Bread and the Wine belong to all the people, in the name of his Disciples at that time.

All to partake of both Elements.

S. *But why may it not be said, that Lay-men may baptize also, and do those other things for which Christ gave power to his Disciples, as well as this Bread and Wine, divided among the Disciples, should belong to them?*

C. The answer is given already, That the Apostolical practice, and the universal consent of the Antient Primitive Church, have defined the one, and defined against the other, and that ought to satisfie any sober man's scruples; it being no way probable that Christ's Institution would be presently frustrated and corrupted by his own Apostles, or their practice so falsified by the Universal Agreement of all that lived next after them, especially there being no Universal Council wherein it were possible for them all uniformly to agree on such an opposition.

S. *Is*

S. *Is there any fifth obſervation of this kind?*

C. Yes, the manner of Chriſt's inſtituting this Supper, by way of bleſſing or praiſing God, or giving thanks over it, from whence it is called the *Euchariſt*. The manner, by way of bleſſing.

S. *What doth this import to us?*

C. The offering up ſomewhat unto God in imitation of the firſt-fruits under the Law. To which purpoſe you may pleaſe to obſerve the manner of the Sacrament in the firſt Apoſtolical and Antient Church. The Chriſtians, all that were preſent, brought ſome of the good fruits of the earth along with them, and offered them at God's Altar or Table, and the ° *Prefect* or Biſhop, or, if he were not there, the Presbyter, receiving them as an *Abel*'s offering, bleſſed God for all his mercies, the fruits of the ſeaſon; but above all for the death of Chriſt ſignified by and commemorated in the breaking of the Bread and pouring out of the Wine: and all the people ſaying *Amen*, the Officer or Attendant, called the Deacon, delivered portions of theſe, to wit, Bread and Wine, to all that were preſent. Then was there a Common Table ſpread for all rich and poor promiſcuouſly, who ate together one common feaſt, and what was left was reſerved by the Prefect for thoſe that ſhould be in want, ſtrangers, orphans, widows, *&c.* And ſo this was a *feaſt of Charity* in S. *Jude*'s Epiſtle, verſ. 12. Proportionably to this it is, that every one that comes to the Sacrament ſhould bring ſomething with him, *not appear empty before the Lord, or ſerve him of that which coſt him nothing*, but always bring ſomewhat to the Treaſury of the Church, for the uſe of the *Prefect* and Presbyters, in caſe they were not otherwiſe ſufficiently provided for, (and then they were called Oblations, and the place where they were put, the *Sacrarium*) but in caſe they were, then for the uſe and ſuſtenance of all that are in want. And that this ought not to be neglected by any man of ſubſtance, eſpecially by any Congregation, was the main thing I meant to deduce from this circumſtance. The Offertory.

° προεστὼς *Juſt. Mart.* Apol. 2.

S. *Is there yet any more behind?*

C. Yes, to enquire what is the full importance of thoſe words, added in S. *Luke*, Chap. 22. 19. and repeated by S. *Paul*, 1 *Cor.* 11. 24. though not mentioned in the other Goſpels [*Do this in remembrance of me.*] Do this in remembrance of me.

S. *What is the full importance of them?*

C. It is, firſt, a Commiſſion given to his Apoſtles to continue this Ceremony (now uſed by him) as an holy Ceremony or Sacrament in the Church for ever. Secondly, a Direction, that (for the manner of obſerving it) they ſhould do to other Chriſtians as he had now done to them, *i. e. take, bleſs, break* this *Bread*, *take* and *bleſs* this *Cup*, and then give and diſtribute it to others, (ſetling this on them as part of their office, a branch of that power left them by him, and by them communicable to whom they ſhould think fit after them.) Thirdly, a ſpecifying of the end to which this was deſigned, a commemoration of the death of Chriſt, a repreſenting his Paſſion to God, and a coming before him in his Name, firſt, to offer our Sacrifices of ſupplications and praiſes, in the name of the crucified Jeſus (as of old, both among Jews and Heathens, all their Sacrifices were Rites in and by which they ſupplicated God. See 1 *Sam.* 13. 12.) and ſecondly, to commemorate that his daily continual Sacrifice, or Interceſſion for us at the right hand of his Father now in Heaven.

S. *To whom then doth this office now belong in the Church ever ſince the Apoſtles time? On what ſort of men was it ſettled by them?*

C. All that the Scripture reveals to us of this matter is, Chriſts beſtowing or ſettling it on the Apoſtles; whom thereby (and by the coming of the Holy Ghoſt after upon them) we may ſuppoſe inveſted with power, as for the planting a Church, which was to endure after the time of their life to the end of the world, ſo for the appoining and ordaining ſucceſſors to themſelves to preſide and officiate in that Church, and particularly to adminiſter this Sacrament to the people by way of office, to do as Chriſt here did. But who they were, or what ſort of men, on whom the Apoſtles did actually beſtow this power of adminiſtring this Sacrament, this you muſt be content to receive, not from expreſs words of Scripture, but from the Antient Records and Writings of the Church, which begin where the Scripture ends, and are the only way imaginable to inform us of ſuch matters of fact as theſe.

S. *For paſſages of ſtory after the Scripture-times, it were unreaſonable for me to expect evidence from Scripture, or any other than ſuch as you now mention, the writings of the Fathers of the Primitive Church: with their relations I ſhall willingly reſt ſatisfied in this matter. I beſeech you therefore, what is the ſum of what you find in them to this purpoſe?*

C. That the Apoſtles ſettled in the Church (beſides the Biſhops, who were to ſucceed them in the power of ruling, and Cenſures, in the power of Ordination, *&c.*) others of an inferiour order, called, within a while, by the diſcriminative title of Presbyters, who in the abſence of the Biſhop, or when licenſed by him, and not otherwiſe, had this power to bleſs the Bread and Wine, and to deliver it, either by their own hands, or the hands of the Deacon (which was an Order founded, *Acts* 6. but inferior to them) to all Chriſtian Communicants. And ſo this branch of the Apoſtles power and office, with ſome others (not now pertinent to be inſiſted on) may be reſolved (in this forementioned ſubordination to the Biſhop) to be enſtated on Presbyters, and conſequently, that the Presbyters in the Church are thus far the ſucceſſors of the Apoſtles; to whom this commiſſion thus belongs, and with it the duty of adminiſtring this Sacrament to the people committed to their charges, frequently and at fit ſeaſons, and of inſtructing, exciting, and preparing them for a worthy receiving of it. And this is all that I think needful to trouble you with on this ſubject. To whom the adminiſtring this Sacrament belongeth.

S. *I thank you for this; and ſhall now ſuppoſe that you have paſt through all the firſt ſort of obſervations, thoſe that are more circumſtantial. What now is that which is the more ſubſtantial difficulty to be explained in thoſe Goſpels?*

C. It is to reſolve what is the meaning of Chriſt's words of Inſtitution, *This is my body*, &c.

S. *And what is that?*

C. Not

The meaning of *This is my Body.*

C. Not that the Bread was his Body, and the Wine his Blood, in ſtrict ſpeaking; for he was then in his Body when he ſo ſpake; and when the Diſciples diſtributed it among themſelves, he was not bodily in every of their mouths. And now his Body is in Heaven, and there to be contained till the day of *reſtitution of all things*, and is not corporally brought down in every Sacrament, either to be joined locally with the Elements, or for the Elements to be changed into it: many contradictions and Barbariſms would be conſequent to ſuch an interpretation. Every loaf of conſecrated bread would be the Body of Chriſt, and ſo the ſame thing be two cubits long, and not two cubits long; and many the like contradictory propoſitions would be all true; which it is generally reſolved to be impoſſible even for God, becauſe it would make him a liar, and be an argument not of power, but imperfection. So again, every Communicant muſt carnally eat mans fleſh and blood, which is ſo ſavage a thing, that S. *Auſtine* ſaith, That whenſoever words of Scripture ſeem to ſound that way, they muſt otherwiſe be interpreted.

S. *What ſence then may, or muſt be put upon them?*

C. In anſwering this Queſtion, I ſhall firſt give you an obſervation taken from the Jewiſh Phraſes and cuſtoms uſed in this matter; and it is this, That the Lamb that was dreſt in the Paſchal Supper, and ſet upon the Table, was wont to be called The * Body of the Paſsover, or the † Body of the Paſchal Lamb; and that Chriſt ſeems to allude to this phraſe, when he ſaith, *This is my Body*; as if he ſhould ſay, The Paſchal Lamb, and the Body of it, *(i. e.* the preſentation of that on the Table in the Jewiſh feaſt) the memorial of deliverance out of *Egypt*, and type of my delivering my ſelf to die for you, I will now have abrogated, and by this Bread which I now deliver to you, I give or exhibit to you this other Paſsover, my own ſelf, who am to be ſacrificed (my Body which ſhall preſently be delivered to death) for you, that you may hereafter (in ſtead of that other) retain and continue to poſterity a memorial and ſymbol of me. This for the words [*my Body:*] but then for the whole phraſe, or form of ſpeech, [*This is my body*] it ſeems to be anſwerable to (and ſubſtituted in ſtead of) the Paſchal form [* *This is the bread of affliction, which our fathers ate in Egypt*, or, *This is the unleavened bread*, &c. or, *This is the Paſsover*] not that it is that very identical bread which they then ate, but that it is the celebration of that anniverſary feaſt which was then inſtituted, as when in ordinary ſpeech we ſay on *Good-friday*, and *Eaſter-day*, This day Chriſt died, and this day Chriſt roſe, when we know that it was ſo many hundred years ſince he died or roſe; which example is adapted to this point in hand by S. *Auguſtine* in his Epiſtles. Thus much for the phraſe or form of ſpeech; now for the ſence or full importance of the words, [*This is my Body*] I ſhall by the authority of the Antient Fathers think my ſelf obliged to acknowledge, that the higheſt ſence that will not be ſubject to thoſe intolerable inconveniences mentioned in the anſwer to your laſt queſtion may poſſibly be the ſence of them; and that that which moſt belongs to other places of Scripture, ſpeaking of the ſame matter, muſt in any reaſon be reſolved to be the ſence of them. For the former of theſe, it is certain that many of the Ancient Fathers of the Church conceived very high things of this Sacrament, acknowledged the P Bread and Wine to be changed, and to become other than they were; but not ſo as to be tranſubſtantiate into the Body and Blood of Chriſt, to depart from their own Subſtance, or Figure, or Form, or to ceaſe to be Bread and Wine by that change: And that the faithful do receive the Body and Blood of Chriſt in the Sacrament (which implies not any corporal preſence of Chriſt on the Table, or in the Elements, but God's communicating the crucified Saviour (who is in Heaven bodily, and no where elſe) to us ſinners on the Earth) but this myſtically and after an ineffable manner. And generally they make it a Myſtery, but deſcend not to the revealing of the manner of it, leaving it as a matter of Faith, but not of Senſe, to be believed, but not groſly phanſied or deſcribed. I ſhall leave theſe then, and apply my ſelf to the latter ſort, the other places of Scripture which ſpeak of this matter, reſolving that that muſt be the meaning of the words of Chriſt [*This is my Body*] which by examination ſhall appear to be moſt agreeable to thoſe other places. And of this ſort of places, you may firſt take the paſſages in the Goſpels themſelves, *Luke* 22. 20. where Chriſt ſaith of the Cup (not the Wine, but the Cup, which refers to the action, the pouring out and drinking) that it is a new Covenant in his blood which was ſhed for us: which it ſeems is all one in ſence with that other, *Mark* 14. 24. *This is my Blood of the new Covenant which is ſhed for many*; and in *Matthew*, *This is my Blood, that of the new Covenant*, &c. Which being put together as parallels to interpret one the other, will conclude that Chriſt's Blood was truly ſhed for our benefit, particularly to ſeal a new Covenant betwixt God and us, and that this Sacrament was the exhibiting that Covenant to us: as when God ſaith to *Abraham*, Gen. 17. 10. *This is the Covenant that I will make with you, every male among you ſhall be circumciſed*; this Circumciſion is in effect called the Covenant (as here the Cup is the Covenant) *i. e.* not only the ſign of the Covenant, but a ſeal of it, and an exhibition of it, a real receiving me into Covenant, and making me partaker of the benefits of it. And this you ſhall more fully ſee, if you proceed to the places in S. *Paul*, eſpecially that 1 *Cor.* 10. 16. But firſt we muſt deſcend to the next part of our method propoſed, that is, to obſerve what is ſaid of this Sacrament by way of ſtory of the Apoſtles practice, *Acts* 2. 46. and 20. 7.

S. *What is that?*

C. In the ſecond of the *Acts* this is all that is ſaid of it, that *continuing daily with one accord* (in unanimous Prayer) *in the Temple, and breaking Bread in* q *ſome houſe* or *room*, (as the upper room, *Acts* 1. 13. aſſigned and ſeparated from all other to that particular uſe, to be the place of Chriſtian Aſſembly, it being by the Jews permitted them to pray in the r Temple, but not to break Bread, or adminiſter the Sacrament there) *they did eat their meat with gladneſs, and ſingleneſs*, or s liberality, *of heart, praiſing God, and* t *having* (or exerciſing) *charity toward all the people.*

* ניצי שיל פסח † ניצי שיל כבש הפסח
So *Talmud. de Paſch. c. ult.* So *Rab. Moſ. Maimon. in Hilchos Chamets umatzah, c. 8. ſect. 1. & ſect 7.* So in *Mekilta, fol. 4. col. 1.* האלחמא דעניא

P Τὰ σύμβολα τοῦ σώματος καὶ τοῦ αἵματος μετὰ τὴν ἁγιαστικὴν ἐπίκλησιν μεταβάλλεται καὶ ἕτερα γίνεται, ἀλλ' ἐκ οἰκείας ἐξίσταται φύσεως. μένει γὰρ ὅπερ ἦν πρότερον οὐσίας καὶ τοῦ σχήματος καὶ τῆς ὄψεως, καὶ ὁρατὰ δεῖται καὶ ἁπτὰ, οἷα καὶ πρότερον ἦν. *Theodoret. Dial.* 2 And for the Readers eaſe, he may ſee many other Teſtimonies of this nature, and the uſe of the words, μεταποίησις, μετακοσμῆσις, μεταῤῥύθμισις, μετάληψις, μετασκευάσις (but never μετουσίωσις) collected by the late Biſhop of *Norwich* in his Θεανθρώπ. *Orig. Eccl. Tom. pr. part. poſt. p.* 247, &c.

q κατ' οἶκον.

r ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ.

s ἀφελότης being all one with ἁπλότης, of which we ſpake on Matth. 6. 23.

t ἔχοντες χάριν πρὸς ὅλον τὸν λαὸν, where χάρις ſignifies *Charity* more than once; 2 *Cor.* 8. and in a place fully parallel to this, *Acts* 4. 33. χάρις τε μεγάλη ἦν ἐπὶ πάντας αὐτούς, great grace was upon them all, which by the antecedents, ver. 32. (*Having all things common*) and conſequents, ver. 34, 35. [*No man wanted*, &c.] appears to belong to that matter; and therefore the Syriack renders it טוביהא דבת *i. e. Bonitas, benignitas, beneficentia multa*, though *Fabricius* rather following the Greek, render it, *gratia magna*. And ἔχειν is to *uſe* or *exerciſe*, as [*to him that hath ſhall be given*] and [*let us have grace*] *Heb.* 12. 28. And therefore the Syriack renders it יתבין גרחמיא *dabant in eleemoſyna vel in miſericordia, coram uniuerſo populo*; not as *Gu. Fabricius* renders it *(quum iniſſent gratiam)* for יהב is *dedit* clearly, and רחמא *miſericordia, gratia, eleemoſyna*, that which we ordinarily render כרלדאכא *bowels of mercy.*

S. *What*

S. *What do you obſerve from this place?*

C. Firſt, the frequency of the Apoſtles receiving the Sacrament, (at that time immediately after Chriſt's Aſcenſion, and the Deſcent of the Spirit) for ought a man can gheſs by the Text, every day, at leaſt every firſt day of the week, at their meeting together. Which although it be acknowledged (as will appear by what you ſhall ſee anon) not to be ſtrictly obligatory to us for the like frequency, yet will much reproach and upbraid our infrequency and negligence in this duty now adays, eſpecially our forſaking ſuch Aſſemblies, going out of the Church oft-times when that Feaſt is prepared, and ready for us, if we did not contemptuouſly depart from it. Frequency of the Apoſtles receiving.

S. *What more do you learn from hence?*

C. Two ſpecial acceſſories uſed by them, and (as we have reaſon to reſolve) required of us, to make up this ſolemnity.

S. *What be they?*

C. Firſt, Godly or Chriſtian joy and chearfulneſs in bleſſing and praiſing God for all his benefits, but eſpecially that gracious gift of his Son Chriſt. This is ſet down in two phraſes. Firſt, *Receiving food with* * *gladneſs of heart*, Verſ. 46. And the words ſignify firſt a cordial joy and chearfulneſs, then an exceſſive degree and expreſſion of it. Secondly, [x] *Praiſing God*, ver. 47. or ſinging praiſes to him with lofty and even Poetical expreſſions. Chriſtian joy.

* ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει καρδίας.

[x] αἰνοῦντες θεόν.

S. *What is the ſecond thing?*

C. The Communicants liberality and charity to thoſe Brethren that are in want. This is expreſſed alſo by two phraſes in the Greek, neither of them fitly rendred in our Engliſh. Firſt, [y] With liberality or frankneſs of heart, a chearful, bounteous, cordial giving. Secondly, [z] Having charity to all the people; by the word which I render [*charity*] intimating that offertory here and in other places, eſpecially 2 *Cor.* 8. which was then and ever ſince uſed conſtantly in the Church of Chriſt at the receiving of that Sacrament: and by the phraſe [*all the people*] ſignifying, firſt, the liberality of thoſe offerings, ſuch as would ſuffice to that end; ſecondly, the impartiality of diſtribution, as in a common table all partaking of what was thus offered, the poor as well as the rich, as you ſhall ſee anon more at large. Liberality.

[y] ἐν ἁπλότητι καρδίας.

[z] ἔχοντες χάριν πρὸς ὅλον τὸν λαόν.

S. *Will you now proceed to that other place*, Acts 20. 7?

C. I will, and that will add but little to what this laſt place hath yielded. The words are theſe, *And on the firſt day of the week, when the Diſciples came together to break bread*, &c. *and there were many lights in the upper Chamber, where they were gathered together*, &c.

S. *What do you gather from hence?*

C. Only this; Firſt, That the Celebration of this Sacrament is called in the Scripture phraſe *Breaking of Bread*, as before it was, *Acts* 2. Secondly, that the Lord's day or firſt day of the week was the time ſo early ſet part to this and ſuch holy duties, and that that is the reaſon that S. *Paul*, 1 *Cor.* 16. 2. gives the exhortation, That on the *firſt day of the week every man ſhould lay aſide his proportional liberality*, for the uſe of the poor; Thirdly, That the upper room again was the place of thoſe Chriſtian Aſſemblies: Fourthly, that it is uncertain whether *Acts* 2. they received daily or no, it being poſſible that the word [*daily*] there, may belong only to their going to the Temple; or however, that here that frequency doth not appear to be continued, but only every Lord's day once a week, and that ſtill will be a reproach to our ſlackneſs. It is now time to advance from theſe more caſual mentions of this matter to thoſe other more ſolemn Texts, and in the next place according to our method, to obſerve what S. *Paul* adds to the ſtory of the Inſtitution in the Goſpel, in his deſcribing or directing the uſe of it, 1 *Cor.* 11. 20, *&c.* Breaking of Bread.

S. *Pleaſe you to do ſo?*

C. I ſhall, and to that end briefly give you a paraphraſe of the whole place. Verſ. 20. *When you after this inordinate manner* (mentioned Verſ. 18, 19.) *meet together, this is not to do as becomes Chriſtians, when they eat the Lord's ſupper* (or, as the Syriack reads, *when they eat and drink on the Lord's day.*) Verſ. 21. *But as if you were at your own meals, every man of you eateth that which he brought with him; ſo that one eats and drinks more than is fit for him*, (*viz.* the Rich that brought more with him) *and another* (Poor man that could bring but a little) *is well-nigh famiſhed.* Verſ. 22. *If this be it you will do, you ſhould keep at home, and eat by your ſelves: and to come to the Congregation and do this, is the deſpiſing and ſcorning the Church of God*, (where all that is brought is to furniſh a common Table) *and withal a ſhaming thoſe poor men that* (could bring but little, and) *are out of countenance to have done ſo, when you* (rich miſers that are by them) *have ſuch plenty. What? do you expect to be born with, and not reprehended for this? You are miſtaken, this is a fault in you*, (to which purpoſe I will tell you the manner of Chriſt's Inſtitution of the Sacrament, to which thoſe Chriſtian feaſts were annext) Verſ. 23. *The Lord delivered down this courſe to me which I deliver to you*, viz. *That the Lord Jeſus in the night that he was to be delivered up to the Jews, took Bread, and giving thanks over it, brake it, and ſaid, Take, and eat, This* (not *this Bread*, for if that ſhould be the Antecedent, the Greek word is of a Gender that in ſtrictneſs will not bear it, both here and in the Goſpels; but either indefinitely *This*, or with reſpect to the immediate antecedent, *this taking and eating*) *is my Body which ſhall be delivered* (or, as the Syriack, *is broken*) *for you: do this* (or, as the Syriack, *do thus*) *in commemoration of me.* Where I conceive the literal notation of the words will bear this obſervation, That as the word [a *This*] in the latter words ſignifies not the Bread, but the whole action or adminiſtration, [*Do this*] *i. e.* do you all that I have done in your preſence, take Bread, break, bleſs it, give it to others, and ſo commemorate me: ſo the ſame word [b *This*] in the former ſpeech [*This is my Body*] may ſignifie the whole action too, *viz.* that the breaking and diſtributing, taking and eating this Bread, is the body of Chriſt: (in what ſence you ſhall ſee anon) like as, when *Matth.* 13. 19. the words literally run thus, [*When any one heareth*, &c. *This it is which is ſowed by the path-ſide*] they muſt be thus neceſſarily explained, Any mans hearing, and not conſidering the Word, and the *Devil's coming*, &c. is the meaning of that which is ſowed by the *path-ſide*; or yet more plainly, like as verſ. 20. [*That which was ſown upon the ſtony parts of the field, this is he that heareth the word*, &c.] where it is clear, the *ſeed* is not anſwerable to the *man*, but to the *word*, and

[a] τοῦτο.

[b] τοῦτο.

and that *ground* to the *man*. But the Seed as it was ſown on the ground, all together, *This is he* (*i. e.* this ſignifies him) *that hears the word, and receives it with joy*, &c. After this it follows, Verſ. 25. *So likewiſe he took the cup*, having ſupp'd before, (and ſo he did it for ſome peculiar intent, not to ſatisfy thirſt) *and gave it them to drink, ſaying, This cup is a new Covenant made with you, and ſealed in my blood*, and as oft as you thus drink together in time of holy Aſſembly, give it to others alſo, as I have done to you, and do it in commemoration of me. Verſ. 26. *For as oft as you ſhall eat this Bread, and drink this Cup*, (ſaith S. *Paul* by way of concluſion from the premiſſes, for the Syriack ſetting it, ſuffers it not to be part of Chriſt's ſpeech) *you do* one to another *annunciate* or *proclaim the death of our Lord, till he come* again to judge us. Verſ. 27. *And therefore whoſoever doth eat of this Bread, or drink of this Cup unworthily*, (either not performing the condition required in the Covenant, of which that is the Seal; or breaking the Inſtitution of it in any principal part, particularly in that of the Charity and Liberality here mentioned to thoſe *Corinthians*) he is ſo far from being benefited by that Sacrament, or that death of Chriſt, that he is rather to be looked on as a man that by this unworthy action had wounded the Lord, contributed farther to the crucifying of him. Verſ. 28. *And therefore let a man examine* and *ſhrive himſelf*, and ſee that he come worthily to the Sacrament, both by laying off all his former hainous ſins, and behaving himſelf in that action Chriſtianly, quite otherwiſe than thoſe *Corinthians*, it ſeems, had done. Verſ. 19. *For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily* (being unworthy by his impenitent ſins to approach to ſo ſacred an Action, or behaving himſelf ſo unchriſtianly there) by thus eating and drinking engageth himſelf to *damnation, not conſidering* the death of Chriſt, which this was to commemorate, and the end thereof, that he ſhould die unto ſin, and give himſelf up to new life. Verſe 30. The not performing of which is oft puniſhed even in this life, by ſickneſs, diſeaſes, and even exciſion or death it ſelf. Verſe 31. Which are puniſhments of God to bring them to a ſenſe and reformation that nothing elſe will work on. Ver. 32. And ſure, ſuch kinds of puniſhments are in God acts of chaſtiſement, and ſo of mercy, to mend, that he may not condemn; to give us our puniſhment here, that it may not be behind an arrear to be paid hereafter. Verſ. 33. Therefore for the fault which you were firſt told of, that of eating before others, even before they come, engroſſing to your ſelves and deſpiſing others, I beſeech you let that be mended in theſe publick Aſſemblies. Verſ. 34. And for private meals, or eating by your ſelves, let it be at home, for to take them in the Church is a damning ſin. And for other directions, I will give you them when I come among you.

S. *What do you chiefly obſerve to me from this place for my farther inſtruction?*

C. The punctual confirmation of almoſt every particular before collected from the Goſpel: which although it be no new thing, becauſe it was there delivered, yet in effect teaches us ſomewhat, *viz.* this, that thoſe other doctrines that according to ſeveral mens phanſies are delivered concerning this Sacrament, having no ground in either of theſe Texts, have not authority from Chriſt, nor yet from S. *Paul*, (unleſs the other place which is behind will afford them) which what they are, I ſhall no farther tell you than thus negatively; it being my purpoſe only to teach you the poſitive truth to direct your life, not the contrary errors that may ſatisfie your curioſity, or provoke your diſpleaſure againſt any. There is alſo here a great weight laid on a worthy receiving of that Sacrament, and to that end, ſpecial care muſt be taken that we examine our ſelves, come not to that ſpiritual preſence or viſion, as it were, of God, to the renewing of his Covenant with us, with any impurity about us; and as a pawn or pledge of our leaving all other ſins, we muſt ſignifie and expreſs our charity and liberality, and not be guilty of any of thoſe earthly ſins of pride and covetouſneſs, but condeſcend to a common partaking of ſome part of God's mercies with our Brethren.

S. *You told me there was another paſſage by the way*, Chap. 12. 13. *looking this way, what is it?*

C. This only, That we have been all made to drink into one Spirit: which by ſome of the Greek Antients hath been thought to refer to the Cup in this Sacrament, (though the truth is, it may ſignify no more than being *watered*, or *irrigation*, a conſequent diſtinct from the planting in Baptiſm that went before, in that ſence as it is ſaid that *Paul plants and Apollos waters*, 1 *Cor.* 3. 6. where the ſame word is uſed.) And then the plain meaning of it ſeems by the context to be no more than this, That as by Baptiſm we are all entred and incorporate into that one Body, of which Chriſt is head; ſo by the other Sacrament, whatever our particular condition in the Church be, we are received into a participation of that one ſpirit, which furniſhes every order and ſort of men with gifts convenient for their miniſtration; and ſo this Sacrament is an obligation to charity and humility toward one another, neither oppoſing nor contemning one another, as follows in that chapter.

S. *Will you now proceed to the fourth part of your propoſed method, and ſee what is to be found to this purpoſe in that ſpecial place*, 1 Cor. 10. 16?

C. I ſhall, and for a right underſtanding of it, and collecting that which the context was meant to afford us, you muſt mark that the practice of the Iſraelites firſt in their ſacrifices, and then of the Heathens in theirs, are there brought to convince the truth of what is there ſaid of this Chriſtian Sacrament; and therefore it will be uſeful to obſerve firſt, what it is that is there ſaid of the Iſraelites, then of the Gentiles, and then to apply or bring it home to this buſineſs.

S. *What then is it that is ſaid of the Iſraelites?*

The Iſraelites ſacrificial Feaſts.

C. It is this obſervation concerning their ſacrifical feaſts, *ver.* 18. that they that eat any part of them (as when the Prieſt offered up a ſacrifice, ſome parts of the beaſts were eaten together by the people) are conceived to have joined in the ſervice performed by the Prieſt or Sacrificer, and to have right together with him in all the benefits of the ſacrifice; his eating is called *Eating before the Lord*, and is by God counted as an acceptable ſervice: and whatever flows from God in this caſe by way of benefit or advantage, comes to him as really as to the Prieſt, it being the Prieſts part to ſacrifice, the peoples to eat; and ſo in thoſe two things, there is a mutual reciprocal action betwixt God and them, they ſerve God, and God bleſſes them, and that is called communicating or being partakers of the Altar.

S. *What is it that is ſaid of the Heathens?*

C. Firſt, That they ſacrifice to their falſe gods, when only the true one ought to have that wor-

ſhip

ſhip from them, Verſ. 20. and 22. and (as by the 22. it appears) that this is a breach of the Second Commandment, for to that refer thoſe two ſpeeches [*Do we provoke God to jealouſie?*] in reference to his Title there of being a *Jealous God*;] and [*Are we ſtronger than he?*] in reference to his Title * God, which ſignifies *ſtrong*. Secondly, That they which have this mutal conjunction with thoſe falſe gods, are ſuppoſed to receive influxes from them, and to diſclaim expecting any thing from the true one, Verſ. 20. and 21. where alſo the phraſe [*The Cup of the Lord*] is to be taken notice of, and parallel to that, [*The Table of the Lord*] to note the action again, and not the elements, as (before I ſhewed you) the [*This*] ſignifieth. * אל

S. *What then is the reſult of both theſe inſtances, together?*

C. That they that eat of the ſacrifical feaſt, either of the true or falſe Gods, have a mutual conjunction with them, a kind of confederation, perform ſervices to, and receive influences, benefits and advantages from them, do ſo really from the true God, and are ſuppoſed to do ſo from the falſe; (which is the reaſon why *Daniel* refuſed to *eat of the portion of the Kings meat*, *Dan.* 1. 8. becauſe a part thereof being caſt upon the Altar to the heathen gods, the reſt thereby was conſecrated to them, and ſo was meat offered to an Idol, which a Jew was not to taſte of.)

S. *How then will you bring this home to our buſineſs in hand, to the* Sacrament?

C. You ſhall ſee, Verſ. 16. for there the Sacrament is ſet down, and the nature and uſe of it. Thus: *The Cup of bleſſing which we bleſs*, or (as the Syriack) *The Cup of praiſe*, *i. e.* the Chalice of Wine, which is in the name of the people offered up by the Biſhop or Presbyter to God with Lauds and Thankſgivings, *i. e.* that whole Euchariſtical action (and that expreſt to be the action of the people, as well as the Presbyter, by their drinking of it) is the communication of the Blood of Chriſt, a ſervice of theirs to Chriſt, a ſacrifice of thankſgiving, commemorative of that great mercy and bounty of Chriſt in pouring out his Blood for them, and a making them (or a means by Chriſt ordained to make them) partakers of the Blood of Chriſt, not of the guilt of ſhedding it, but (if they come worthily thither) of the benefits that are purchaſed by it, *viz. the waſhing away of ſin, in his Blood:* ſo in like manner, the [a] *breaking and eating of the Bread* is a communication of the Body of Chriſt, a ſacrifice commemorative of Chriſt's offering up his Body for us, and a making us partakers, or communicating to us the benefits of that bread of Life, ſtrengthning, and giving us grace. And both theſe parts of each part of this Sacrament put together are (parallel to what was ſaid of the Iſraelites and Gentiles) a mutual confederation betwixt us and the crucified Saviour; on our parts, an acknowledging him for our God, and worſhipping of him; and on his part, the making over to us all the benefits of his Body and Blood, (*i. e.* his death) grace and pardon, to ſanctify and to juſtify us.

[a] So the phraſe τὸ ἄρτον ὃν κλῶμεν, will be all one with λαβὼν καὶ φαγὼν τὸ ἄρτον, (*To take and eat the Bread*) proportionably to the notion I gave of ποτήριον and of τοῦτο in the Goſpel, *This is my Body*, i. e. *the taking and eating this Bread*, (not this Bread it ſelf) and ſo it will be anſwerable to ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας, the Cup, not the Wine, to note the Wine in the Cup ready for drinking.

S. *You told me even now that you would ſhew me how the phraſe* [This is my Body] *in the Goſpel, (interpreted by* [*this* taking and eating is my Body]) *was to be underſtood: perhaps it may now be time for you to pay me that debt.*

C. It is a fit ſeaſon to do ſo; for this very phraſe of S. *Paul*'s, [*The Bread which we break is the Communion of the Body of Chriſt*] is the Key to open that difficulty, and indeed perfectly all one, of the very ſame importance with that. This *breaking*, *taking*, *eating of the Bread*, this whole action is the real communication of the Body of Chriſt to me, and is therefore by ſome [b] ancient Writers called by a word which ſignifies the *participation*, (communication and participation being the ſame, only one referred to the giver, the other to the receiver) the very [c] giving Chriſt's Body to me; that as verily as I eat the bread in my mouth, ſo verily God in Heaven beſtows on me, communicates to me, the Body of the crucified Saviour. And ſo all that I told you of the full ſence of that phraſe [*Communication of Chriſt's Body*] is again to be repeated here to make up the ſence of thoſe words [*This is my Body:*] which being ſo largely inlarged on, I need not now to repeat to you.

[b] *Damaſcen.* Μετάληψις, δι' αὐτῆς τὸ Ἰησοῦ θεότητι μεταλαμβάνομεν.

[c] Ἔχεται σῶμα Χριστοῦ, *Chryſoſt.*

S. *I ſhall ſpare you that pains, and reſt ſatisfied with what you have already afforded me, and now only remember you, that having gone through four parts of your intended method, the fifth is now next to ſucceed, to ſee what will certainly ariſe from theſe four views: Pleaſe you to proceed to that.*

The Communication of the Body of Chriſt.

C. I have in effect done it already; yet on condition you will fetch that part, which I told you was more circumſtantial and extrinſecal, from that place where I laid down all on that head together, in the places of the Goſpels, I will now give you a compendium or brief of the main ſubſtantial part of this Sacrament. And that conſiſts only of two branches, one on our parts performed to God, the other on God's part performed to us. That on our part [d] is commemorating the goodneſs of God in all, but eſpecially that his great bounty of giving his Son to die for us: and this commemoration hath two branches, one of praiſe and thankſgiving to him for this mercy, the other of [e] annunciation or ſhewing forth, not only firſt to men, but ſecondly and eſpecially, to God, this ſacrifice of Chriſt's in offering up his body upon the Croſs for us. That which reſpecteth or looks towards men, is a profeſſing of our Faith in the death of Chriſt; that which looks toward God, is our pleading before him that ſacrifice of his own Son, and through that humbly and with affiance requiring the benefits thereof, grace and pardon to be beſtowed upon us. And then God's part is the accepting of this our bounden duty, beſtowing that body and blood of Chriſt upon us, not by ſending it down locally for our bodies to feed on, but really for our Souls to be ſtrengthened and refreſhed by it: as when the Sun is communicated to us, the whole bulk and body of the Sun is not removed out of its ſphere, but the rayes and beams of it, and with them the light and warmth and influences, are really and verily beſtowed or darted out upon us: And all this is the full importance of [*This is my Body*] or [this is the *Communication of his Body*.] And ſo I have paſt through the fourth undertaking alſo.

Two branches of the Sacrament.

[d] So the *bitter herbs* were זכר a *memorial* of the bitter *Egyptian* ſervitude, *Exod.* 1. 14. the uſe of the *red wine* was לזכר for a *memorial* that *Pharaoh* waſhed himſelf in the blood of the children of *Iſrael*.

[e] So that Precept *Exod.* 13. 8. is given by *Moſes*, That on the Paſſover they ſhould annunciate, or tell forth unto their Children, the mercy of their deliverance, (והגדת) and thence they call the Paſchal leſſon הגדה καταγγελίαν *Annunciation*; and from thence, by a miſtake of a paſſage in *Elias Levita*, did *Scaliger* conceive that the night after the fourteenth of the month *Niſan* was called הגדה, which belongs only to the leſſon then uſed.

S. *There is then only a fifth behind, to apply all this by way of illustration and confirmation to what is said of this matter in the Catechism.*

C. This will be easily done, you would be able to do it your self; yet I shall go before you in this also.

S. *The first Question then is* [Why the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was ordained?] *and the Answer*, [For the continual remembrance of the Sacrifice of the death of Christ, and the benefits which we receive thereby:] *What is the meaning of that Answer?*

C. Dissolve the words, and you shall see most clearly. First, Christ died: Secondly, this death of his was a sacrifice for us, an Oblation once for all, offered to his Father for us weak sinful men: Thirdly, by this sacrifice we that are true Christians receive unspeakable benefits, as strength to repair our weakness, and enable us to do what God in his Son will accept; and reconciliation, or pardon for us miserable sinners: And fourthly, the end of Christs instituting this Sacrament was on purpose that we might at set times, frequently and constantly returning (for that is the meaning of *continual*, parallel to the use of [* *without ceasing*] applyed to the sacrifice among the Jews, and the duty of Prayer among Christians) remember and commemorate before God and Man this sacrifice of the death of Christ.

* ἀδιαλείπτως.

S. *The next question*, [What is the outward part or sign of the Lord's Supper?] *and the Answer* [Bread and Wine which the Lord hath commanded to be received] *are so plain, that I shall not crave your aid. I conceive it is this, That Bread and Wine is in this, as Water was in the other Sacrament, the Element or outward part, set to signify somewhat else; this appointed by* Christ *to be eaten and drunk, as the Water to be dipped in, or sprinkled with. And so likewise for the next Question, and first part of the Answer, That the* Body and Blood of Christ *is* the inward part, or thing signified *by the other, the Body broken on the Cross signified by the bread broken and eaten, and the Blood poured out on the Cross signified by the Wine poured out into the Cup and drank by us. But then what is the full importance of that which follows in the latter part of that answer, That* the Body and Blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received of the faithful in the Lord's Supper?

The Body of Christ verily received.

C. It is this, That in that Sacrament God really bestows, and every faithful prepared Christian as really and truly receives the body and Blood of Christ. As truly as the Bishop or Presbyter gives me the Sacramental Bread and Wine, so truly doth God in Heaven bestow upon me on Earth the Body and Blood of Christ, *i.e.* the crucified Saviour, not by local motion, but by real communication, not to our teeth, but to our souls; and consequently exhibits, makes over, reaches out unto us all the benefits thereof, all the advantages that flow to us from the death of Christ: The truth of which you had even now confirmed by the words of the Gospel explicated by the plainer expression of Saint *Paul, That the Cup was the communication of the Blood of Christ*, &c.

The benefits of it.

S. *The next Question is plain also* [What are the benefits whereof we are partakers thereby?] *Be you pleased to explicate the answer to it.*

The first.

C. Dissolve it again, and you will do it your self. Thus: The first benefit is the *strengthening of our Souls by the Body of Christ, as our bodies are strengthened by Bread.* Bread signifies all nourishment for the body, and is called, you know, *The staff of life*, without which the body is not able to sustain it self, but grows feeble, staggers, and falls into the very grave of death and rottenness, if this staff be not constantly continued to it. Thus is grace to the Soul; we can do nothing that is in order to spiritual life (but fall into sin, custom of sin, the putrefaction of the soul, and so to eternal death) without it: and having forfeited that stock that God had given us in Paradise, we have none of this kind left, but what Christ had by his death purchased for us; and by that great dear bargain of his, there is come into the Church a new stock and staple of grace and strength, for every one that shall in the name of Christ ask it importunately, receive it watchfully, and make use of it diligently; enough, I say, though not to keep us infallibly without sinning any more, (though not to possess us irresistably, and so keep us that we cannot fall) yet to enable us to do that which God in Christ will now graciously accept at our hands, *i.e.* to serve him sincerely in holiness and renewed righteousness, and to enable us again (if we be not wanting to our selves) to continue and persevere thus to our lives end.

S. *You have shewed me the first benefit, but I conceive there is another; What is that?*

The second.

C. It is *the refreshing of our Souls by the blood of Christ, as our bodies are refreshed with Wine.* Wine may be taken in a double propriety, one to refresh the thirsty, another to comfort the sick; as a little was allowed to *Timothy* for his § frequent sicklinefs. He that pants for thirst, hath his inward flame quenched (and so is refreshed) by Wine; and he that hath any indisposition of body, hath that eased (and so is also refreshed) by Wine. And just thus is the pardon of sin to a thirsty wounded Soul: the conscience of sin is a flame or fire within, and a deep wound to the Soul, and no rest, no quiet under it; and God's free pardon and remission, his speaking peace to the unquiet, his saying [*Thy sins are forgiven*] to the burthened and sin-sick Soul, is the greatest, only refreshment to that Soul. Let God say this word only, and thy servant shall be healed. And this pardon was wrought by the Blood, *i.e.* again by the death of Christ, by the sacrifice and satisfaction of that innocent Saviour, by which suffering we are released, *by whose stripes healed.*

§ πυκνὰ ἀσθενείας, the word used for the *diseases* as well as *weaknesses.*

S. *But how is this strength and this pardon purchased by Christ's death?*

Strength purchased by Christ's death.

C. The strength thus: *Christ being in form of God, and equal with God, took upon him the form of a man*, all of him but our sins, in this he suffered a shameful death; whereupon, saith the Apostle, *God did highly exalt him*, rewarded this great humility and patience of his with this dignity and preferment, *That all power should be given to him both in Heaven and Earth*; that he might dispense to his Disciples all the riches of Heaven, *i. e.* that sufficient strength and grace which will, being made use of, raise us up from death, spiritual and corporal, enable us to live like Saints here, and raise us to life again hereafter. This power was indeed enstated on him at his Resurrection, but purchased by his Death.

S. *How was the pardon of sin purchased?*

And Pardon.

C. You have oft heard; by the satisfaction wrought by him in his sufferings, taking upon him to be

be our ſurety, and to ſuffer in our ſtead, that as many as are renewed by his grace, may be releaſed by his ſufferings; and from both theſe reſults the conſummation of our hope, everlaſting bliſs in another world: God's mercy (when he is thus reconciled unto us in the Blood of his Son) rewarding every poor mean Chriſtian action of ours with eternal glory.

S. *There remains now no more behind, but only the concluding Queſtion, which ſuppoſing theſe benefits thus made over in the Sacrament, but imagining it impoſſible that unworthy, unprepared, prophane receivers ſhould be ever the better for it, asks* [What is required of them which come to the Lord's Supper?] *What have you to add to that Anſwer that there is given to that Queſtion?*

The preparation for worthy receiving.

C. No more but this; That every man is infinitely concerned to have his Soul always poſſeſt with every part of that preparation; that the careleſs oſcitancy and fatal ſtupidity of the world, in never ſo much as conſidering whether they have any of them or no, is a moſt prodigious thing; that the time of preparing our ſelves for the Sacrament (which ought to be frequent, but how frequent is not defined in the Scripture, but left to the judgment of the Church) is a very fit time for that ſelf-examination; that till that be done, and all and each of thoſe graces found ſincere in our hearts, we ought not to come to that holy Sacrament (which yet will not excuſe any for not coming, becauſe he is not prepared, but rather aggravate the ſin upon him, that rather than thus fit himſelf he will part with ſo great a treaſure;) and laſtly, that the particulars of which we muſt thus examine, and which we muſt thus require of our ſelves, are five. 1. True Repentance, (containing ſenſe, ſorrow, humiliation, contrition, confeſſion of all former ſins.) 2. A ſtedfaſt purpoſe to lead a new life, a reſolution to reform all, and that reſolution ſuch as will ſtand faſt in the hour of trial or temptation. 3. A lively faith in God's mercy through Chriſt; a faith, and that a vital one. 4. A thankful remembrance and commemoration of his death. 5. Charity with all men. Every one of which being in their ſeveral due places particularly explained unto you, I ſhall ſuppoſe you ſufficiently inſtructed, and only deſire to oblige you that all this be not laid up to fill your brain, but ſunk down into an honeſt heart, that knowing theſe things, you may be capable of that bliſs that belongs to the doers of them.

O *Holy Jeſu, that cameſt down from Heaven, and wert pleaſed to pay that dear Ranſom on the Croſs for us, on purpoſe that thou mighteſt* redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto thy ſelf a peculiar people, zealous of good works; *We beſeech thee to write thy Law in our hearts, that moſt excellent divine Law of thine, that we may ſee it, and do it, that we may know thee, and the power of thy Reſurrection, and expreſs it in turning every one of us from his iniquities: that we no longer flatter our ſelves with a formal external ſerving of thee, with being hearers of thy Word, partakers of thy Sacraments, profeſſors of thy Truth, knowers or teachers of thy Will; but that we labour to join to theſe an uniform faithful obedience to thy whole Goſpel, a ready chearful ſubjection to thy Kingdom, that thou maiſt rule and reign in our hearts by Faith; and that we being* dead unto ſin, and living unto righteouſneſs, *may have our* fruit unto holineſs, *may* grow in grace, and in the *practical* knowledge of *thee* our Lord *and Saviour* Jeſus Chriſt; *and at laſt, perſevering unto the laſt, attain to that endleſs glorious end, the reward of our Faith, the fruit of our Labours, the perfection of our Charity, and the crown of our Hope, an everlaſting bleſſed life of love and holineſs with thee, O Father of Mercies, O God of all conſolations, O holy and ſanctifying Spirit, O bleſſed Trinity coeternal. To which one Infinite majeſty we moſt humbly aſcribe the honour, glory, power, praiſe, might, majeſty, and dominion, which through all Ages of the world have been given to him which ſitteth on the Throne, to the Holy Spirit, and to the Lamb for evermore.* Amen.

OF THE REASONABLENESS OF Christian Religion.

THE INTRODUCTION.

IT hath always been accounted more Reasonable to doubt of Principles first, and then to throw off the Deductions that naturally arise from them, than to contest the Conclusions when the Principles or Premisses are granted. This occasioned that saying of *Picus Mirandula*, That the *Speculative Atheist was the greatest Prodigy but one, and that was the Practical Atheist*. To acknowledge Christian Religion to be true, and, consequently, that without sincere obedience to all Christ's Precepts, not only the infinite rewards of the Gospel are forfeited, but the infinite torments become our portion; and yet to live lives of prophaneness, and luxury, and indulgence to every liberty that suits with our humours, without fear or discomfiture of mind, is a shortness of discourse, that no man that hath consideration enough to examine, or judgment to compare, can chuse but discern and condemn in himself. As therefore the [a] *Epicurean* that was resolved not to be repress't, or live in the awe of Religion and Priests, counted it but necessary to disbelieve the perpetuity of torments beyond this life; so hath it been Satans method (and the advantage which he hath taken of these times, from the commonness of casting down mounds and hedges, of disputing and questioning the most establisht Truths) to offer it to the Reason and Judgment of his Clients, Whether it be not more easie and hopeful to break up the foundation it self, than, while that remains in its firmness, to demolish that which is erected upon it, and by entangling men in those practices which render them uncapable of receiving benefit by Christianity, to oblige them to endeavour to cast off the doctrines, and to rid themselves from the ill consequences of it. Thus have some men taught themselves the skill and dexterity of unravelling principles, and by giving themselves liberty to disobey Christ in some pleasant or gainful particulars, have at last in their own defence (that they may salve their *Phænomena*, and appear congruous to themselves) arrived calmly to the Scorners chair, the casting off Christianity it self. *Sect.* 1.

[a] —*nam si nullum finem esse putarent Ærumnarum hominis, nullâ ratione valerent Religionibus atque minis obsistere vatum.* Lucret. l. 1.

In stead of gainless Complaints, I shall therefore hasten to give some check to this growing evil, and reduce the whole matter of debate to these two heads. *Sect.* 2.

First, I shall consider the Grounds of Christianity in the gross, or bulk, all of it together, and in some measure justify the reasonableness of them; and then secondly, I shall descend, in the retail, to the survey and vindication of those particular branches of Christianity which appear to men at this time to be least supported with Reason. *Sect.* 3.

CHAP.

CHAP. I.

The Grounds of Christianity, or the Reasons upon which men embrace Christian Religion in the gross, all of it together.

Sect. 1. IN lieu of the many grounds (or several branches and improvements of the same one complicated ground) which [a] other men have very rationally enlarged on, this present discourse (which desires not to expatiate, nor to suppose the Reader to have renounced his Christianity wholly) shall confine it self to these two heads: First, the Testimony on which Christianity is built; secondly, the advantages that those which embrace it shall reap by it. The first will render the belief rational, and conclude it impious to doubt of it. The second will render the belief gainful, and conclude it most uncharitable to our selves, yea, and unsafe and treacherous, not to adhere to it. The first will pronounce it, with the Apostle, *A faithful saying*; the second, *worthy of all acceptation*. The first will reconcile it to our brains, the second to our hearts. The first will give it possession of our understandings; the second will ravish our wills with the beauty and lustre of it.

[a] *H. Grotius, and Ph. Morney du Plessis, &c.*

Sect. 2. The Testimony on which we believe Christianity, *i. e.* on which we believe that Christ was sent from God, to reveal his Father's will unto us, and to be believed in all that he delivered to the World (which when it is believed, it necessarily follows, that all and every part of Christian Religion is infallibly true, and capable of no farther doubting) is the most important and convincing of belief, or faith, which can be imagined.

Sect. 3. For if the Apostle had not said it, it is yet in it self most evident to common sense, That *Faith cometh by hearing*, *i. e.* that I cannot believe any thing to be true on any better, nay on any other ground but only that I hear it thus affirmed. And as the affirmation is, such is the belief: If the affirmation be from a fallible person, from a meer man, the belief must be a fallible belief; but if the person affirming be infallible, then is the belief infallible also.

Sect. 4. That infallible Affirmer is but one, *viz.* God, of whose nature it is to be veracious, to be able to do any thing but to lie, which was also affirmed by Christ out of the Principles of common nature, *Let God be true, and every man a liar*; i. e. though no infallibility of testimony can be attributed to any meer man, yet whatsoever is testified by God, doth certainly deserve to be fully credited.

Sect. 5. And therefore if God shall testify the truth of any thing, there can be no farther scruple or possibility of doubting, or suspecting the truth of what is so testified, than there is actual doubt whether the God of Heaven be God, or whether the God of truth be the father of lies: which as it is a degree above the denying of Christ, and above the infidelity either of the Jew, or Mahometan, or even of Heathenism it self, in that notion wherein it signifies the [b] acknowledgment of more gods than one, (for all that have adored any deity have acknowledged that God, or gods, to [c] *speak nothing but truth*) so is the pretending to it peculiar to very few since the beginning of the World. There being not many that appear in story to have affirmed that there is no God at all, and those not able to perswade others that they did believe themselves when they so affirmed.

[b] πολυθεότης ἀντὶ ἑνὸς θεῶν.

[c] ἀληθεύειν καὶ διαψεύδεσθαι. *Pyth.*

Sect. 6. Now this affirmation or testification of God, that Christ was sent from him to declare his Will to us, *&c.* (upon which, being once supposed, the truth of all Christian Religion truly so called is immediately and infallibly founded) hath more than one way been authentically interposed. Such are the many repeated testimonies of the Prophets in the Old Testament (which finding a perfect completion in Christ, and none but Christ, do amount to a divine testimony.) Such was the coming of the Angel to *Mary* the Mother of Christ, and to *Elizabeth* the Mother of *John Baptist*, in the New Testament, as also the *Star* which lighted the wise men of the East unto him, (and of which the [d] Heathens themselves have affirmed, not only that it was a special Star that never before appeared in the Heaven, but also that it had a portentous significancy, *pointing at the descent of a venerable God, for the salvation of men, and the good of Mortals.*) So again that of the Miracles wrought by Christ and his Apostles, which are another kind of God's speaking to us in men, and upon Earth (particularly that of raising the dead) and are by the Apostles styled, what in reason they are, Demonstrations, *Acts* 2. 22. and testifications of God himself, *Heb.* 2. 4. But above all, his own *Resurrection* out of the Grave, after he had been crucified by them. God by thus raising him is said (most truly according to the dictates of Reason) to have [e] given to all men Faith, *i. e.* an argument of full conviction, that he was what he pretended to be, and so to * set him out as the person to be believed on, † being powerfully and determinately pointed out by that great act, to be the Son of God. But because all of these would much lengthen this discourse above the designed proportion, and because each of them is largely insisted on by others, and because no testimony is ordinarily deemed more Authentick than that *audible voice*, I shall therefore chuse principally to insist on that one ordinary way of God's testifying to men, known to the Jews by the title of בת קול the *daughter of voice*, or of *thunder*, *i. e.* a Revelation from Heaven delivered in (or coming out of the midst of) thunder, which, say the Jews, was the special way of God's revealing himself under the second Temple.

[d] *Est quoque alia venerabilior & sanctior historia, quæ perhibet ortu stellæ cujusdam insolitæ non morbos moresq; prænuntiatos, sed descensum Dei venerabilis ad humanæ servationis* (without question ἀνθρωπίνης σωτηρίας in the Greek, though that be not extant) *rerumque mortalium gratiam, quam à Chaldæis observatam fuisse testantur, qui Deum nuper natum muneribus venerati sunt.* Chalcidius *in Plat. Timæum*, p. 219.

[e] Πίστιν παρασχὼν πᾶσιν, Acts 17. 31. * ἐγείρατα αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν, καὶ δόξαν αὐτῷ δόντα, ὥστε τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν εἶναι εἰς θεόν, 1 Pet. 1. 21. † ὁρισθέντος υἱοῦ θεοῦ ἐν δυνάμει, ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν, Rom. 1. 4.

Sect. 7. And by this, God three times gave testimony to Christ. First, immediately after his Baptism, *Behold, the heavens were opened to him*, *i. e.* visibly and miraculously parted asunder, *and he*, i. e. *John* that baptized him, *saw the Spirit of God descending like a Dove, and coming upon him*, i. e. descending, as a Dove descends upon any thing, visibly hovering and lighting on him, *And behold, a voice out of the Heavens saying*; i. e. as the Heavens parted asunder, a clap of thunder came out, and with it a voice

voice delivering these words, *This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased, i. e.* this is my Son whom I have sent; his coming to the world and his undertaking is perfectly agreeable to, and hath its original wholly from, my Will. From which Testimony of God's it is consequent, That whatsoever he teaches, comes from God, and is to be embraced as that which is perfectly his Will and Law. And it is observable that in one of the old Prophecies of the *Messiah*, where it is foretold that *God's spirit shall descend upon him*, it is affirmed almost in the very words which were here said to come out of the thunder, that *this was God's beloved, in whom his Soul* (*i. e.* he) *was well pleased.*

So again a Second time, in the presence of three sober men (which was the number by which the weightiest matters were authentically testified) *Peter*, and *James*, and *John*, being all with him in a Mountain, *Behold a lightsome cloud overshadowed them, and a voice out of the cloud, saying, This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased: hear him.* Giving an unquestioned Authority to all that should ever come from him after. *Sect.* 8.

Thirdly, at a time not long before his death, when he was a praying to his Father to glorify his Name, *A voice came from Heaven, saying, I have both glorified it, and will glorify it again.* And of them that *stood by, some said that it thundred; others, that it was an Angel that spake to him.* From both which it is easily concluded, That God, whether by, or without the Ministry of an Angel, was heard to speak to him out of the Thunder. *Sect.* 9.

What was thus done personally to Christ, was with some small variation promised, (and so by *John Baptist* first foretold) that it should be performed (after his departure) to his Apostles or Disciples, who were to preach his Doctrine, and what they knew of him, after his going out of this world: and accordingly, in the very manner which was foretold it came to pass, and all other things foretold by him did punctually follow. For as *they were all together, there was suddenly a noise from Heaven, as of a violent wind, and filled the whole house where they sate.* And so this (styled the [h] *Baptizing them with the Holy Ghost, i. e.* Receiving them with a far higher Ceremony than that of Baptism, *viz.* with a shining glorious descent of the Spirit of God upon them) did at once give them their Commission from Heaven, and was a testimony of God himself, That what they should teach from Christ, was the very doctrine which God required to be embraced by the World. *Sect.* 10. [h] Acts 1. 5.

And of this sort there was yet farther one most eminent passage. A known and eminent Jew, one *Saul*, who by his *Sect* (a *Pharisee*) and by his extraordinary warmth and zeal to the Jewish Law, in opposition to Christianity, had interessed himself profestly in the persecuting of it, had a principal hand in the putting Saint *Stephen* to death, (as appears by the witnesses laying *their garments at his feet*, Act. 7. 58.) and was engaged in a most vehement bloody design against the Christians in *Damascus*, and having gotten Letters of Commission from the High Priest to that purpose, *Acts* 9. 1. was now very rageful upon his way thither: This man, thus *breathing out threatnings and slaughters against the Church*, and as he was close to *Damascus*, his journeys end, on a sudden a *light from Heaven shone about him*, like lightning flashing about his ears; and *falling to the ground*, by that means he heard a voice saying to him, *Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?* in words so convincingly delivered, that he knew assuredly that it was God that by an Angel thus appeared and spake to him: and thereupon he gave answer immediately, *Who art thou, Lord?* The voice replyed, *I am Jesus whom thou persecutest*, with the addition of other words, which struck him into such an horror, that immediately trembling, and in an agony of Passion, he said, *Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?* And was again answered what he should do, *Go unto the City*, and there he should receive particular directions. Which accordingly happened, and this person became immediately a prime Apostle, or Preacher of Christianity. This thing was not done privately, but every circumstance of the story was publickly known at that time: his Letters from the High Priest were known to the *Sanhedrin*; and before he came to *Damascus*, the news of them was come thither, so far, that *Ananias* a Christian there, that in a Vision from God was bid to go to him in such an house, made this objection against obeying the command, That this was the man that had done so much mischief, and was now come with such a Commission to apprehend all that *profest the worship of Christ* in that place. And besides, there was company with him on the way when the Prodigy befel him, and all they *heard the voice*, and *saw no body*, ver. 7. 'Tis true indeed, that in one relation of that passage, *Acts* 22. 9. it is said, that they *heard not the voice.* But that (as all other seeming contradictions of the Scripture) is easily salved by observing, that the word קול in Hebrew, which signifies a *voice*, signifies *thunder* also, as *Hebr.* 12. 26. *Whose voice*, i. e. *Thunder, shaketh the earth*; and so very often. And so where it is said, that *they heard the voice*, the sence is, that they *heard the thunder*, which was joined with the lightning that flasht about him: and when it is said, they *heard not the voice*, it is expresst in the place what is meant by it, *they heard not the voice of him that spake to him*, i. e. the voice of Christ immediately appearing from Heaven, and calling unto him, *Saul, Saul*, &c. but only saw the lightning, and heard the thunder: but what was said to him, he only heard that was concerned in it; but by the effects, his answers, and consequent charge, they easily discerned that also, though they heard it not. This story did this man always avow as a notorious truth, whensoever he was called in question by Jews or Romans for preaching Christ; and there was never any question made of the truth of it: And this went for his Commission to be an Apostle of Christ; and he never sought for any other; and after doing more service in the Church than all the rest of Christ's own (regularly chosen, and designed) Apostles, he at last laid down his life for the Testimony of that Truth which before this he had so sharply persecuted. *Sect.* 11.

This is not all yet; for at the beginning of the diffusion of the Gospel to the Gentile World, and for the declaring of God's Will in that particular, there was not only a Vision to *Cornelius*, and an Ecstasy, and an audible Voice from Heaven to Saint *Peter*, in these words, *Arise, Peter, kill and eat*, (the obscurity of which words, and of the Representation to which they belonged, was presently interpreted by the Effect:) but beyond both these, it follows, That at the preaching of *Peter* to *Cornelius* and the rest of his Company of Gentile Believers, the *Holy Ghost fell on all that heard the Word*, *i. e.* probably, came down upon them in some way of visible Appearance, (the like * as before had befaln the Apostles;) or if not so, yet in such manner as evidenced it self by giving them power of *speaking strange languages*, and other Gifts and Graces, fitting them for several conditions in the Church. *Sect.* 12. Acts 10. 44. *See Acts 1. 8. & 11. 15, & 17.

Church. And this was ſeen by the Jews, that were very far from being inclinable to believe ſuch a thing of Gentiles, and being convinced by the evidence, [k] were aſtoniſhed at it, rapt with admiration at the ſtrangeneſs, but no way doubting the truth of it. And it ſo fell out, that *Peter* afterwards being called in queſtion by other Jews, for what he had then done in Preaching to Gentiles, (which they thought utterly unlawful) by this relation of the deſcent of the Holy Ghoſt upon thoſe Gentiles, [l] he ſatisfied them; which ſure he could not have done, if there had remained any doubt of the truth of it. And the ſame fell out again to the *Epheſian*-Diſciples, and the truth that it did ſo was evidenced, by their *ſpeaking all ſtrange languages* (which they had never learned) *and propheſying*. Two Gifts which were ſo conſtant conſequents of that coming of the Holy Ghoſt on any, that they teſtified it convincingly to thoſe that had no evidence of the fact.

[k] Verſe 45.

[l] Acts 11. 15. and 18. Acts 19. 6.

Sect. 13. The Propriety of this Deſcent to this turn, and to that other grand one of giving Commiſſions (and authorizing, and ſo teſtifying the truth of all that ſhould be taught by them on whom the Spirit thus deſcended) may perhaps be better underſtood, by remembring the Cuſtoms appointed by God among the Jews. Thoſe that were among them called to be Prophets out of their Schools, were aſſumed and conſecrated to it by Anointing, (a Ceremony of advancing to ſome eminent Office; and therefore the Chaldee Paraphraſe for *Unction*, reads ordinarily רבא *Advancement*.) Now for many years before this coming of Chriſt, Prophecy had failed among the Jews. Under the ſecond Temple, ſay they, there was no *Oyl*, nor any [m] way of Revelation, ſave only that of the voice from Heaven. Now therefore when God was thus pleaſed to ſend his Son, to reveal his compleat Will unto the World, and from him to continue the ſame by his Apoſtles and others after him; inſtead of that ſolemn Ceremony of Unction, is this viſible Deſcent of the Holy Ghoſt on him and on them in a ſhining fiery Cloud, and with it theſe words of Conſecration to Chriſt, *This is my Beloved Son*, &c. and in lieu of that voice, the gift of Tongues to the Apoſtles and others. This was foretold by one of the Jewiſh Prophets long before, That the *Lord ſhould anoint him to preach*, and that the *Spirit of the Lord ſhould be upon him*, *i. e.* that he ſhould be anointed, *i. e.* ordained, to this Office of Preaching God's Will, not by material Oyl, but ſpiritual Unction, by the real Deſcent of the Spirit of God upon him. And accordingly one of his Diſciples, Saint *John*, being to confute a ſort of Antichriſtian Hereticks of his time, which denied Chriſt to be come really in the fleſh, uſeth no other argument (to fortify them to whom he writes) but onely the mention of this Teſtimony from Heaven, this Deſcent on Chriſt and the Apoſtles, and others who had inſtructed them in Chriſtianity; which he veils under the title of the Unction, *viz.* that unction vulgarly known among them by that name; the [n] *Unction from the holy One*, as he calls it, *i. e.* from God in Heaven, by which (as by their Teachers it had been communicated to them) they *knew all things*, (*i. e.* were ſure that the Doctrine they had been taught was true) *and needed not to be taught by any*, *i. e.* wanted no more Arguments to confirm this truth unto them: That unction, as he farther adds, *teaching them of all*, *i. e.* giving them ſufficient inſtructions in that matter, and in all other ſuch Fundamental Truths of the Chriſtian Doctrine, teſtified to them by thoſe who had been thus anointed immediately from Heaven, authorized to teach them Truth. This ſame again, as far as concerned Chriſt, is by another [o] Evangelical Writer joined with his working of Miracles, and called *God's anointing him with the Holy Ghoſt and with Power*, (as in [p] another place *God's anointing him*, alone) which is directly the ſame with that other phraſe uſed by Saint *Paul*, the [q] *demonſtration of the Spirit*, *and of power*, the Deſcent of the Spirit, and working of Miracles: the two things which he urged to the Jews or Heathens whereſoever he preached, (as things which he was ſure they could no more contradict than Demonſtrations themſelves, there being ſo many then alive that could witneſs the truth of them.) In which reſpect, he after tells them of God's having confirmed them into Chriſt, and anointed and ſealed them; all in the ſame ſence, to ſignify God's having afforded them theſe convincing Teſtimonies of the truth of Chriſtianity, preached to them by thoſe on whom the Holy Ghoſt had deſcended, and who wrought Miracles among them.

[m] *Gradus Revelationis divinæ quatuor. Nſiah, prophetia per viſionem & ſpectra. Ruach Hoccodeſh, afflatus Spiritûs Sancti, qui erat ſine iſtis ut in David, &c. Urim & Thummim, inpectorali judicio* (ſplendeſcentia pectoralis, ſeu *Hoſchen*, prænuntians *Judæis* victoriam, quod ceſſavit ſplendeſcere *An.* 200. antequam ego ſcriberem, inquit *Joſephus*, cùm Deus iraſceretur ob tranſgreſſiones Legum. Vid. *Suid.* in voce *Ephod*) & *Bath Col*, i. e. *vox cœlitus audita*; & *hæc ultima erat ſub templo ſecundo*, &c. Vid. P. *Fagium in Targum Pent.* Exod.

[n] 1 John 2. 20.

[o] Acts 10. 38.

[p] Acts 4. 27.

[q] 1 Cor. 2. 4.

Sect. 14. That this was a very competent Confirmation of the Doctrine of Chriſt, may yet farther appear by conſidering, firſt, the Perſons to whom this was to be done, the then Church of God, the people of the Jews, which were acquainted with his Voices, and his Prophets, and his Oeconomies formerly among them: Secondly, the matter that was thus to be confirmed, no greater change than to which this way of atteſtation may in reaſon be deemed abundantly proportionable. For the things to be believed, only the real completion of ſome things which had been before foretold, and the revealing ſome truths which had been more obſcurely repreſented in the Old Teſtament; and then thoſe, how high and myſterious ſoever, yet being clearly revealed by Chriſt and the Apoſtles in the New, and the explicite belief of them no further required of any than in proportion to the degree of the revelation of them; the revealing of them muſt be looked on as the ſatisfying of an appetite, a deſire of more knowledge (which is naturally in all men, and is ſharpned by the having received ſome imperfect rayes of it) and conſequently ſhould not in reaſon be expected to be atteſted with ſuch a pomp of ſigns and prodigies, as impoſitions of Tasks and Exactings of obediences are wont to be. Then for the things to be done in Chriſtianity, the duties and obſervances; It is again conſiderable, that the change in that reſpect was not ſuch as would denominate it a new Religion, but onely the reforming and perfecting that which was before received among the Jews, and the making it more tolerable and eaſie to be received by other parts of the (Gentile) World. The worſhip of the One True God, Creator of Heaven and Earth, (contrary to the falſe worſhips of the many gods and idols of the Heathens, and to all the unnatural luſts attending them) had been ſufficiently teſtified to the Nation of the Jews by many voices from Heaven, and undeniable atteſtations of God himſelf (and indeed to other Nations by the fearful, miraculous judgments ſhewn in *Egypt*, and on the *Canaanites*, under the conduct of *Moſes* and *Joſhua*, &c.) and by God's continual reſiding among that people, and his atteſting that by the *Urim* and *Thummim*, by the ſeveral Prophets ſent by him, and the other ways of revelations. And to thoſe that granted all this it was foretold (ſo often that no Jew doubted of it) that there ſhould come days of Reformation, that there ſhould come a *Meſſias*. This was long ago promiſed through all paſſages of their ſtory: to *Adam* under the title of the *Seed of the woman*; to

Sem,

Sem, that *God should dwell or pitch his tabernacle in the Tents of Sem*, take flesh upon him in his family; to *Abraham*, to *Judah*, to *David*, and all along through the writings of their Prophets. Concerning this *Messias* their carnal hearts had pre-conceived some Mistakes, as that he should be a glorious King here, and make them again (after their being subdued by the *Romans*) a most victorious, glorious people on Earth, and this howsoever they demeaned themselves, only by the priviledge of having *Abraham* (to whom great promises were made) *to their Father*. At last this *Messias* (otherwise described by their Prophets, as one that should come in a mean and lowly manner, no way desireable to the eye of the world, *Isa.* 53.) comes just as he had been foretold, a Forerunner being sent before him, on purpose to prepare his way, to dispossess them of their fond perswasions of their absolute election by having *Abraham* to their father, and pointing him out particularly as the *Son of God*, the *Messias* that was now to be received (as he had been so greedily and so long expected) by them. This Forerunner that thus foretold, and after pointed him out, was (as they that crucified Christ confess) by all the [r] Jews taken for a Prophet. And moreover to this testimony of this acknowledged Prophet, comes in the addition of the miraculous descent of the holy Spirit, and the voice from Heaven, and all that hath been mentioned consequent to that. And to those among whom this had always been acknowledged an authentick way of attesting God's Will, nothing could be more required but this. Christ then (or God himself in humane Nature, assumed of a Virgin, and born after a supernatural manner) when he came to thirty years old (the age of a Doctor among that people) sets to this business which it was foretold he should perform, tells them how the former Law was to be reformed, (and especially their former lives, from external observances to internal purities) and how to be filled up and perfected in some particulars; and then lightly changes some ceremonies customary among them, and accommodates them to present use, removes the wall of division which had been between them and all the rest of the world, shews them that that was meant only to keep them from imitating the Heathens sins, and now that there was more need that Heathens and they should love one another, and join to reform both their lives, and practise Christian vertues, than keep that supercilious distance from one another; and in a word, he brings the whole matter to such a model, as all other men but the Jews like extremely better than that which was before among them, and consequently, come in in sholes at the preaching of it: and the Jews that do not so, acknowledge the only reason why they do not, to be their zeal to their law of outward performances, and the perswasion of their absolute election; that is, in effect, that they had no other quarrel to him, but only that he did not teach the doctrines that they liked and were before imbued with, which if he had, he had by that very means done contrary to the prophecies by them allowed of, which foretold he should work a Reformation. Upon these unreasonable terms they crucify him: and by their doing so, more wonderful attestations yet are given to all this. In his very death the Sun is miraculously eclipsed, at a time of the Moon when by nature it was absolutely impossible, and so far against all rules of *Astronomy*, that learned men in other places took notice of it to be a violence done to Nature, which must signify some great matter. Then a prodigy befalls the Temple, and that a very significant one. Then the bodies of many dead men arise and go to *Jerusalem*, and are seen by many. But above all, he himself riseth from the dead, and Angels again are sent to give notice of it: and those that at his death had feared themselves deluded (as adversity is a great temptation, and by Christ himself foretold to be so) are every one of them confirmed by seeing, touching, talking with him: and what is seen and testified by them, was *seen* also by *five hundred persons at once*, which lived many years to attest the truth to all that doubted it. And at length (which was the most immediate testification of the truth of all the former) he is bodily and visibly taken up into Heaven, before their eyes.

[r] Matth 21. 26.

When that was done, there was but one imaginable method behind, that, according as he had promised while he was upon earth, he should, being himself departed, *send the Paraclet*, which by descending visibly upon the Apostles, and by endowing them with the gift of doing Miracles, and of speaking of all Languages, which they were known never to have learnt, should enable them to convince the world, by the testimony of Christ's Resurrection and Ascension, and destroying of Satan by his death (the most improbable means of working victories) that he was the Messias foretold, that *Seed of the Woman* that should *break the Serpent's head*. On strength of this, they which so lately doubted, now chearfully lay down their lives in testifying of all these truths: And those Jews that did not yet believe on him were, according to his distinct Predictions many times repeated (they, their Temple in which they trusted, their City, their whole Nation, and infinite multitudes of them, whersoever they were found) most stupendiously destroyed by the *Roman Eagles* or *Legions*. All this (thus hastily put together, so as necessarily to omit many weighty circumstances under every head) is sure prodigy enough to attest and authorize no greater a change than the clearer Revelation of some obscurer Truths, the confutation of some false Doctrines, and the Reformation of some Ceremonies, and the perfecting and heightning of some Laws less perfect before, and the instituting of a few useful Ceremonies in stead of many burthensome ones, can be thought to amount to. *Sect.* 15.

This first ground of believing Christianity being thus mentioned, is not capable of any dispute from any reasonable man, unless from him which shall question whether this be not fabulous in the relation; *i. e.* whether first there were ever indeed heard such voices; or secondly, whether they were not delusions of the hearers, or at least the voice of some other, and not of God. And to him that shall make the former scruple I shall be able to give as satisfactory an answer as is possible to be given of a matter of this nature, of any the lightest or weightiest consequence; to a matter of this nature, I say, *i. e.* of a matter of fact, (for such it must needs be, that such a voice was heard from Heaven) and that fact past so many hundred years ago. For first, that fact was of necessity to be confined to some determinate time and place, to be done somewhere, and why not in *Judea*, where it is said to be done? to be seen by some particular men, and by them of necessity (if it were to be known) to be attested to others: nay, if it had been done so as to be heard and seen by the whole World then living (though that this should point out that one person *Jesus*, would not be well reconcileable with *Sect.* 16.

that, becauſe his body could not be in every place) yet could not the next Age come to know this; but muſt be forced to make uſe of the atteſtation of men of that Age to reveal it to them, and ſo proceed by the very way that now is allowed us, that of faith or believing. For ſecondly, ſhould there at this hour come the like voice from Heaven, in the hearing of any the moſt credible honeſt men of this Age, what way would be expected to convince the Ages to come (who ſhould not be preſent to hear it) of the truth of this, but by the conſtant affirmation of thoſe who are now ear-witneſſes of it, and by their committing all this to writing now, ſo that all that ſhould now live, and ſuſpect, or believe it a forgery, might be able to examine and diſcover the truth of it; eſpecially, if to that they ſhould join the doing of the greateſt Miracles, which coming only from God, cannot be conceived to be by him allowed to aſſiſt the bringing a lie into the World.

Sect. 17. Beyond ſuch teſtimony of eye or ear-witneſſes thus publickly and authoritatively proteſted, and conveighed to poſterity, there is no rational evidence imaginable for thoſe that lived not in that Age; nor do men at any time exact or require any more authentick proof of matter of fact or ground of believing any thing. For as to the voice of God again from Heaven, (which alone can pretend to be above this) this is not at all commodious to this turn; for this were for God to multiply prodigies improperly and unſeaſonably, 'tis ſure unneceſſarily, and to all that were not preſent this would be again as queſtionable as the former.

Sect. 18. For the teſtifying an high important Truth, which cannot otherwiſe be known, God hath been pleaſed thus perſonally to interpoſe his own Power and Authority, and to ſpeak from Heaven, yea, and to repeat that again and again, that there may no matter of doubt remain concerning it: But when that hath been thus done by God ſufficiently, then are there ſufficient humane means to convey the truth or hiſtory of this fact to other men, *viz.* the teſtimony of thoſe that ſaw or heard it. And as it were ridiculous to ſuppoſe or expect from God, that he ſhould teſtify from Heaven, that ſuch men did hear that former voice from Heaven; ſo the ſame Law of God and Nature which forbids lying as ſinful, forbids alſo Incredulity as irrational, when a thing is by unſuſpected witneſſes, upon certain knowledge, with ſo many improvements and advantages thus ſufficiently teſtified. And if God upon mans ſeveral incredulities ſhould be ſtill obliged to give witneſs to his Truths by his own voice, then ſhould he cut off that Rule for Belief, which in all other things (agreeably to the dictates of reaſonable Nature) he hath made ſtanding among men. And in this caſe to require any higher teſtimony, were the ſame inconvenient abſurdity as not to believe any thing upon any other ground than that of ſight (which is indeed to miſtake knowledge for belief, or evidence for adherence, and muſt neceſſarily leave nothing of vertue rewardable in that Faith which is ſo violently and unavoidably produced) or to expect a voice from Heaven to give me daily aſſurance of all the paſſages or relations of Hiſtory, and not to believe that there was ſuch a man as *Alexander*, or *Caſar*, or *William the Conqueror*, or *Elizabeth* the late (but before our birth) *Queen* of this Kingdom, unleſs ſome *voice of God from Heaven* atteſt it to me.

Sect. 19. They that cannot believe at any cheaper rate than of a new minutely Prodigy from Heaven, for every act of believing, a Prodigy from Heaven, or (more plainly) they that will not believe any thing but what they know, muſt be fed alſo as well as taught by Miracle, or elſe muſt be obliged to abſtinence (greater than any man inflicts upon himſelf) by continuing conſtant to that Principle. For no man hath Demonſtration, or Infallibility, or Evidence, for his ſafety in any bit of meat that he eats, or the firmneſs of any floor he ſtands on; it being always poſſible, that what doth moſt nouriſh and ſuſtain, might by ſome poiſonous mixture ſmite and deſtroy; that the roof that covers and protects might minutely over-whelm and bury us: yet are we not ſuch *Hypochondriacks* in theſe matters of daily uſe, (and in them that are, it is interpreted an eminent defect or decay of Reaſon, and not an higher pitch of it) as to deprive our ſelves of the benefit of food and raiment upon conſideration of theſe remote poſſible dangers, nor to fear all things, but what we know infallibly.

Sect. 20. And if it ſhall be ſaid that Eating is neceſſary for the Preſervation of Life, and that that Conſideration makes it reaſonable to truſt on thoſe grounds, becauſe by diſtruſting we ſhould ſubject our ſelves to a certainty of that whereof the other is at moſt but an hazard; I anſwer, Firſt, that this Inſtance was produced only to ſhew that we think it reaſonable, without fear or doubt, to rely on ſome things for which we have no demonſtration or knowledge of the impoſſibility of the contrary; and that is ſtill proved by this inſtance, though it be granted that eating is neceſſary; becauſe if the neceſſity of eating were the cauſe that made men venture that hazard, they ſhould never venture it till they were neceſſarily to ſtarve without it; and when they did ſo, they ſhould do it with continual doubt, and fear of the poſſible danger: neither of which are thought rational, nor practiſed by conſidering men. And ſecondly, the interpretation of [*being fed*] in the inſtance, was [*the whole courſe of men in feeding*,] which is not the proportioning of food to the neceſſities of life, or the *Leſſian* or *Cornarian* diet, but the free manner of feeding among men, ſuch as was parallel'd to the ſtanding on a floor that might poſſibly fall, that is, being in an upper room; which being not at all neceſſary to life, and withal poſſible in nature that it ſhall minutely be our death, is yet made uſe of among all wiſe men with as much confidence and fearleſneſs as it is expected of us that we ſhould believe the Goſpel.

Sect. 21. This may be enlarged to the ſeveral buſineſſes of the World, wherein all men act moſt confidently; to that of Trafficking and Trading, and all kinds of Merchandiſing, which are really mixt with not improbable hazards: the whole life of the husbandman is a continual example of thoſe that think fit to adhere and believe and act accordingly, without having received any demonſtration. And none of all theſe are ever counted irrational, even by thoſe who have fixed no thoughts beyond this life, and the thriving and proſpering in it, and who conſequently are to loſe their chief and only good if it ſhould miſcarry, and who in all things of that nature are generally as rational and wary, and hard to believe without ſecurities, as the wiſeſt men in the World.

Sect. 22. And if we will in the buſineſs in hand (the believing of the Apoſtles relations concerning thoſe Teſtimonies given Chriſt from Heaven, wherein we have infinitely ſtronger grounds to build our

Faith

Faith on, ſecurities and convictions incomparably more pregnant and vehement) allow it reaſonable for us to do that once, which in all other things we do confidently every minute of our lives, *viz.* believe what we have all reaſon to believe, without exacting of evidence or demonſtration, there will be no more required of us in this matter.

That this is directly the caſe in hand, and, over and above this, that the teſtifying of the Goſpel hath all imaginable advantages, will appear by a bare application of the particulars. *Sect.* 23.

The voices from Heaven concerning Chriſt are teſtified by the joint concurrence of all that were preſent at them, no one finding any cauſe of ſcruple or interpoſing any doubt concerning them. Thoſe very perſons, with the addition of many more, are allowed the favour of ſeeing him after his Reſurrection, of uſing all the moſt infallible means of ſecuring themſelves and others of the reality of this. Being thus aſſured, they make it the buſineſs of their whole lives after to communicate it to others, ſome in writings, all in preaching through all parts of the World, (whither they travelled on purpoſe to propagate this Truth) agreeing in the whole matter of ſtory, and in every circumſtance of it. The truth of what they ſay they again back with Miracles on one ſide, with completion of Predictions, both of the Prophets of old concerning Chriſt, and of Chriſt concerning them and the ſucceeding Ages, (eſpecially that concerning his ſpeedy coming in vengeance againſt his crucifiers) on the other ſide: both Teſtimonies of *God*, to authorize *their* Teſtimonies. In propagating this doctrine as they uſe not ſtrength or force, which hath been the engine by which all other Religions have received their growth, ſo they never endeavour to diſturb States or Governments for (or by) the planting this Doctrine, but always preach ſubjection to the Powers which are any where eſtabliſhed, and without all reſiſtance profeſs (and by their actions demonſtrate) themſelves obliged to ſuffer whatſoever their lawful Magiſtrates inflict on them, and contend only with their Prayers to God, that they may live quietly and peaceably under them, having ſtill their croſs in their hands, and many times on their ſhoulders, to follow Chriſt. And if this were not ſufficient to prevent, or to ſatisfy the jealouſies of Heathen Princes, yet upon that very account it is the greater teſtimony of the truth of their Doctrine, when they that propagate it are ſo far from deſigning any temporal advantages to themſelves, which might bribe them to the depoſing an untruth, that they actually part with their very lives, and conſequently with all capacity of thoſe poſſible advantages, and acquire nothing but reproaches, and torments, and death it ſelf: and all this without any other imaginable reward or payment in commutation or reparation for all this, ſave only the future expectation of that for which they yet had no farther aſſurance than the truth of that which they thus confeſt: nay, yet farther, when they have given this coſtly teſtimony to this truth, God again bears teſtimony to them, and by Miracles wrought at their Monuments, *being dead, they yet ſpeak.* *Sect.* 24.

That all this is thus true, is again it ſelf teſtified, not only by Records ſtill extant under their hands who wrote Goſpels and the Acts, and by footſteps and remainders of all others preaching, whereſoever they taught, but alſo by the like conſent of the whole Church, *i. e.* whole multitudes of that age wherein this is pretended to be written and taught, who being convinced with the truth of what we now enquire after, readily gave up their names to the belief of it, and to the conſequent confeſſion of Chriſt, though the doing it did in like manner coſt them very dear, the parting with their eſpouſed cuſtoms of living, whether among the Jewiſh or Gentile world, their pleaſures, their worldly wealth, and oft-times their lives alſo. *Sect.* 25.

Beyond all this, the ſucceſs which attended it had ſo much of ſtrangeneſs in it (*viz.* that from ſuch mean and ſimple beginnings and inſtruments, without any kind of power or earthly authority to back it, without one ſword ever drawn in defence of it, Chriſtianity ſhould ſoon obtain ſuch a victory over the hearts of men in ſo great a part of the World) that nothing but truth, which hath that over-ruling force in it, can be deemed to have been its Champion. *Sect.* 26.

Laſtly, that theſe are the writings, thoſe the tradition of thoſe eye-witneſſes whoſe they pretend to be, and that they were by ſuch ſholes, ſuch multitudes of men of all Nations believed then, and that belief ſigned by the blood of many, by the hazards and adventures of moſt, by the profeſt non-reſiſtance of all, this is as fully teſtified to us as any matter of fact can be ſuppoſed to be, by the concurrent teſtimonies of all of that age which ſay any thing of it, and by a general ſucceſſive atteſtation of all intervening ages ſince that time, (the authority of [f] thoſe writings being never conteſted by any) *i. e.* by the ſame means of probation upon which we believe thoſe things which we leaſt doubt of, and againſt which men cannot feign any ſound or ſhew of proof, ſave only that teſtimonies are not demonſtrations; which exception will in like manner be in a like or far greater force againſt all other things which we believe moſt confidently. *Sect.* 27.

[f] Among the ὁμολογούμενα, the confeſt writings of Scriptures, atteſted by all, and not ἀντιλεγόμενα contradicted by any, ταχτέον ἐν πρώτοις ἴσως ἀρίαν τῶν εὐαγγελίων τετρακτύν, οἷς ἕπεται ἡ τῶν πραξεων τῶν Ἀποστόλων γραφή. Euſeb. Eccleſ. Hiſt. lib. 3. cap. xx. *The four Goſpels are firſt to be placed, and then the ſtory of the Acts of the Apoſtles.*

I am not willing to leave any poſſible ſcruple unſatisfied in this matter, and therefore I ſhall proceed to that other bolder objection ſtill behind, That that which is pretended to be the voice of God, may not have been ſuch, but ſome deluſion of the hearers, or at leaſt the voice of ſome other, and not of God; as the Devil in the Oracle delivered himſelf by voice: and therefore though it be confeſt, that if this voice were God's, it is infallibly creditable, yet there will need ſome certain way of diſcrimination to aſſure it was his. To this I anſwer, That the perſon whoſe objection this may be ſuppoſed to be, is either a bare *Theiſt*, that acknowledges a God, but not the God of *Iſrael*; or elſe he that acknowledges what the Jew did, the truth of the Old Teſtament. I ſhall reply ſomewhat to each of theſe. *Sect.* 28.

To the former, That if this way of objecting would be of force, there could be no way for God to reveal himſelf to man, Veracity would be an empty Attribute of God, of no ſignification to us. For it is not imaginable that there ſhould be any greater Aſſurance of Gods ſpeaking to men, than by the Heavens opening, and from thence the Spirit of God deſcending viſibly, and lighting on one, and out of the clouds a voice deliver'd: whatſoever elſe can be imagined or named will not be above this. And if all the ways that God can uſe be not able to give aſſurance that it is God that ſpeaks, what *Sect.* 29.

are we the nearer for knowing that God cannot lie, as long as there is ſuppoſed for us no way to know what at any time he ſaith? nay, to what uſe (as to this particular) is his Omnipotence, if he cannot reveal himſelf to us in ſuch a way that may be reaſonable for us to believe to be his, and not ſome deceivers voice? Nay, in this God ſhall not be able to do ſo much as any ordinary man; for he can ſo reveal himſelf, or ſpeak, as no man that is preſent, and doth not ſtop his ears, ſhall be able to doubt of his ſpeaking.

Sect. 30. To the ſecond ſort of Objecters I anſwer, That the objection will loſe all its ſeeming force, if it be remembred, that although now among us voices from Heaven are not heard, (and therefore we are not at this diſtance ſo competent judges of the clearneſs or certainty that ſuch, when they were, were not deluſions, and accordingly the aſſent required of us of this age is but proportionable to the ground of belief which we enjoy) yet among that people of the Jews this was very ordinary. God's Law was given to *Moſes* in that manner, and God led that people by a pillar of cloud and fire, which was anſwerable to this: And in after-times, under the ſecond Temple, they confeſs this the only way of God's revealing himſelf to them. And therefore in this very matter it was allowed and pleaded by ſome prime men of that people, that if the Spirit, or an Angel, had ſpoken to *Paul*, the reſiſting him would be a fighting againſt God; and hereupon, *Acts* 23. 9. they confeſſed, that they *found no harm in him*: that God had thus ſpoken to him, thoſe men then thought probable, but did not avow the knowing it certainly, having no preſent evidence of the fact, ſave only the affirmation of *Paul* himſelf at that time. But had they had evidence of the fact by being preſent at it (as they that teſtify the voice to Chriſt were eye and ear-witneſſes of it) they would not then have thought it reaſonable to make any farther queſtion, whether that which they call the voice of the Spirit, or an Angel, were ſuch or no, and being ſuch, whether the reſiſting what was ſpoken by it were the fighting againſt God. For the teſtifying therefore of the truth of ſuch pretended facts, and indeed to leave no place for rational doubt in this matter, there is yet a farther anſwer, That the power of miracles, and the gifts of tongues that attended theſe voices and deſcents of the Holy Ghoſt from Heaven, were irrefragable teſtimonies and evidences of the reality of them, and could not be the immediate effects of deluſions, being ſuch as could not be wrought by the power of the devil, nor ever were pretended the effects of his oracular Reſponſes.

Sect. 31. Many other ways of diſcrimination there are by which the voices of the Devil, or deluſions magical, might be diſtinguiſhed from Divine, as that of Concordance with Predictions acknowledged to have come from God; and ſuch was the voice that was delivered at the deſcent of the Spirit upon Chriſt, the ſame that was foretold by the Prophet, and by him joined with the mention of the deſcent of God's Spirit upon him. And to the ſame belongs alſo the Completion of the ſo many other things in him, which had certainly been foretold of the *Meſſias*; which Concordance with Divine truth is moſt diametrically contrary to deluſion. And beſides, of the miracles which he did, moſt were to diſpoſſeſs and caſt out devils (to reſtore health, as they brought diſeaſes) who conſequently look on him as (and proclaim him) their enemy: and although this may be thought to be done by them for ſome greater advantage (as the Devil may ſuffer one charm to counter-work another) yet could they not here be thought to have uſed thoſe endeavours to raiſe Chriſt into that power of deſtroying them, or to aſſiſt their utmoſt to give him an authority in the world. Indeed the whole doctrine of Chriſt was ſo directly contrary to that which had been maintained by the Oracles, that it cannot be imagined to proceed from that principle to which they pretend. And the ſtory is approved by *Plutarch* (and the effect hath made it not improbable, that there was ſome truth in it) that about Chriſt's time a voice was heard on the Sea, that the *great god Pan was dead*, and an huge bellowing and roaring, as of infernal mourners, following it: and that this was probably the cauſe, acknowledgedly the forerunner of the Devil's ſilence, and never ſpeaking in the Oracles any more.

Sect. 32. As for the manner of the Devils giving his Reſponſes in the Oracle, it is confeſt by all that then lived and knew them, that they were delivered conſtantly by a man, who was ſeen when he did it, and was called the ἐγγαστρίμυθος, one that *ſpake under the Oracle*, out of the caverns of the earth, (by the vapour of which *Plutarch* conceived him inſpired, and ſo turned *Enthuſiaſt*) which is a far different thing from a voice (no man being ſeen) which came in a clap of thunder, with a bright ſhining cloud from Heaven. This may reaſonably ſatisfy the importunity of that objection alſo.

Sect. 33. And ſo much for the firſt part of the ground of our Faith in groſs, the teſtimony on which it is built, which being an infallible word, derived and conveyed to us by the moſt creditable means, and which we have no temptation from Reaſon to doubt of, may ſure be concluded a rational ground of belief.

CHAP. II.

A Digreſſion concerning the uſe of Reaſon in deciding Controverſies in Religion.

Sect. 1. HAving proceeded thus far for the convincing of the gainſayer; it may not be amiſs to conſider the Believer a while, and give him the Bounds or Limits within which *Reaſon* is obliged to contain it ſelf in matters of Faith, and this even by the verdict of Reaſon it ſelf. And I ſhall do it by a brief ſtating of this Queſtion.

Sect. 2. *Whether Right Reaſon be appointed the Judge of Controverſies. Whether all doubts of all ſorts be to be determined by the dictates of Nature, in the Heart of every Man which hath the uſe of Reaſon.*

To this I ſhall ground my anſwer in theſe two Rules, or Poſtulations. 1. That

Sect. 3. The meaſure of mans Natural Power of knowing or judging of things is his participating of thoſe things

things (in ſome degree) with God, in whom they are as in the Fountain. So that the man may find, and behold them in himſelf as truly, though not as eminently, or in the ſame degree, as they are in God.

For certainly, if a man, denudate of all experimental, acquired, revealed knowledge, of all foreign helps, left only to himſelf as a man endued with Reaſon, ſhould be queſtioned in any thing, and ſuppoſed able to expreſs his Conceptions, he would be fain to fetch out every word that he ſaid from within him, ſay only what his own heart could diſcern within himſelf: otherwiſe he ſhould be ſuppoſed to anſwer more than he had means to come to the knowledge of; the work done would be above the proportion of the means to it; the Concluſion would have more in it than the Premiſſes.

From hence follows this ſecond Rule, That

Men are naturally able to judge only of thoſe things which by ſome ſure connexion depend on thoſe Attributes of God which are communicated to (and particularly by) men, and are the like (as far as the adumbration or tranſcript is to the Exemplar or Pattern) for kind, though not degree, in man as in God. *Sect.* 4.

Now all Controverſies (*i. e.* all things ſubject to judgment) are reducible to two heads, Goodneſs or Truth; ſo that the Queſtion now is, Whether *Right Reaſon can infallibly judge what is good or bad, true or falſe.* *Sect.* 5.

And then to this I anſwer, Firſt, concerning the firſt Head:

For a thing to be good morally (for Metaphyſical Goodneſs is all one with Truth) depends, by ſure connexion, from that eternal Juſtice which is primarily in God, that being the Rule, as it is the Fountain, of all moral Goodneſs in men, or things; every thing being good, more or leſs, as it more or leſs partakes of that Juſtice which is in God. *Sect.* 6.

Now this being one of the Attributes of God which are called Communicable, it is truly affirmed, That that Juſtice which is in God is the very ſame in ſubſtance communicated to men, though in a lower degree. And therefore it follows by the ſecond Rule, That man, by the light of Nature and general Impreſſions, *i. e.* by a power of ſeeing whatſoever is within his Sphere, is enabled by God to judge what is juſt, what not, what morally good, what bad. And no man judges amiſs in theſe things, but he that hath his judgment corrupted by ſome prepoſſeſſion, or habitual vice, or preſent prevailing temptation, and therefore of moral Controverſies, *i. e.* whether a thing naturally, or in it ſelf, be good or bad, juſt or not, right Reaſon is a Judge. *Sect.* 7.

Yet this with this Caution or Limitation, that it be not extended to thoſe things wherein the Law of Nature hath been elevated higher by any poſitive Law of Chriſt. For, as right Reaſon cannot judge what is Lawful in any particular Kingdom, becauſe what Nature hath made lawful, the Municipal Laws of that place may have forbidden and made unlawful, (and that right Reaſon cannot take notice of, unleſs it be told ſo:) ſo in Chriſt's Kingdom, the Church, when he hath forbidden what Nature had left free and unforbidden, Reaſon (untaught by Chriſt) cannot ſay that that is unlawful, yet generally will be found to bear that Teſtimony to Chriſt, that what Chriſt hath ſuper-added to the Law of Nature, right Reaſon will of its own accord commend as beſt, or moſt laudable and excellent in them that do it; though, not knowing any Precept for it, it will not affirm that it is neceſſary, ſo as it cannot be omitted without ſin. *Sect.* 8.

Then concerning the Second Head, I anſwer,

That for a thing to be true, *i. e.* to have a Being either potential or actual, depends partly on God's Power, partly on his Will. In reſpect of its potential being, it depends on his Power; in reſpect of its actual, on his Will. *Sect.* 9.

Now God's Power, though it may in ſome ſence be ſaid communicable to the Creature, becauſe all ability in the Creature is a gleam of infinite Ability in God, yet is not this ſo communicated as his Juſtice or Goodneſs was ſaid to be. For Goodneſs in the creature is a kind of image truly reſembling the goodneſs in God, and that a kind of natural image, as is the face in the glaſs not a voluntary one, which hath its Being from the variable Will of the Artificer. But power or ability in the Creature is not thus a natural image of God's Power, but as a reflection of a thing which voluntarily and variouſly caſts its beams. Voluntarily, I ſay, becauſe the diſpenſing of his Power, either in manner or meaſure, is a free act of his Will; and variouſly, becauſe he doth it, firſt, unequally; and ſecondly, not ſo to any, but that he can (and ſometimes doth) withdraw or ſuſpend it when it is beſtowed: ſo that I cannot ſay, that, as that which is juſt in God to be done, is juſt to be done by the Creature, ſo what is poſſible to be done by God, is poſſible to be done by the Creature. *Sect.* 10.

The reaſon of the not communicating of God's Power to the Creature as well as his Juſtice, may be this, becauſe it conduced not to the end of the Creatures Creation, as the other did: for though God intended to make a Creature truly good and juſt, yet he did not truly powerful. Power indeed being in it ſelf not a vertue, as Juſtice is, nor in it ſelf morally good or evil, and therefore not ſo agreeable to the condition of a Creature, but rather indeed peculiar to the Majeſty of a Creator. *Sect.* 11.

From all this it follows by the ſaid ſecond rule, that man is not able to fathom Potential Truths, becauſe Power is not the ſame in Subſtance in God and in the Creature, and therefore by what is in the Creature he is no way enabled to conceive what is in God, and ſo conſequently to define of any Potential Truth; becauſe, though it may not be wrought by any thing that is in the Creature, or within his ſphere of knowledge, yet it may be by God. *Sect.* 12.

All the natural Impreſſion or light that in this behalf a rational Creature hath, is, that *two contradictories cannot be true at once*; and therefore I think all Principles that are not thought fit to be proved in any natural ſcience, (if they be truly ſo) may eaſily be reſolved into this one, *A thing cannot at once be and not be.* And this natural impreſſion riſes not from any obſervation of the power communicated to the Creature (for then ſtill it would hold, that though man cannot do Contradictories at once, yet God may) but from a ſight that this would be an effect of extreme impotency, more than is conceiveable in any Creature, and therefore cannot be imputed to God, who is conceived Omnipotent; nor conſequently to man, unleſs God ſhould take away all degrees *Sect.* 13.

of

of power quite from him, and then he ſhould be annihilated.

Sect. 14. Now for actual Truths already in Being, which are works either mediately or immediately of God's Will, our Reaſon is no farther judge of them than as God's Will is communicated to us by ſome Images or Pictures of it; either ſubſtantial and real, as, when a thing done is preſented to the Faculty to which it is objicible, there a real image of God's Will is impreſt in me, (and by that I may judge diſtinctly;) or when it is revealed to me either from God, or from any other Witneſs, of which in this matter I am convinced that he partakes of God's Veracity, *i. e.* would not lie to me, and this may be called an intentional Image of God's Will impreſt in me.

Sect. 15. Thus may right Reaſon judge of things in Being, either becauſe it is ſo really repreſented to the Senſes, and that is evidence; or becauſe it is either reveal'd or elſe atteſted by God, which Reaſon knows can neither erre nor deceive, and this is adherence; or becauſe ſuch a concurrence of Teſtimonies agrees to tell me ſo as I have no Motive or Reaſon to disbelieve, and this is humane Faith, (which may reaſonably take place, until I either ſee ſomewhat or receive ſomewhat by an higher Teſtimony revealed to the contrary:) which alſo is weaker or ſtronger, according to the importance of the matter, authority of the Teſtifiers, my particular danger if I be deceived in it, *&c.*

Hence the Concluſion is, That

Sect. 16. Right Reaſon is able to judge of all merely Moral Objects, whether any thing be good or bad morally; of Natural Objects in matter of Fact, whether ſuch a thing be done or no, by the help of the means ſpecified, and by Diſcourſe, and Analogy from things that we ſee are done, to judge that ſuch another thing is poſſible. But of ſupernatural Truths, ſuch things as it never diſcern'd in Nature, either in the kind or the like, it cannot judge any farther than thus: Either firſt, that though we cannot do it, yet, for ought we know, it is poſſible (nay it hath a Being) with God; or ſecondly, that God hath affirmed it ſo, therefore I am ſure it is; or thirdly, what comes to me from Authority, that I have no reaſon to ſuſpect, but, on the contrary, concurrence of all Reaſons to be perſwaded by it; nay, there are ſome inward Characters in the thing it ſelf, that make me caſt off all jealouſy or doubt of ſuch affirmations, and therefore I believe it is ſo. But generally, and *in theſi*, it is no way judge of theſe laſt kind of Controverſies.

Sect. 17. And therefore though God, in moral Actions, even in himſelf, ſubmits and appeals to mans reaſon, *Iſa.* 5. 3. *Ezek.* 18. 25. yet in theſe latter he derides all thoſe that go about to judge of them by Reaſon, 1 *Cor.* 1. 20. And agreeably Saint *Paul* in his Preaching the Goſpel, for the proving the truth of Chriſtianity, was fain, ſaith [t] *Origen*, to uſe a peculiar way of Demonſtration, firſt, by comparing of Prophecies in the Old Teſtament concerning Chriſt; ſecondly, by Miracles: but in Practical matters he appeals to that which was *written in every ones heart*, Rom. 2. 15.

[t] ἡ ἀποτείσαν παρὰ τῶν ἀπὸ διαλεκτικῆς ἑλληνικῶν. Cont. Celſ. p. 4.

Sect. 18. To this purpoſe hath *Eulogius* an Oration againſt thoſe who think to be able to comprehend the true Theology of Chriſtians (*i. e.* Chriſtians Diſcourſes concerning the Perſons of the Deity) * by the Wit or Reaſon of Man; and *Photius* hath approved of that Diſcourſe of his, that he doth [x] *Talk of God pioufly and devoutly*, and ſet *Chriſtian Divinity a pitch beyond humane wiſdom*, [y] *ſuperior to all other* [z] *artificial method, or rules of Art.*

* τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων διανοίας, p. 862.

[x] θεολογεῖν ὁσίως.

[y] ἡ κρείττων πάσης διατεχνήσεως. [z] Vide Juſt. Mart. p. 5. & 6. A. & 8. C. & 9. A. *So* Juſt. Mart. p. 375. A. *and for the* πῶς τοῦτο, p. 379. *So for the* τρόπος *of the union of Chriſt's natures*, 382. B. σαφὴς ἔλεγχος ἀπιστίας τὸ πῶς οὐ δεῖ λίγειν, 386. B. 387. D. 388. A.

Sect. 19. In ſumme, it is obſervable in the writing of the Scripture, that generally in defining theſe laſt ſorts of Truths, God's Authority is ſet down as the onely proof of what is ſaid, without uſing any other way of arguing, or ſecular demonſtration: All that is indulged to mens Reaſon being onely this; Firſt, to conſider whether it be not very equal and reaſonable to believe God without any other motive or topick of proof, even in thoſe things which are above or beſide right Reaſon, nay, againſt the propoſals of corrupt; and ſecondly, to ſearch (by what helps ſoever a reaſonable mans prudence and diligence can ſuggeſt, or furniſh him with) which is that word of God which contains theſe Revelations, which Reaſon tells them they muſt believe without farther reaſoning.

Sect. 20. But not to ſuffer my ſelf to believe any thing (though revealed by the Scriptures) but what Reaſon otherwiſe would lead me to, is the ſame that *Celſus* perſwaded the Heathens (of his ſide) to, againſt Chriſt, to [a] follow Reaſon and the rational guide in all the doctrines we receive, all error and deceit being, ſaith he, brought into the World by Faith; and that they that believed any thing without Reaſon for it, are like them that delight in Juglers, *&c.* and therefore he laughs at all thoſe who requiring not Reaſon for what they believe, uſe this phraſe, [b] *Do not examine but believe, thy Faith ſhall ſave thee*, as men that are diſpleaſed with wiſdom, and in love with folly. To all which, *Origen*, as acute a Reaſoner as any, oppoſes nothing but the Evidence of Prophecies, and the Word of God for this rule of Faith. Which if it be not ſimply believed without any Philoſophical rational enquiry concerning the things affirmed in it, many will of neceſſity ſtill wallow in Infidelity after all that God hath done for the reſcuing them out of it, and only a few find that by rational ſearch which before they believed by ſimple Faith.

[a] λόγῳ ἀκολουθοῦντας καὶ λογικῷ ὁδηγῷ, παρεμπίπτειν δόγματα, ὡς πάντως ἀπάτης γε νομίζοντος τῷ μὴ ἄνευ σωκατατίθεσθαι τῷ λόγῳ τισί. *Orig. cont. Celſ.* p. 8.

[b] μὴ ἐξέταζε, ἀλλὰ πίστευσον, πίστις σου σώσει σε.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

Of the power of the Affections and Interests in matter of Faith.

THE belief of Christianity being in the first Chapter supposed to be thus sufficiently recommended to the Understanding, which is a well-natured faculty, and very ready to hear Reason when it is offered to it: there is but one Obstruction possible, and that is from mens Affections or Interests; and that by two ways of proceeding; first mediately, secondly immediately. *Sect.* 1.

First, they work mediately by the Will, and have sometimes that unhappy influence upon that, as by their importunity to perswade it to interpose before the full Representment or Proposal of the object, and so to hinder the free access of the Argument to the Understanding. *Sect.* 2.

Thus we see it often in prejudicate and passionate men, who are impatient of hearing or considering any thing that may dispossess them. And thus we see it sometimes in those of a better temper, who yet being unwilling to lose any Advantages which they can make use of to maintain their present perswasions, are so intent upon their own part of the dispute that they do not receive the opposite Arguments with that equal Justice of improving them to the height with which they are offered, or to which, if it had happened that they had undertaken the maintenance of the other part, they could have heightned them. This latter, being not an effect of so great a distemper, is not so discernible (to our selves especially) as the other; but yet is a fault, and that of ill consequence, and a deviation from the rules of distributive Justice, which would allow as much of our Attention or Diligence to the improving of the Arguments of the one part as of the other, and expres as impartial a kindness to the Neighbour as to my self. And in all this the Will is culpable for being thus (more or less) instrumental to the Affections. And so it is Negatively also, whensoever we do not use that industry of search as our condition permits, and the importance of the matter requires of us. *Sect.* 3.

But then, secondly, The affections and interests do themselves immediately, sometimes, perform their own business; they cloud and darken the understanding, and make it less capable and receptive of such Representations as are made to it. *Sect.* 4.

This made *Aristole* to affirm, That Pleasures are in some men [a] corruptive of Principles, *i. e.* that those common dictates of nature, *&c.* which are by all unbyassed men naturally consented to as true, and unquestioned, do yet to voluptuous men (and the same holds in matter of fear, and interest, and the other passions, and ill habits also) become matter of dispute, whether they be true or not: not because in Reason any thing can there be offered fit to infuse scruples into a rational man, or to combat with the far greater potency of Reason on the other side, which denominated them Principles; but because these rational dictates having somewhat in them which is contrary to, and unreconcileable with, passions and sensitive pleasures, those consequently that have indulged to them, and espoused them, as the most desireable things, do, for the enjoying of them, undervalue and despise the rational Arguments, which would cost them so dear (even the parting with their lusts) if they continued in that reputation which is due to them. *Sect.* 5.

[a] φθαρτικαὶ τῶν ἀρχῶν.

Hence is it that the more prudent of Heathen Philosophers have proposed it as the best Preparative to the studying and search of Truth, to have mens Affections and Appetites well regulated first (though not by reading or studying the Books and Science of Morals or Ethicks, yet) by [b] Assuetude and vertuous Custom, by inartificial Precepts and sober Education, *&c.* moderating and tempering their Passions, and bringing them [c] to live Orthodoxly, [d] lest having their Reason disturbed by Passions, they be not able to pass an exact judgment of things. And without this, say they, it is as impossible for a man to behold and judge aright of Truths (such Truths as have any thing any way contrary to passions) [e] as for a man with sore eyes to behold illustrious splendid Objects, without being anointed or cured of their distemper. *Sect.* 6.

[b] διὰ ἀγωγῆς συνηθισμοῦ καὶ ἀτέχνων παραινέσεων τὸ ἦθος ἡμῶν ἀπαθυνόντων. Simplic. in Categ. Arist.

[c] ὀρθοδοξαστῶς ζῆν, κατὰ τὰ Ἠθικὰ διατυπώματα, Anonym. Schol in Categ. [d] ἵνα μὴ τεθολωμένου ὑπὸ τῶν παθῶν τὸ λογισμὸν ἔχοντες, τὰς περὶ τῶν πραγμάτων κρίσεις μὴ ἀκριβῶς φέρωμεν. Id. [e] ὥσπερ ὀφθαλμῷ λημῶντι, καὶ κεκαθαιρμένῳ, τὰ σφόδρα φωτινὰ ἰδεῖν οὐκ οἷόν τε. οὕτω καὶ τῇ ψυχῇ μὴ τῷ ἀρετῷ κεκτημένῃ, τὸ τ' ἀληθὲς ἐποπτεῖσαι καλλος. Hierocl. in Præf. ad. χρυσᾶ ἔπη.

Accordingly it hath been observed in the first Ages of the Church, that luxurious and intemperate men were of all others most hardly brought to believe the Christian Doctrine of the Resurrection of the Body and Immortality of the Soul, because their carnal joys being so material and gross, and contrary to what Christ hath taught of an Eternal Life, and of Spiritual Bodies, and Bliss, their being so deeply engaged and immerst in the former, fortified them pertinaciously against all impression from the latter, and enabled them to hold out finally against the belief of those Christian Truths, which others of more ruly tempers, upon equal Reasons, and the same Representation, did most readily embrace and assent to. *Sect.* 7.

And it is worth our present consideration and enquiry, whether they which are now most willing to entertain doubts of the truth of Christianity, are either more sharp discerners of truth then all others that are not (or then themselves, before they) arrived to this pitch of *Stanchness* and *Scepticism*; or again, whether they have seriously spent any considerable time in reviewing their Principles, and, doing so, have sprang any special new Arguments which they had not considered before, and those of such weight with them, that they will contentedly expose themselves to all the torments of Hell (the sure reward of an Atheistical Antichristian life) upon the bare probability of those their Arguments, (which cannot be rationally done by them, unless their pretensions against Christian Religion exceed ours for it, in strength of Credibility, as far as an eternal Hell exceeds those short sufferings of this life to which Christianity betrays us; or as an eternal state of spiritual bliss in Heaven doth surpass the transitory, unsatisfactory, short pleasures of sin in this life;) or whether it *Sect.* 8.

be

be not really their freer indulgence to some Liberties which Christianity admits not of, (and that more against light, and against the importunity of God's judgments, than before) or perhaps some change of affairs abroad, which hath made the practice of Christianity a more inconvenient, costly thing, than it was wont to be; most men being willing to have the Advantages of Religion, as long as there be but few, and supportable, encumbrances that attend it, and after changing their opinion of it, when they have run any hazards by it.

Sect. 9. Which truly is so far from being new or strange, that it was a part of the Character that our Christ set upon himself and his Doctrine, both in that Parable of the *Seed that fell upon stony ground*, which is supposed to be scorched at the rising of the Sun upon it, and by that close of his answer to *John*'s Disciples, *Blessed is he that is not scandalized at me*, foretelling them that the most eminent and considerable danger to Christian Religion is, That they which in prosperous times are forward Professors of it, will, when their Religion begins to offer them smart, fairly forsake and fall off from it.

Sect. 10. Thus much hath been premised to this second Head of Arguments, on purpose to shew the influence that matter of advantage may have on Belief; and that on either side, not only where mens interests do chance to thwart their perswasions, but also, and as discernibly, when they appear on their sides, to assist and confirm them.

Sect. 11. For so certainly did the sweetness and well tastedness of the *Manna* work as effectually on the Faith of some Jews, make them as willing to adhere to God and *Moses*, in opposition to returning to *Egypt*, as the new miraculous manner of the coming of that down upon them; and the *Milk* and *Honey of Canaan* were very good Motives, and Allectives, and Engagements to the Faith and Obedience of others: And so in like manner the carnality of the paradise that *Mahomet* promised to his disciples hath much advanced the credit, and facilitated the belief, and disguised the grosness and absurdities of the *Alcoran*.

Sect. 12. And because Advantages are not to be disliked because they are such, but because they pretend and are mistaken to be such, when they are not, and by so doing do rob us of those that are truly so, or that are infinitely weightier and more considerable; and because that which is really the most advantageous is always most rational, most prudent for man to chuse and pursue and aspire to; therefore it is that to the former argument of the reasonableness of the ground or testimony on which we believe Christian Religion to be true, I now proceed to the advantages that those that embrace it shall reap by it, both because most mens Objections against Christianity are founded in an opinion, that it is not an advantageous Profession, and would have no other quarrel to it if they were satisfied that it were; and also because though advantageousness no way contributes to the making or proving a thing to be true or false, yet it doth to the making it more or less worth believing or embracing, (for every slight truth is not such) and so more or less fit to be set up in our hearts as our Religion.

Sect. 13. For, that by Religion every man entertains hopes of acquiring somewhat of benefit to himself, and would not chuse to enter into those bands, if he did not promise himself some advantage by it, is a *Maxime* which I shall not think fit to prove or confirm in this place.

CHAP. IV.

Of the Advantages of Christian Religion in the gross.

Sect. 1. THere is nothing therefore after the testifying of the Truth so proper for this present Disquisition, as the consideration of the Advantages of Christian Religion, and those advanced above all other imaginable advantages of any other Religion, as much as the credibility of Christian Religion is above the credibility of any other that pretends against it.

Sect. 2. This I am by my premised Method obliged to consider here only as true in the gross. And that will be done by this one consideration, which hath been enlarged on * in other papers, That the Precepts of Christ, especially his superadditions to the former Laws of *Moses* and of Nature, are, beyond all the contrary Vices, or the lower degrees of the same Vertues, perfectly agreeable to Humane Reason, cultivated, and improved, and heightned by Philosophy; so that that shall confess those things to be still most commendable and most excellent which Christ hath thought fit to command his Followers. This might be demonstrated through all particulars: but I shall more strictly restrain my self to the Advantages of a Christian life, by considering it first in order to outward, and secondly to inward advantages.

* Second Sermon on *Matt.* 11.30.

Sect. 3. The outward advantages are again more publick, or more private. Of the publick there is none sure more valuable and more fundamental to all other than that of Peace; and that is so immediately and inseparably annext to the Christian Doctrine, that, would men think fit to be guided by that Rule, were but Christ's Precepts constantly practised, there would be no occasion of distemper or disturbance through the world, either between Christian Potentates among themselves, or betwixt any Christian Prince and the Subjects of his own Kingdom.

Sect. 4. First, In what state or condition soever a man is placed in any Nation, be he King or Subject, this commands him most strictly therein to abide with God; every man to content himself with his present portion, whether it be of Soveraignty or of inferiour estate under Subjection. Then secondly, wheresoever the Supremacy of power is placed by the Laws of any Kingdom, there Christ requires Subjection and non-resistance in all Subjects; and both by himself, and in the Writings of his Disciples, † repeateth and impresseth that far more earnestly on the Subject, than he doth the duty of Protection on the Supreme; and where they [a] conjoin them both, there they begin constantly with that of subjection in the Inferiour, as being of more universal concernment to the Peace and Preservation of the whole, and as that which earns the Superiors performing of his duty, as a due reward to their Obedience.

† Matt. 22.21. Acts 23. 5. Rom. 13. 1 Pet. 2.13,18.

[a] Eph. 5.22,25. & 6. 1, 4, 5, 9. 1 Pet. 3. 1, 7.

Obedience. Thirdly, Chriſt prohibits ſelf-love, thinking highly of ones ſelf, all covetouſneſs, ambition, animoſities, revenge, doing or returning of injuries, whiſperings, backbitings, diſtruſts and jealouſies, all ſcrupulous preventions of remote poſſible dangers: and Fourthly, he commands doing as we would be done to, bleſſing of enemies, contempt of the world, not valuing any thing which is moſt tempting in it, and, above all things, purſuing of Peace with all men, (in the greateſt extent imaginable) as much as in them lies, and where-ever it is poſſible, even over the whole world. And fifthly, the Precepts delivered by Chriſt (plain and intelligible to all) as they are a Standard by which every man is to meaſure his own actions, ſo are they alſo to examine others, and conſequently they will fortify againſt Seducers and ſly diſturbers of a peoples Peace, if, according to Chriſt's direction, we try them by their fruits, and reject and ſtop our ears againſt all thoſe whoſe doctrines bring not exact Concordance to Chriſtian practice along with them. And where theſe Precepts are put in practice, what poſſible in-let is there left for Diſturbance or Sedition to enter?

Sect. 5. After Peace, Plenty is the moſt deſireable publick good, and that is hardly ſeparable from the former; but, beſide the Contributions which all the fomenters of peace have made toward Plenty alſo, Chriſtian Religion hath peculiar ways of aſcertaining any people of that, if its Laws be embraced and practiſed. For, firſt, Chriſt commands labour, and induſtry, and diligence, baniſhes the idle, as a [b] *diſorderly walker*, disbands him as ſoon as he appears to be ſuch. Secondly, he makes the rich man his Almoner or Steward to diſtribute to every mans wants as he is able: and as he bleſſes his liberality and renders it the moſt probable courſe to make him rich; ſo he convinces him, that gathering and hoarding up wealth is the meaneſt, and, withal, the moſt diſadvantageous folly, and that the only real Commodity in riches is the Joy and Happineſs of relieving others, and the inhancing of their future Reward by ſo doing. Thirdly, he forbids rapines, defraudings, gaining to our ſelves by any other mans loſſes: And fourthly, by putting the wealth of the world in a Chanel, to deſcend from Superiours to Inferiours, from him that hath to him that hath not, from the part that is filled to that other that is emptied, he makes a certain Proviſion for every part of the body. And beyond all this, fifthly, he hath taught men, that all the good of Plenty is to be enjoyed in a Competence or a Sufficience, (and that there is only more trouble, and more charge, and more fears, and more temptations annexed to any greater abundance.) And ſixthly, he hath given all his faithful Servants aſſurance, that he that hath the diſpoſing of all, and knows what they have need of, will never ſo deſtitute them that they ſhall want theſe neceſſary things. And when Plenty is thus interpreted, and theſe Proviſions made for it, there will be little poſſibility that any people that live according to theſe Rules ſhall fail of that certain benefit of them.

[b] ἀτάκτως περιπατοῦντες. 2. Theſſ. 3. 6.

Sect. 6. Then for the private outward Advantages to every Chriſtian-liver, they will be as diſcernible alſo. And theſe are of two ſorts, Firſt, thoſe that have an univerſal influence on the comfortableneſs and chearfulneſs of the whole life, without which neither health nor wealth, nor any particular advantage will have any taſte or reliſh in them: Secondly, thoſe particulars of health, *&c.* Of the firſt ſort, I ſhall be confident to prefer the obſervance of one Chriſtian Precept, Attending to a mans particular Calling, which as it is the ſtrict duty of every Chriſtian of what rank or quality ſoever, ſo is it that which ſweetens the whole life to him that lives orderly according to that Rule. It is certain that Aſſuetude and cuſtom hath a moral efficacy in it to make every thing pleaſant that is accuſtomed, (were it not upon that ſcore, it is not imaginable that ſome ſins to ſome men, which have natural averſions to them, ſhould ever be taught to go down ſo ſmoothly.) By this means, buſineſs and bodily labour it ſelf, which at the diſtance ſeems moſt uneaſy, to thoſe that have been brought up in it proves moſt pleaſant and delightful. To ſuch an one, idleneſs and want of imployment is really the moſt uneaſy affliction of his life.

Sect. 7. And for him that is not brought up to either of theſe, yet we ſee by Experience, and are able to give the Reaſon of it, from the active temper both of the body and mind of man, that there is no ſuch conſtant torment as the not knowing what to do with his time, the having his hours lie upon his hands; for the removing of which moſt of the vain or ſinful mixtures of our lives are ſought out, as cures or divertiſements, and having no real pleaſantneſs in them, do yet imitate ſome, by ridding us of the contrary uneaſineſs, the burthen of that idle time, which is made more ſupportable by ſuch varieties. Thus hath that uncharitable and very mean quality of cenſuring and backbiting and deriding of others become ſo frequent and faſhionable in the world, (ſo inſeparable from all our Converſations, the only modern good Company, as it is called) only becauſe many perſons have no other imployment for their time but that of talking; and of that ſort this is the moſt obvious to thoſe who have neither zeal enough to their own good, nor ſo much of friendſhip to thoſe with whom they converſe, as to make the faults of one another (in order to the reforming or fortifying one another) the ſubject of their diſcourſe. To this and all other ſins and vanities of this nature, this duty of attending the Calling is a certain Antidote or Cure: The advantages of which cannot be more eminently exemplified than among thoſe men who by miſtake are conceived to have no Obligation of Calling upon them, I mean thoſe of the Nobility and Gentry in a Kingdom. I ſhall inlarge on this inſtance a little.

Sect. 8. The Calling of thoſe that are not born to Eſtates or Poſſeſſions is generally acknowledged to be ſomewhat of Labour or Induſtry for the acquiring of wealth; and to them may reaſonably be confined that part of *Adam*'s Curſe (which is yet ſweetned to Chriſtians by Chriſt) that *in the ſweat of their brows they ſhall eat their bread.* But then thoſe that have ample poſſeſſions left them, ſufficient for themſelves and family, (and much more) and beſides, a perpetuity of that to their Families for ever, are certainly under no ſuch obligation to labour, to increaſe ſo fair an heap, or to ſpend that pretious time and ſweat and induſtry on the bringing more water into the Ocean, or indeed more weight unto that burthen of wealth which lies already an encumbrance (more commonly than a real advantage) on their ſhoulders. Their Calling therefore, without queſtion, conſiſts in the ſcattering not encreaſing, in the diſcreet, charitable diſtribution of that early revenue which is committed to their ſtewarding, *i. e.* in the uſing that wealth (to the richeſt advantages they are able) to the ſervice of God. Such is the ſpending their time as Citizens not of one City, but of the World, enqui-

ring what is the duty of mankind, and how they may ſerve God chearfully in thoſe Precepts of Chriſt which are of the greateſt perfection, obſerving the wonderful things of God's Law, and the Harmony which thoſe notes of Diſcord make, which to the unskilful or untuneable ear are ſo harſh. This and much more in reference to God: and then in order to Men, the well ordering of that part of the Commonwealth wherein they are imployed, the relieving of thoſe that want, the attracting inferiours by Exhortation, Admonition, Correption, (but eſpecially by exemplary acts of all piety) to the practice of Chriſtianity, and, as much as in them lies, bringing vertue into countenance and reputation, into faſhion and credit in the world.

Sect. 9. That wealth and eminency of place are very proper inſtruments toward this end, will not be needful to be demonſtrated here; all that is ſeaſonable will be, to conſider what a Treaſure of Joy and Sweetneſs would come in to every ſuch perſon in a Kingdom by a conſtant chearful attendance on the ſeverals of this calling, every one of them infinitely more proportionable to the appetites of a generous ingenuous mind than any thing elſe which his ambition could ſuggeſt to him, nothing vulgar or mean in it: and (beſide all the particular delights in every act of each) the great tranſcendent comfort of having ſatisfied Conſcience, the not having lived an unprofitable burthen of the Earth, the having in ſome meaſure performed the task for which he came into the world, would be to him that comes to reap them unſpeakable raviſhments, though at the diſtance perhaps, the ſenſual deſigner diſcerns not ſuch excellencies in them.

Sect. 10. Next are the ſeveral particular external advantages, as they are the deſired portion of every individual man, which (beyond all other prudential methods imaginable) Obedience to Chriſt's Precepts provides for us. Of this ſort, firſt, the health of the Body (the foundation of all other outward comforts) cannot better be preſerved from diſeaſes, than by ſtrict rules of conſtant temperance and ſobriety, and of faſting and abſtinence ſometimes, of continence or conjugal chaſtity, of active and induſtrious purſuit of the buſineſs of the Calling; nor can it better be ſecured from wounds and maims and violent deaths, than by mildneſs, and quietneſs, and ſobriety, and bearing of injuries; all which are the ſpecial charges of Chriſtian Religion.

Sect. 11. The very ſame practices, beſide theſe proprieties of advantage to the health, and eaſe, and ſtrength of the body, have in them a far greater delight and pleaſure and gratefulneſs to the ſenſes than any of the unchriſtian contraries. No pleaſure in eating and drinking like that in the temperate feeding on the plaineſt, wholeſomeſt diet; and ſo in the reſt.

Sect. 12. For Reputation, another ſpecial outward advantage, it is clear, that beſides that Chriſtian Religion teaches every man to *think better of others than himſelf*, forbids judging and reproaching and backbiting, and ſo moſt certainly preſerves that Jewel entire to every man; the practice of Chriſtian Vertues commands eſteem and value even from thoſe which leaſt exerciſe them themſelves. The proud man cannot chuſe but reverence the meek, the debauch'd man the temperate, the greateſt ſelf-ſeeker him that moſt deveſts himſelf of all his ſelf-intereſts. There are not three things in the World which ſo certainly bring a good reputation along with them, as Charity, and Humility, and Conſtancy; and theſe three are the prime commands of Chriſtian Religion.

Sect. 13. After the outward, I proceed to the inward advantages, the advantages of the Soul; and thoſe either of this life at the preſent, or in order to another life.

Sect. 14. The Chriſtian Precepts tend evidently to the bettering of the Soul in this life: Firſt, by purging. The Heathen Philoſophers, *Porphyrie*; and divers others, eſpecially the Pythagoreans, were much concerned in the pollutions of the Soul which they diſcerned, and beyond all things in the World deſired and endeavoured the purging them out, ſought to Magick and Sorcery to that end, but terribly miſtook in that way to it. Our Chriſt hath done this, by the Grace and Doctrine of Repentance, as far as is neceſſary for an inferiour State. And ſo, is foretold by the old Prophets under the ſtyle of [*the deſire of all Nations*] and [*the expectation of the Gentiles*] as he that brought with him, in his precepts and in his graces, a full ſatisfaction to all the gaſpings and thirſts of the moſt rational and earneſt appetites about us.

Sect. 15. Secondly, by cultivating it with all uſeful knowledge and true wiſdom. For ſuch, by the Oracles own confeſſion, is Practical Knowledge; and of that kind all the Philoſophers that ever were never aſcended to ſo high pitches as Chriſt's one Sermon in the Mount hath done.

Sect. 16 Thirdly, by ſatisfying it, allowing it here thoſe injoyments which of all others a rational Soul is pleaſed with. 1. The pleaſures of friendſhip, or profitable converſation, admoniſhing and inſtructing one another. 2. The pleaſure and ſpecial raviſhment of relieving and refreſhing thoſe that want, of making a poor man happy. 3. The pleaſure of contentment, and deſiring nothing but what we enjoy. 4. The pleaſure of Victories, in reſiſting and overcoming temptations of all ſorts, but eſpecially of, *overcoming evil with good*. And whenever there is any unpleaſant mixture, then 5. The pleaſure of a difficult obedience, thereby to approve our love and zeal to him who hath given himſelf for us.

Sect. 17. And fourthly, by daily rewarding of it: 1. By the comforts and joyous reflexions of a good Conſcience (as that is ſet off by the contrary Hell and torments of a bad.) 2. By the ſeveral eaſes that the ſeveral Chriſtian vertues give men here: the eaſe of Patience, contrary to the uneaſineſs of rage; the eaſe of contempt of the World, contrary to the perpetual drudgery and toils of the worldling; the eaſe of the continent man, contrary to the flames and diſquiets of the libidinous. 3. By the preſent experience of God's loving kindneſs here, in anſwering of thoſe Prayers which are uſeful for us, in denying thoſe which would be hurtful, in reſtraining us ſometimes, in exciting us at other times, in ſpeaking peace to our Souls, *&c.* 4. By converſing with God by meditation, by thankſgiving, ſinging Hoſannahs and Hallelujahs to him, the moſt joyous employment in the World. Nay, by a perpetual chearfulneſs, *rejoycing always*; which, as it would be another mans reward, ſo is it the duty of a Chriſtian. 5. By the expectations of a reward in another life; which, though future, is yet by the benefit of two Chriſtian vertues, Faith and Hope, foreſtalled, and anticipated, and made preſent to us. And all theſe, if there were not infinitely more, were ſure advantages enough to entertain a ſhort life of fifty or threeſcore years, and ſecure it from being weariſom to a Chriſtian, or

from

from needing those sinful, shameful, unworthy divertisements that all other sorts of men, on purpose that their time may not lie upon their hands, are fain to seek out unto themselves.

Lastly, the Advantages which a Christian reaps by Christ are in order to another life. And those I shall best represent to you by shewing these two things. 1. The Valuableness of the Reward promised by Christ, and aspired to by Christians, infinitely above all other rewards that any other Religion pretends to bestow upon men. 2. The Attainableness of that Reward, and the blame that will light on none but our selves (so that we shall be bound to acknowledge our selves most stupidly wretchless and irrational) if we do not attain to it. *Sect.* 18.

For the former, the Valuableness of the Christians future reward, infinitely above the wages of any other Religion, that will appear, 1. by the Immateriality, and 2. by the Eternity of it: Both these it is defined to be, by Christ; and by being so, is concluded to be an eternal, infinitely blissful state. And that Christ said true in that, need not again be proved, God himself having been proved to bear him witness, that all that he said is true. The Immateriality of this reward demonstrates it agreeable and proportioned to the nobler part of us, the upper or rational Soul; all other grosser pleasures, the *Mahumetans* enjoying of women, and the *Jews* long life in a *Canaan*, being gratifications to the viler parts of us, our senses or bodies, and to those too in their vilest state, as they are natural, not as they shall be spiritual (and equal to Angelical) bodies. *Sect.* 19.

Having said this, I need not add the shamefulness and emptiness and unsatisfactoriness of all bodily pleasures, proceeding partly from the covetous ingrateful condition of that basest part of us, as the Heathens have styled the body, partly from the great meanness and poorness and baseness of all bodily contents (so unworthy to be the ambitions, or any thing but the servants and attendants of the reasonable Soul) and the instant satieties and irksomnesses that they always are attended with, such as nothing could make any mere man place any considerable value upon them, were not he either cheated into it, at the distance, by the false glosses that other men put upon them, and by seeing what hazards are willingly run in pursuit of them; or were he not early ingaged in an habitual indulgence to them, which makes that difficult to part with which he hath injoyed so long, and so consequently which imitates some pleasure (and is mistaken for it) by the contrary painfulness of giving it over. *Sect.* 20.

Whereas on the other side the immaterial, spiritual, more sublime satisfactions to the pure undefatigable Spirit, the rational immortal Soul within us, as they cannot be liable to those baseneses and emptinesses, so neither are they in danger of those satieties; and by satisfying and blessing that part of us which is infinitely most excellent in our natures, must of themselves necessarily be concluded most superlatively excellent, and deserve, as such, to be infinitely preferred and most valued by us. *Sect.* 21.

Having said this one thing of the Immateriality of the Christians future reward, and agreeableness to that part about us which alone is worth providing for, (the happinesses of the other inferiour parts being consequent to and included in this, and a provision withal being (by the wisdom of our God) made for them that they shall no longer desire or want those enjoyments, which is perfectly the same, if not with some advantage better than if they had them) it is not possible any farther improvement or accession should be made to this reward, but only by the perpetuating of it. *Sect.* 22.

And this is that other part of Christ's Promise, That the bliss which he thus bestows shall in respect of its own plenitude never be exhausted or diminished; nor again, through the repentance of the Donor or the envy of any other, ever be withdrawn or forced from us. *Sect.* 23.

And this is a great Enhancement and Evidence of the Rationalness of our Religion, how severe soever Christ's Commands or how rigid his Exactings are supposed to be, or what sharpness soever we here are forced or permitted to endure in approving our Obedience to him. If there be any Difficulty in the Obedience, or Ungratefulness in the sufferings of a Christian's life, yet the abundant recompence of the present advantages, and, after those, of the Soul-ravishing unspeakable bliss (infinitely above the weight of the hardest or roughest part of Christ's task of Performances, and above the proportion of the sowrest portion that any pious man tastes in the afflictions of this life) were they supposed to be of the same equal duration, would make our Hopes and Patience and Perseverance perfectly rational, according to the balances with which indifferent men weigh, or Husband-men labour, or Merchants traffick here on Earth. *Sect.* 24.

But when to every minute of a pleasant not painful Obedience, to every mite of Pressure (which God that sends gives strength also to bear chearfully, makes matter not of Patience, but Victory and Rejoycing to us) there is most immutably ascertained to us by Christ an *eternal* (ETERNAL) *weight of glory*, how impossible is it that those few sowr drops of so short-transitory Obedience and Patience, should not be drowned and lost in that vast Ocean, whereinto within a while they shall be really, and at the instant, by Faith and Hope, they are (in Effect and by Equivalence) poured out. *Sect.* 25.

If there be any thing now left disputable in this matter, it must be, Whether it will not be justly deemed irrational that God should so over-heap his measure, so over-proportion his wages to us, reward that so gloriously, which, if there were never a Heaven hereafter, were at the present reward sufficient to it self, and infinitely preferable before the condition of any other man's life. But the advantage of that being on our side, we shall have little reason to dispute or complain of it. *Sect.* 26.

The only thing imaginable to be replied will be, that Christ's inflictions are as immaterial and as eternal as his rewards; and the reason not presently discernible, why our short, empty, nauseated pleasures, the sins of a short life, and the joys of those sins far shorter than the shortest life, should be punished so sadly and so eternally. This scruple of the Atheist hath been searched to the bottom, and answered * in other Papers; and the brief of it is this, That the choice being referred to us to take of the two which we best like, *Eternal Death* set before us on the one hand, to make *Eternal Life* the more infinitely reasonable for us to chuse on the other hand; and the eternal Hell (whensoever we fall into it) being perfectly our own Act, neither forc'd on us by any absolute decree of God's, nor irresistible temptation of the Devil, nor our own flesh, but as truly our wish and choice, and made purchase, nay, much more truly and properly than eternal Heaven is (when our Obedience is first so wrought by God's Grace, and yet after that so abundantly rewarded by the Donor:) *Sect.* 27.

* Pract Cat. l. 5. Sect. 4. p. 118.

it is certain that if there be any thing irrational, it is in us unkind and perverſe Creatures (ſo obſtinately to chuſe what God ſo paſſionately warns us to take heed of, ſo wilfully to die, when God ſwears he wills not our death) and not in him, that hath done all that is imaginable to be done to reaſonable Creatures (here in their way or courſe) to the reſcuing and ſaving of us.

Sect. 28. And ſo this hath by the way demonſtrated alſo the Attainableneſs of that reward, and the no kind of fault of God's (he hath ſent his Prophets, his Son, his Spirit, his Miniſters, his Mercies, his Judgments, all ſorts, and new Methods of working Deliverances and Salvations for us, and all ſlaughtered, and crucified, and grieved, and abus'd by us) but all merely of our ſelves, if through our irrational prides or ſloths we do not attain to it. I ſhall not need therefore farther to inlarge on that, eſpecially having † elſewhere abundantly demonſtrated the truth of it.

† Pract. Cat. 1 *Sect. l.* 1. *p.* 3.

CHAP. V.

The Exceptions againſt ſome particulars in Chriſtian Religion; and 1. *God's Diſpoſitions of Providence.*

Sect. 1. IT now remains that I proceed from the groſs to the retail, from the general to the particular view and conſideration of thoſe particular Branches of Chriſtian Religion which ſeem to men at this time to be leaſt ſupported with Reaſon. And they will be of two ſorts, either concerning God's Providence, or concerning God's Commands now under the Goſpel. The firſt concerns his wiſdom in diſpenſing the things of the World among men, the ſecond his choice of duties wherein to exerciſe us.

Sect. 2. For the firſt of theſe, it will briefly be reduced to this queſtion, Whether it can be deemed rational that Injuſtice ſhould proſper, and Patience never be relieved or rewarded in this life; as it is every where taught to be the Method of God, and is moſt eminently exemplified on Chriſt himſelf in his own perſon in the Goſpel.

Sect. 3. Where firſt, if the Queſtion were, Whether Injuſtice could be really favoured by God, or by him ſo approved and encouraged, as to be thought worthy of any the leaſt reward, though but of a Cup of cold water, by him, or (as conſentaneous to that) Whether Injuſtice by going unpuniſhed here, and by being triumphant in this World, might be thence concluded to be an act either of Sanctity or of Innocence, owned and commended and juſtified by God by its thus proſpering; I ſhould then, I confeſs, acknowledge this to be irrational, and not plead or undertake to be the advocate of that Religion which ſhould teach one ſuch Doctrine as this.

Sect. 4. For this were to make a God (who by being ſuch is ſuppoſed to be of an immutable Will and Juſtice) to become inconſtant and contradictory to himſelf, to forbid oppreſſion as contrary to his Will, and yet, without making any change in the matter (without withdrawing what he hath given to one, and diſpoſing it to another, as in the caſe of the *Egyptians* Jewels and the *Canaanites* Land) to reward it as agreeable to his Will; to pronounce that no *Covetous Perſon*, without repentance, *ſhall inherit the Kingdom of Heaven*, and yet to give the covetous, beſide an infallible title to the Kingdom of God, continued to him as a ſpecial Saint of his, the addition of all the bleſſings of this life. In a word, this were the ſame irrational thing as to affirm that Thief which proſpered in his aſſault and actually robbed the Traveller, and perhaps killed him too, to be by that means turned honeſt man, and that nothing but miſcarrying in his attempt could denominate or demonſtrate him a thief; that no ſin were any longer a ſin if it were once acted, no oppreſſion any longer oppreſſion if it were permitted to come to its fulneſs; that every the fouleſt violence, as ſoon as it were come to the height, bearing down all the reſiſtances of Divine and Humane Laws and force, did then preſently ceaſe to be violence, and by being the loweſt fiend in Hell commence *ipſo facto* the moſt rewardable Saint. And therefore the only Religion that hath been known in the World to maintain and countenance this, that of the Turk or Mahometan, I profeſs to believe abſolutely irrational.

Sect. 5. But for Chriſtianity, that is ſo diſtinctly contrary to this, that the great fundamental Hiſtory upon which all our Religion at once is built, is the moſt lively example and doctrine of the contrary. For when Chriſt himſelf was delivered up into the power of wicked men, and by them arraigned and reviled and crucified, not only the Diſciples which were his conſtant attendants, but his Army of Myriads of Angels that were always at his command, doing nothing toward his releaſe, when this conſultation of the *Sanhedrin* became ſucceſsful, and obtained the deſired event againſt him (the higheſt and moſt proſperous oppreſſion of the greateſt innocence and vertue) then, though there were more circumſtances which might affix this on God his Father, and ſeem to draw him into partaking in it, than we find recorded of any or all other ſinful actions (as that God's Hand and Counſel did foredetermine this to be done; that God foretold it by all his Prophets, and from the certainty that they could not lie, doth, when it is done, conclude that Chriſt *ought thus to ſuffer*; that they that did it, even the chief Rulers of them, had the excuſe of ſome ignorance, until God's raiſing him from the dead diſpelled this miſt from before their eyes; that what God had thus foretold and predetermined, *viz.* that Chriſt *ſhould ſuffer, he had thus fulfilled*, Acts 3. 18. that he that ſuffered voluntarily *laid down his life*, and by a ſpeedy taking it up again was freed from the ſaddeſt part of death, the remaining under the power of it, nay, was in the iſſue ſo far from being the worſe for ſuffering, that beſides the glorious advantages that came to his Diſciples and children by it, he himſelf was in that humane nature of his highly rewarded and exalted for this his ſuffering; though, I ſay, all theſe circumſtances concurred to make the injury leſs, the crime more excuſable, and altogether more fit and more honourable to be charged upon God, and ſo to turn it from the crime of murther to the vertue of obedience to God's will and charity and benefaction to mankind, and even to him that ſuffered) yet this one act of the Jews, their doing againſt the expreſs Command and will of God, that

Acts 3. 17.

thing

thing which yet was by God * *determined to be done*, their crucifying an innocent person, that desired nothing but their amendment, their committing that act which by God was forbidden under the Commandment of Murther, is thought fit by that God whom the Christians worship to be punished most prodigiously and exemplarily, that ever any sin of the deepest dye and the most mischievous effects was ever punished, even with the utter desolation of the whole Nation, and all the prodigies that have been read of, the greatest pomp of aggravating circumstances, the calling Heaven and Earth together, to make the execution of these crucifiers the more solemn and remarkable. So far is Christianity from owning any such irrational doctrine as this. * προώρισται ἁγιασθαι.

But this being thus disclaimed, and the Doctrine which is acknowledged to be Christian being cleared to be only this, That in God's Dispensations and Providence, and governing of the World under the Gospel, it is not unusual for injustice to prosper, and patience and innocence never to be relieved or rewarded in this life; this I shall now assume on me to clear to be perfectly reasonable; and it shall be by thus taking it asunder. *Sect.* 6.

First, That wicked men should be permitted to be wicked, when all fair rationable means have successively been used to bring them to repentance, to restrain them from waxing worse and worse; that they that will not mend by all the probablest and most effectual means, should at last be left to themselves and become incorrigible; that God should not proceed from perswasion to violence, and force them to be good (contrary to the nature of man in this his state of proficiency, who was created with a will or freedom of doing evil if he pleased, and contrary to the nature of free and rewardable goodness, which if compelled ceaseth to be such) who will not be restrained from evil without force: This will never be deemed irrational in God, who hath another Tribunal to arraign and punish those who will not submit to Exhortation and Discipline here: But on the contrary, it will very ill become the servant of God, for his own ease and security, to wish the disturbance of that method of God with mankind, to expect that man, which when he was in innocence was created with a liberty to chuse the evil, should now, amidst the briars and thorns, after the provocations of a long vitious life, have such shackles laid on him, as that he should not be able to break God's Bands and Laws; and all this only that the good man may be protected, who, if he be not, knows that it is far more for his advantage than if he were. *Sect.* 7.

Secondly, that they which are wicked and have cast off all restraints of Divine and Humane Laws, which break through all the ties and securities that promises and oaths can lay upon them (the greatest protection for innocents that any Religion or Law hath ever provided for them) should by these advantages above other men, be able to over-reach and defraud others; and by this means having acquired a power of hurting, should, when they have it, make use of this power to do what is most agreeable to their lusts and interests to do: This again hath nothing in it strange or irrational: It is far more strange that it is not always thus, that (wicked men allowing themselves all the liberty, and being by their very sins furnished with all armour and instruments to work their wills; and all innocent men, that resolve to continue such, being by this means disarmed and naked before them) the wicked should not get the whole world into their possessions. *Sect.* 8.

This certainly were to be expected, and by this means all that have wicked inclinations would in any humane likelihood be incouraged to act the height of their power of hurting, were there not a peculiar hedge of Providence to defend the meek, without any of their own (considerable) contributions toward it, to guard them wonderfully in the open field without any visible means of doing it. And if this shall otherwise happen at some one time, perhaps but once in many ages, and that for some very great end, in God's wisdom more considerable to the God-like Government of the whole world, than the miraculous rescuing of a few meek innocents from a short oppression (in earthly things which are not worth the possessing) could be deemed to be; there is sure no great wonder in this, nothing irrational in the sometimes permitting of it. *Sect.* 9.

He that were secured in his inheritance in a quiet Kingdom as long as any man injoyed his own, as Majesty were permitted on the throne, or Law and Justice on the Bench, would never desire a fairer conveyance, or a longer lease of the most valued possessions of this life: and this security remains to the meek man, though once in many Ages it may have happened not to prove good unto him. *Sect.* 10.

And as there hath been nothing strange or irrational on the part of the wicked oppressor that prospers: so next, on the part of the patient or sufferer that smarts under him, there will appear to be as little. *Sect.* 11.

For first, Absolute innocence is a thing which (save in the person of Christ) hath never been met with in Man or Woman on the Earth; and therefore he that is guilty of no fault in one particular, may yet be culpable and punishable in many others: he that is legally possessed of an estate, and hath done nothing to forfeit it in Law, may yet have sinned against God, and so have punishments due to him from that eternal Justice; which if they fall upon his body or estate in this World, there is nothing irrational in that; but especially if so light a discipline may pass for all the revenge, and (through the sufferings of Christ, and interposition of Mercy) avert all future punishment, and be accepted in commutation for the torments of another Judicature, this sure is all the charity and bounty in the World, that may be admired, but not complained of as unreasonable. *Sect.* 12.

Secondly, That those that for their other faults might justly be punished, should have this punishment inflicted on them by those which themselves are wicked, and are actually such in thus afflicting them, if this seem to have any thing unreasonable in it, it will soon be answered by the necessity of the matter, which makes it impossible for any but wicked men to be imployed in it. The *Israelites* were once used to root out the Nations, but that by an infallible Commission from God the Supreme Law-giver (and whose Will being once made known over-rules all former laws) and the universal Owner and Disposer of all the World and the possessions thereof: And by this Commission, this became to them not only lawful, but necessary, an act not only of Justice, but of Obedience. And so upon the like Commission, the *Levites* killing their Brethren was an act of Sanctity, a consecrating themselves unto the Lord; those bloudy Sacrifices were in a manner the Ceremonies of their Consecration to their Priests Office. But then, first, all this depended upon the infallible validity of *Sect.* 13.

their

their Commiſſion, which had it been falſly pretended by them, or had they not been aſcertained that it came from God, their Actions had been as ungodly and murtherous as *Abraham*'s ſacrificing his ſon muſt have been deemed without the like Commiſſion. And ſecondly, this Commiſſion was by no means to be enlarged to any other, but thoſe particular ſubjects or matters to which it was given. The Jews might not at that time have deſtroyed or invaded any other Nation upon the face of the Earth, nor might the *Levites* at any other time have killed their Brethren on ſtrength of that Command; much leſs may any other People of any other Nation, on ſtrength of that example. And ſo now that ſuch Commiſſions are out-dated, when all is left by God in the hands of ſtanding Laws, in oppoſition to new Revelations, and conſequently, when that which is moſt juſt for me to ſuffer, or God to permit, (or by proſpering in him to inflict on me) is moſt injurious in him that doth it, were it not perfect fury, much above the pitch of irrational, to demand that God's deareſt Children ſhould act as the vileſt men? to require ſuch explicite contradictions, that none but godly men ſhould be permitted to oppreſs, to kill, to commit Sacriledge, to lay waſte, and to deſtroy, to break all thoſe Commandments of God, which he that doth, *ipſo facto* ceaſeth to be godly? If there be any wickedneſs to be done in a City, ſhall the righteous be the only men to do it? this were worth wondring at indeed. But for the wicked, whoſe trade it is, whoſe joy of heart to be thus for ever occupied, he is in his element, he needs no call or incitation to do it. The turning him out of that office, and employing any body elſe, were the greateſt unkindneſs to him; as the caſting the Devils out from tormenting the man, was by them looked on as the *deſtroying them before their time*; whereas the Angel of light would have looked upon it as a degree of Hell, had he been ſent in on that errand to torment him.

Sect. 14. Thirdly, Beſide the perfect reaſonableneſs of having offenders puniſhed temporally here, (which were reaſonable, if it were for ever in another World) there is a ſecond, not only Juſtice, but Mercy, in ſuch Sufferings on whomſoever they fall. They are Admonitions, and Doctrines, and Spiritual Medicines, diſciplines of the Soul, to awake us out of ſecure, and ſtop us in wilful, ſinning; and are by God on purpoſe made uſe of to that end, when Proſperity hath been long uſed and experimented to have no ſuch auſpicious influences in it, to be proper to feed and foment, very improper to ſtarve and ſubdue enormities. And if the Phyſician adminiſter a bitter Potion, if the Surgeon apply a Corroſive or Cauſtick, when Julips or Balſoms are judged and proved to be uneffectual, ſure it is not the manner of men to count ſuch Methods irrational.

Sect. 15. Nay, it will be no *Hyperbole* to affirm, that the addition of ſuch Documents as theſe may ſometimes deſerve to be preferred and more pretiouſly valued than all the Doctrines in the Book of God it ſelf without theſe, one ſuch ſeaſonable Application than all other Receipts in his Diſpenſatory. The word of God gives Rules of living to all men, but thoſe ſo general and unapplied, that it is ordinary for paſſionate men not to ſee themſelves concerned in them. Theſe puniſhments and viſitations will be able to bring home, and make us, while we are under the diſcipline, confeſs that we are the very men to whom by peculiar Propriety they appertain.

Sect. 16. But there is yet a third ſublimer benefit of ſuch diſpenſations of God under the Goſpel, which will render them abundantly rational. And that is the exerciſe of many Chriſtian Graces of the greateſt price in the ſight of God, and ſuch as ſhall be ſure to be the moſt richly rewarded by him, which were it not for ſuch changes as theſe would lie by us unprofitably; ſuch are Patience, Meekneſs, Humility, Contentedneſs with whatſoever lot, faithful Dependance on God in all outward things, Thankſgiving for Plenty and for Scarcity too, a ſubmitting to God's Will in ſuffering as well as doing it chearfully; yea, and to his Wiſdom too, in reſolving God's choices for us to be abſolutely fitter for our turns than any our own wiſhes; and laſtly, that Wiſdom which Saint *James* ſpeaks of, the skill of Spiritual judging, which can really prefer this ſtate of ſuffering for Chriſt (an excellence that Angels do not partake of) beyond any other ſtate or condition of life.

James 1. 5.

Sect. 17. Were it but only for the Variety, that all the burthen of the day might not lie on thoſe Graces which are exerciſed in fair weather, but that thoſe other provided for the Storm or Winter might take their turns, and give them ſome relaxation, this would be very rational and uſeful for us; as *Ariſtotle* ſaith, that the change of motions from uphill to down-hill, and ſo back again, doth provide againſt laſſitude, more than the conſtancy of any one, be it in the eaſieſt, ſmootheſt Plain, becauſe that lays all the burthen inceſſantly upon one pair of muſcles without any relief or aſſiſtance from any other. But when withall every exerciſe of each of theſe Graces hath attending it an addition of more Gems in our Crown, more degrees of Glory in another World, (that I may not add alſo of preſent Joy, and Satisfaction, and Raviſhment in the preſent Exerciſes here,) then ſure the ſuperfluities and pleaſures of this life, the any thing that is ever taken from us by the Harpyes and Vultures of this World, are richly ſold and parted with by the Chriſtian (which knows how much, or, indeed, how little they are worth enjoying) if they may thus bring him in that rich fraight of never-fading bliſs in another World. And this will ſerve for juſtifying the rationalneſs of God's dealing with us now under the Goſpel in reſpect of his Providence.

CHAP. VI.

The Exceptions againſt Chriſt's Commands.

Sect. 1. IT remains that I proceed to Chriſt's Commands under the Goſpel, and ſhew the Rationalneſs of them.

Sect. 2. And having done it ſo largely already on the head of Advantages, I ſhall now only deſcend to that one againſt which our Modern Exceptions are moſt frequently made, *viz.*

The

The great Fundamental duty of *taking up the Croſs to follow Chriſt*, *i. e.* of approving my obedience to Chriſt in all and every particular, even when the extremeſt danger, the loſs of my Life, is like to be the Price to be paid for it. *Sect.* 3.

The unreaſonableneſs of this is argued and concluded from the contrariety of it to that Liberty of ſelf-defence, and to that Law of ſelf-preſervation, which nature is ſuppoſed to dictate to every man. And the ſhewing the weakneſs of this Objection will be a full vindication of the rationalneſs of the Precept. *Sect.* 4.

And this is done by putting us in mind what is meant by Self-preſervation, and what by Nature, and what by Law. A man is made up of a Body and a Soul, a mortal and an immortal part, and thoſe may be conſidered either ſeverally or united: And conſequently Self-preſervation may be ſet to ſignify any one or more of theſe four things. Either, firſt, the preſerving that material mortal part of him from preſent hurt; or ſecondly, preſerving the immortal part of him in well and happy being; or thirdly, preſerving the preſent union of one of theſe with the other; or fourthly, the providing for the perpetual happy union of them eternally. The firſt is the preſerving the Body, and with it the eſtate, and liberty, and reputation, *&c.* from preſent loſs or diminution. The ſecond is preſerving the Soul in Innocence, or Vertue. The third is preſerving of this Life of ours, which we live in the natural Body. And the fourth is, providing for a joyful Reſurrection, and an everlaſting Life attending it. *Sect.* 5.

Then for Nature, that may ſignify either blind uninlightned Nature, which ſees no more than the reflexion upon it ſelf, and the Book of the Creatures, and Natural Inſtincts repreſent to it; or elſe Nature as it is inlightned by Revelation, *i. e.* by God's making known ſome things in his Word, which Nature had never known had they not been thus revealed: Such are the Doctrines of our Faith, and particularly the eternal rewards and puniſhments which are revealed to us in the Scripture. *Sect.* 6.

Then for Laws, thoſe may be either abſolute and peremptory, which yield not to any ſuperiour Laws; or elſe conditional and ſubordinate, when a ſuperiour Law doth not interpoſe to the contrary. *Sect.* 7.

To bring all this home to our preſent diſcourſe. If by Self-preſervation be meant either the firſt or the third notion of the *ſelf*, the preſerving my Body or my life, then though it may truly be ſaid that it is a Law of Nature, that men may, and that (when no ſuperiour Law requires the contrary) they ought, and are bound to preſerve theſe imperfect mutilate ſelves, theſe Bodies; yet then as there is a higher notion of a man than as that barely ſignifies his Body, his Soul being the far more excellent part of him, and the eternal union of Body and Soul together being moſt eminently the Notion that he is concerned in, ſo there muſt be a ſuperiour Law of Self-preſervation than that which commands only the preſerving the Body: and though bare uninlightned Nature, that is able to look no farther than this life, do not give any Law in this matter; yet Nature being ſuppoſed inſtructed in the Chriſtian Doctrine, that there is another life of Body and Soul after this to laſt for ever, muſt needs be reſolved to do it; it being impoſſible that reaſonable Nature, when two things are repreſented ſo diſtant, as the life of a few years here in the midſt of ſuch ſad mixtures, and an everlaſting life hereafter in the fullneſs of all joys, ſhould not enjoin the preſerving of the latter, even with the contempt of the former, when the care of the former may bring any danger to the latter. *Sect.* 8.

The ſhort of it is, That when Eternal Life is in the hand of Chriſt to give to them that continue obedient and conſtant to him, and to none elſe, and when the *fearing of them which can hurt and kill the body*, the caring for or preſerving of this preſent life, doth at any time or in any caſe reſiſt or obſtruct the performance of that duty which Chriſt then requires or expects from me; there Nature commands me to deſpiſe the leſs and preſerve the greater: and if it be not abſolutely willing to Sacrifice the preſent to the eternal life, and conſequently to prefer the obeying of Chriſt to the preſerving of this fading ſhort life, it muſt acknowledge it ſelf a blind Heathen Nature, that knows nothing of an eternal future life, and of him that can *caſt both body and ſoul into Hell*; or elſe an irrational wild Nature, that knows theſe diſtances of finite and infinite, and doth not think them worth conſidering. *Sect.* 9.

It is therefore my moſt charitable opinion of thoſe that object the Principle of Self-preſervation to the Doctrine of taking up the Croſs, and determine us free from the Obligation of paying obedience to Chriſt, when it cannot be done without endangering of Eſtate or Life, that they ſpeak out of their memory only, what they have read in Books of that ſupreme Law of the preſerving ones ſelf, but do not withal remember, that if that Self ſignified only the Body, it was the Philoſophy of them that knew nothing of the Immortality of the Soul or the endleſsneſs of another Life; or if they were aware of the Chriſtian Doctrines of Eternity, they never called the Body that Self that was to be ſo ſolicitouſly tended. *Sect.* 10.

And therefore it is obſervable in the firſt Ages of the Church, that thoſe Hereticks that were enemies of the croſs of Chriſt, that taught it to be [a] indifferent and lawful in time of Perſecution to forſwear and renounce Chriſt, and offer Sacrifice to Idols, were a ſort of men (the *Gnoſticks*) that immerſt themſelves in all unnatural filthineſs, and depended not at all on the Promiſes of another life; and having firſt taught that Chriſt did not [b] really ſuffer in the fleſh, but only in appearance, would not be perſwaded that either he had any [c] need of their lives, or indeed expected it from them, [d] being come, as they ſaid, *to ſave their lives*, to die that they might not be killed. Where the miſtake was clear and viſible, that they thought they were theſe tranſitory Lives that Chriſt came to preſerve, and not thoſe other lives which were to be conveyed over to Eternity. *Sect.* 11.

[a] ἀδιαφορῶν εἶναι δοκεῖ τὸν ἀπομνυμένους ἀπὸ περὶ ζωὴν καὶ πᾶν ὅτι ἐν σαρκὶ ἀνωμολογημένους καιρούς. Euſeb. *l.* 4. Eccleſ. Hiſt c. ζ'.

τὸ ἀρνήσασθαι ἐν ἀνάγκαις ἀδιάφορον. Euſeb. *l.* 6. c λή. *out of* Origen *on* Pſal. 82. [b] ἐκ ἀληθῶς, vid. Ignatii Epiſt. ad Smyrn. ἐκ ἐν σαρκὶ ἀλλὰ δοκήσῃ, vide Cyril. Hier. Catech. σὰρξ αἰρέσ. Non hîc, nec apud homines confeſſionem putant conſtituram, ſed in cœlo. *Tertul. cont. Gnoſt. c.* 10. [c] Nec deus humanum ſanguinem ſitit, nec Chriſtus vicem paſſionis, quaſi ipſe de ea ſalutem conſecuturus, expoſcit. *Tertul. cont. Gnoſt. cap.* 14. [d] Semel Chriſtus pro nobis obiit, ſemel occiſus, ne occideremur: ſi vicem expectat, num & ille ſalutem de mea nece expectat? *Tertul. cont. Gnoſt. c.* 1.

The fate of thoſe *Gnoſticks* at that time was very remarkable, and that which will render our irrational *Sect.* 12.

tional fondneſs of theſe bodily lives yet more irrational. Their great care was to preſerve their lives, and their prime dexterity in order to that, to comply conſtantly with the powerful perſecutor; that was, eſpecially, with the Jews, (for though the Sword was in the Heathens hand, yet the great malice againſt the Chriſtians was in the Synagogue, from [e] thence ſprang all the Perſecutions.) To this end thoſe *Gnoſticks* took upon them to be great zealots for the Moſaical Law of Circumciſion, and generally pieced with the Jews, and approved themſelves to them. At laſt the Roman Army comes againſt *Jeruſalem*, takes *Jews* and *Gnoſticks* together, and deſtroys them all: and ſo Chriſt was as remarkably a true Prophet in that as in any one particular, That *he that would ſave his life ſhould loſe it*, (that very temporal life, that all his compliance with the Jews was deſigned to ſave) *and he that would loſe, i. e.* venture and *lay down his life for Chriſt's ſake, ſhould find it, i. e.* have it more probably preſerved and continued to him here, than they that were moſt ſolicitous for it, and, whether he loſt or kept it here, have it reſtored to him to continue eternally.

[e] Synagogæ Judæorum fontes perſecutionum. *Tert. ib. c.* 19.

Sect. 13. And if that promiſe of the Goſpel have truth in any ſence of it, then is the command no irrational command, of *taking up the Croſs to follow Chriſt*, when he can, if it be for thy turn, accept of thy taking up the Croſs, without its bearing thee; or if he do not, can pay thee abundantly for what thou loſeſt, reward thee with Eternity.

Sect. 14. If I could fore-ſee any other command of Chriſt could fall under our jealouſie and cenſure, I ſhould proceed to it, and be confident of approving it exactly rational. As it is, I am at an end of my deſigned Method, and am glad it hath been contrived into ſo ſmall a compaſs, being now at leiſure to retire to my Meditations, which will, I hope, be more calm, being thus disburthened; and make it my firſt Theme to diſcourſe with my ſelf, how extremely rational it is that thoſe very turns of Providence which have been our great temptation, and, they ſay, made many Atheiſts among us, ſhould be reviewed again, and upon ſecond demurer thoughts engage and inſtruct us all to become more Chriſtian.

Who is wiſe, and he ſhall underſtand theſe things: prudent, and he ſhall know them? For the ways of the Lord are right, and the juſt ſhall walk in them, but the tranſgreſſor ſhall fall therein, Hoſ. 14. 9.

A COPY of ſome

PAPERS

Paſt at *OXFORD*, betwixt the Author of the *Practical Catechiſm*, and Mr *Ch.*

Χρὴ πρὸς τὰς διαβολὰς μὴ ἀποσιωπᾶν, ἵνα μὴ συγχωρήσωμεν συνδοκεῖν τῷ ψεύδει, καὶ τὸς ἀπατημένους μὴ ἐναφῶμεν τῇ βλάβῃ. S. Baſil. Epiſt. 63.

A BRIEF

VINDICATION

Of three Paſſages in the

Practical Catechiſm,

From the Cenſures affixt on them by the MINISTERS of LONDON, in a Book Entituled, [*A Teſtimony to the truth of Jeſus Chriſt*, &c.]

For Mr *Cheynell.*

SIR,

AT my return from *London* late laſt night, I met with ſome ſcattered reports of your dealing with the Author of the *Practical Catechiſm*, in a late Sermon or Sermons of yours in this City, within a few days after I met you at Col. *Hammonds* lodgings, and ſignified my intentions to go out of Town the next day. Now though the care I have of the reputation of that Author be not ſo great or paſſionate, as to put me upon the leaſt thought or deſign of working any proportionable revenge on him, that endeavoured publickly to defame him; or to make you any return, ſave only of my prayers to God for you, that he will forgive you all the treſpaſſes that either this, or any other dealing of yours hath been guilty of, and that he will give you a right Judgment in all things; yet becauſe I would not be in danger to believe any thing of you cauſeleſly, I thought my ſelf obliged in Juſtice to you, to deſire from you (who know beſt what you ſaid) an exact account in writing (as far as your memory will ſerve) of all that you ſaid in publick, either at Saint *Maries*, or *Carfax*, wherein the Author of that Catechiſm was concerned. I do much abuſe my ſelf in the notion I have of Chriſtian Juſtice, if that do not oblige you to anſwer this requeſt of

Octob. 10. 1646.

Your Servant

H. Hammond.

I ſhall re-inforce my requeſt, that you will ſend me the ſumme of what you ſaid, with as little alteration as is poſſible.

SIR,

I Return you thanks, and am before-hand with you for Prayers, the Lord pardon, and lead you into all truth and holineſs. Truly Sir, I had ſaid as much of the *Practical Catechiſm* as I did ſay, though you had been in Town, nay, had been (where you might learn ſomething of my brethren) at Church. What I ſaid of the Author of that Catechiſm, was (your Friends being Judges) as much as he deſerved: ſome think I ſpoke too highly in his commendations. But to the point; firſt, you ſay you are obliged in Juſtice to me to deſire an exact account of my Sermons: Sure this is ſomewhat more than equal Juſtice to me, it is to exerciſe Juriſdiction over me. Secondly, you do much abuſe your ſelf in the notion of Chriſtian juſtice, if you conceive me obliged in Chriſtian juſtice to give you an account this night (being to preach to morrow) of what I preached about ten dayes ago.

I will deal plainly with you, I have not ſaid all that I intend to ſay of that Catechiſm, becauſe it ſeems to evacuate the moral Law, under pretence of filling up its vacuities, and it doth in effect overthrow the ſumme and ſubſtance of the Goſpel. Sir, this is more than I ſaid in either Sermon; But you ſhall (in due time, place, and manner, as ſoon as my weighty occaſions will permit) receive the reaſons of this aſſertion

From your humble Servant

Fr. Cheynell.

Saturday, Octob. 10. 1646. *about 4 of the clock in the afternoon.*

SIR,

What I ſaid of the Practical Catechiſm ——

SIR,

I Am ſorry I was ſo miſtaken in you, as to make a requeſt to which you do not by your anſwer return me one word, nor are ſo favourable as to promiſe me any at your greater leiſure. Having had this experience of you, I ſhall make no more new queſtions (to which the former part of your Letter might tempt one that were curious) as who of my Friends they were, which were ſo well ſatisfied with what you ſaid of the Author of that Catechiſm; or, who again, that envyed him the Elogy which you affirm your ſelf to have beſtowed upon him. I ſhall rather take occaſion from theſe two affirmations of yours, to inforce my one former Petition, that you will commit to paper what you ſaid, and give me leave to paſs a judgment whether the Author be obliged to thank you for civilities, or (as my preſent intelligence goes) to clear himſelf from your accuſations. I am willing to flatter my ſelf by the ſecond leaf of your Letter (begun with a [Sir, what I ſaid of the Practical Catechiſm] and ſo abruptly broke off) that you were once in ſo good humour, as to deſign me the

favour I petition'd for; and if I am deceived, yet have I now more reaſon to importune it, becauſe, firſt, by your preſent miſtaking of my few Lines; and ſecondly, returning an anſwer very diſtant from the particular propoſed by me; I am enclined to believe it poſſible that your exceptions to the Author of the Catechiſm might be miſtakes alſo, (and then I would hope I might rectify, and you retract thoſe miſtakes;) Or elſe, ſecondly, that your anſwers might be ſomewhat from the matter, and the ſhewing you that might to you be uſeful alſo. And if neither of theſe ſhould prove true, I ſhall farther invite you to that charity by a ſerious promiſe, that whatever you to my apprehenſion juſtly object againſt, or confute in that Author, ſhall by Gods grace tend to my edification. And having that preparation of mind, I hope your prayer will be heard, that God will *pardon, and lead me into all truth and holineſs.*

That you may not think I have been unjuſt in mentioning ſuch blemiſhes in your Letter (and that I may perform to you, what I deſire of you) I ſhall firſt mention the miſtakes in it. The firſt is, your interpreting my deſire to you, for *an exerciſe of Juriſdiction over you*, which that it may appear probable, you ſay, *I deſire an exact account of your Sermons.* Where firſt, Sir, to *deſire an account*, is not to *exerciſe juriſdiction:* Secondly, the account I deſired, was not of your Sermons, or of any part of them, ſaving only of that wherein the Author of the Catechiſm was concerned; and that I then told you I was obliged (in Juſtice to you) to deſire, and I ſtill conceive I am ſo, it being but juſt, to uſe this obvious conducible means to keep me from believing you to have ſaid any thing but what you did ſay, when perhaps the relations of others may be unjuſt to you, (and tempt me to be ſo alſo) and no body can well aſſure me of either, but your ſelf. What you mean by [*more than an equal juſtice to you*] I ſhall not demand, becauſe I would make haſte to conclude this paper: yet becauſe I ſuppoſe you would intimate by that phraſe, that it was not Juſtice to you (for if it were *more than equal* on your ſide, you would not complain; and beſides you ſay, it is *exerciſing juriſdiction over* you, which for me to do over you, were I confeſs injuſtice) I muſt further evidence it were not, by naming you the particulars which are reported to me from your Sermon, which are ſuch falſe ſuggeſtions, that nothing but your ſaying, and ſaying truly that you ſaid them not, can clear you from a great fault, of which that I may not charge you untruly, I had no ſure way, but to make that requeſt to you. The particulars are four:

Firſt, That you told your Auditory that there was a Catechiſm, and never a word of the Trinity in it. Of this I deſire you to inform me whether you ſaid it or no. For if you did, there was great injuſtice in it. For 1. if you had mentioned the full title of the Book, not a Catechiſm (to which it may ſeem proper to treat of the Trinity) but a Catechiſm with a reſtriction to one kind of matter, a *Practical Catechiſm*, there had then been no great matter of wonder or complaint, that that ſpeculative myſtery had not been handled.

But then 2. the very firſt lines of that Book would farther have prevented that objection. For the Scholar there profeſſing himſelf to have attained in ſome meaſure to the underſtanding of the principles of Religion propoſed by our Church Catechiſm (and that by this very Catechiſts care, who had often done it in his Pariſh, and at this time choſe to do ſomewhat elſe) and the belief of the Trinity being part of that Catechiſm, and of thoſe inſtructions, there is a clear reaſon why in the ſubſequent diſcourſe the Doctrine of the Trinity is not handled, becauſe it is ſuppoſed as a *præcognitum* before it.

3. This ſpeech if it were yours, would ſeem to have ſome deſign in it, and (whether meant by you, or not) be thought by others to affix on the Author either denying of the Trinity, or being guilty of ſome errour in that point, which he was willing to conceal: and that this Author is guilty of neither, I believe any man will be convinced by that Catechiſm, *viz.* in the laſt lines of it, where there is expreſs mention of, and prayer directed to the bleſſed Trinity coeternal, to which one infinite Majeſty, *&c.* In which few words are diſclaimed (though not confuted) as many of the errors of the *Antitrinitarian* and *Socinian* as could be well expected in that matter, I mean the words Trinity, and Unity, eternity of each Perſon, and coeternity.

The ſecond thing that I heard of, was in the matter of Oaths, that the Catechiſm had trained up youth very ill, in giving licence to vain Oaths, which you are ſaid to have concluded from theſe words in the Catechiſm, where in anſwer to this queſtion, Is the third Commandment in *Exod.* [*Thou ſhalt not take the name of God in vain*] no more than [Thou ſhalt not forſwear thy ſelf?] It is anſwered, No more undoubtedly — for there, I am told, you ſtopt, and from thence fell into ſome expreſſions againſt the Doctrine and Book. If this were ſo, then were you very unjuſt to your Auditory, in with-holding from them the conſequents, which would certainly have kept them in charity with the Author. I beſeech you, Sir, read on, and you ſhall find that there is there as ſevere an interdiction of all kind of ſwearing in a Chriſtian (and ſure ſuch are all to whom this Catechiſm was meant) as can be imagined: in plain words, *a total univerſal prohibition of ſwearing it ſelf, making that as unlawful now, as perjury was before*, and a great deal more, ſo extremely ſtrict, that I have by learned men been asked whether that Author were not too ſevere againſt all kind of ſwearing, but (I thank God) never heard it fanſyed, that there was any ground or appearance of liberty to be drawn thence. All that that Author can differ from you in, is his opinion, that the words of the third Commandment belong expreſly to perjury only; and for that opinion he brings the plain words of Chriſt, which reads it μὴ ἐπιορκήσεις, *thou ſhalt not forſwear*, &c. Secondly, the importance of the word in the original, where to lift up (or take) the name of God, ſignifies to ſwear, and [*vainly*] ſignifies [falſly,] and ſo the very word uſed in *Exod.* and there rendred [*vain*] is *Deut.* 5. in the ninth commandment rendered [falſe.] To theſe Arguments if you can give a ſatisfactory anſwer, he may chance to change his opinion in that. But however, the inſiſting on Chriſts direct punctual prohibition will ſure prove it a ſufficient calumny in him that ſhall hence conclude the Author to have given youth any liberty in this kind. I would no man were more guilty of vain Oaths, in himſelf or others, than that Catechiſt is, and reſolves to be. Having ſaid thus much, I ſhall adde *ex abundanti*, that in kindneſs and ſubmiſſion to the meaneſt, the Author thought fit to adde in a laſt edition (intended above a year ſince, but ſold in this Town above a month ago) after theſe words [no more

more undoubtedly] theſe words, by way of explication of what before he meant, [In the primary intention of the phraſe] for to that only he profeſſes to have deſigned that ſpeech, never thinking to deny or doubt, but that vain Oaths (though not ſwearing ſimply taken, *i. e.* all kind of ſwearing) would there be forbidden alſo, though not primarily, yet by way of reduction; which you may gueſs to have been his meaning, becauſe he adds, that perhaps fooliſh, wanton uſing of Gods name (though not in oaths, for one may uſe Gods name and not ſwear) ſurely profane uſing of it, is forbidden by that reduction. And (I pray) do you gueſs whether it be likely that he which ſaid, perhaps fooliſh uſing of Gods name was in the law forbidden, and all kind of voluntary ſwearing under the Goſpel, could juſtly be charged as a friend to young men, in giving them any of that liberty. If you can think it poſſible, yet read on to the end of that matter, and I will be bound you ſhall think otherwiſe.

Your next exception (I am told) was, that in the matter of repentance, the Author makes inclination to ſin an infelicity, not a ſin. This, if you ſaid, you are much to blame. For in the place whereto that refers, 'tis clear that under the general words of [All kinds and ſorts of ſins] the firſt kind named is weakneſſes, frailties, pollutions of our natures, our proneneſs and inclination to ſin. Which being poſitively ſaid, would, in the judgment of any ingenuous man, have helped to interpret that which follows [as infelicities, if not as ſins] thus, not to deny them to be ſins, within two lines after it had been affirmed they were; but that, even in their opinion that took them to be only infelicities, not ſins, (as ſure ſome do, when they are not conſented to) they were yet to be to them matter of humiliation, true ſorrow and grief, as the words are clear, no where ſo much as intimating that they are not ſins, unleſs when he ſaith they are no actual ſins, which I hope you will not ſay they are, when not conſented to.

Your next exception, (I am told) was about Juſtification, but my relations differ in the particular. Some ſay your quarrel was, that he makes faith a condition, no inſtrument. If that were it; I pray tell me whether you think faith a phyſical inſtrument of juſtification, (as for a moral inſtrument, that he in terms acknowledges) or when juſtification is only an act of Gods through Chriſt pardoning of ſin, and accounting juſt, you can imagine that faith hath any kind of real though inſtrumental efficiency in that work, *i. e.* whether faith in any ſuch ſence can pardon ſin, or pronounce juſt; or whether it be not ſufficient to acknowledge it an inſtrument in receiving of Chriſt, and all other acts of the man as Chriſtian, and only a condition or capacity in the ſubject to make capable of Gods act upon him in juſtification? This is the ſumme of what the Author ſaith in that point, and ſhall be farther cleared to you, if that were your exception. Others tell me it was concerning the priority of ſanctification before juſtification. Which point, as it is there ſtated, can be no matter of quarrel to any that affirms the receiving of Chriſt to be pre-required to juſtification. For as that is no more than that faith is pre-required (in the true notion of faith, and that wherein Dr. *Preſton* acknowledges it) ſo is it by that Author ſaid, that only that ſanctification is precedent to juſtification, which is the cordial aſſent to Chriſts commands and promiſes, giving up the heart to him, reſolution of obedience; not the actual performance and practice of thoſe vows, for that is acknowledged there to be after juſtification.

Theſe are the particulars I have heard of, and have now reaſon to believe, that of all them you are not guilty, eſpecially of the firſt, though 'twas (even at *London*) poſitively told me from you. And therefore I do by theſe preſents acquit you of that, but yet think it not amiſs to have mentioned that report, that by it you may ſee (what alone I have now in hand to prove) how truly I told you, that to avoid the danger of believing any thing of you cauſeleſly, I thought my ſelf obliged in juſtice to you to beg an exact account of what you ſaid. I have been too long on the evidencing your firſt miſtake, I would you had anſwered my requeſt, and then you had taken away all excuſe of that prolixity.

Your ſecond miſtake was, that you conceived me to have ſaid that 'twas a piece of Chriſtian juſtice in you to have given me an account this night, *&c.* wherein you were fain to add to my words [*this night*] whereas I only mentioned an anſwer, but aſſigned you no time for it, but punctually required the Meſſenger to deſire to know, when it would be ſeaſonable, and he ſhould call for it; and accordingly, though I have this evening written this rejoinder, yet that I may not trouble you, I mean to reſpite the ſending it till Munday. And yet by the way, I conceive it had been as eaſy for you to have given me what I deſired, as that Letter in ſtead of it, unleſs it be eaſier for you to write out of your invention than your memory. I am ſure it had been the ſavingſt way, for then you had eſcaped this importunity. The diſtance of your anſwer from my propoſition I ſhall not need to put you in mind of. That which you mean to add more of the Catechiſm, is not all, nor (if my intelligence fail me not) any part of what you have ſaid already: and 'tis but diverſion to tell me you will ſay more, and give me reaſon of that more, when as yet much leſs is deſired of you, and cannot be obtained. I ſhall, when you are at leiſure, deſire all your heap of exceptions againſt that poor creature, that (I will be depoſed for it) meant no man any greater malice, than to land him ſafe at heaven the neareſt and ſureſt way that the Author could imagin. But I will not yet importune you for any more than you have yet delivered publickly in this City. By granting me this uprightly and candidly, you will make me really rejoice to hear that you ſhall have taken any further notice of me; but if you ſhall perſiſt to deny me this firſt requeſt, you will utterly diſcourage

Your Servant

Octob. 20. 1646.

H. Hammond.

POST-

POSTSCRIPT.

YOU are pleaſed to mention your deſign of further ſeverity againſt that Author in the matter of the moral law, which (ſay you) it ſeems to evacuate under pretence of filling up its vacuities; and adde, that it doth in effect overthrow the ſumme and ſubſtance of the Goſpel. The latter of theſe (I confeſs) would be a little ſtrange to me, that he that labours to elevate the Goſpel-precepts (as you think, too much) above the Law, ſhould overthrow the ſumme or ſubſtance of the Goſpel. I muſt profeſs to believe that whatever charge can be affixt to that Doctrine, that would not be it, but rather that it labours to raiſe the Goſpel to a greater height than it would bear, or indeed to leſſen the Law, not to alter any thing in the Goſpel. In this particular I muſt profeſs my ſelf poſed, and utterly unable to conjecture what you mean, till you are ſo kind as to adde your reaſons. One thing only I meant to ſerve you in by this Poſtſcript (becauſe I ſee, that, unleſs others have deceived me, you may poſſibly be deceived in paſſing judgment on that Book) and that is, to tell you, that you have a hard task to prove that that Author doth at all evacuate the Law moral (unleſs you guard your ſelf by that cautious word, that *it ſeems* to evacuate it, and that it may, and not do it really.) For you may pleaſe to mark from me, (who know the ſence and ſpirit of that Author better than you) that he ſaith not poſitively that Chriſt added to the Law new precepts, but one of theſe two, either new precepts, or new light; and concludes that either of theſe two will ſerve his turn, and enhaunce the Chriſtians obligation; and adds, that he that will acknowledge that Chriſt requires more of his Diſciples or Chriſtians now, than the Jews by any clear revelation had been convinced to be neceſſary before, did grant as much in effect as he deſired to be granted. And yet farther, in the cloſe, that if any will contend, and ſhew as univerſal plain obliging precepts under the Law, as there are in the fifth of St. *Matthew*, he ſhall be glad to ſee them, and not contend with him, ſo that he will bring the Jews up to us, and not us down to the Jews; profeſſing that the only danger which he had uſed all his diligence to prevent. Now I have told you this, uſe your diſcretion, and let me hear the worſt you can ſay in this particular alſo.

For Dr *Hammond.*

SIR,

I Was not the firſt, no nor the laſt, that endeavoured to confute the dangerous errors of your much admired Catechiſm; yet I do not hear that you have fallen foul upon any but on my ſelf. I acknowledge my ſelf the weakeſt, and yet am confident that Gods power will be manifeſted in my weakneſs, that God may have all the glory. I received your Rejoynder upon Munday: that day I was forced to go out of Town to ſpeak with a Gentleman; I was to preach yeſterday morning, and to perform ſome exerciſe in the afternoon for the ſatisfaction of ſome that are much ſeduced; this Friday morning I return you what I can, and hope it will give you ſome ſatisfaction.

Sir, your meſſenger forgot your charge, and never told me that you expected an anſwer when I was at leiſure, and therefore I ſcribled ſomewhat in haſt, as now I do, for I have not one hour in a day free from diſturbance.

Your errors were more ſolidly refuted by two of my Reverend Brethren, that are both of them Seniors to you: they would have been able to have given you better ſatisfaction.

You deſire to know what I ſaid at *Carfax*. I took notice of that paſſage, *page* 103. of your laſt edition, where you ſpeak to this effect [*That the holy Ghoſt was our advocate in ſetling a Miniſtery to pray and intercede for their ſeveral Congregations (and enabling them in the very Apoſtles time to form a Liturgy to continue in the Church to that end) and thereby helping our infirmities, and teaching us to pray as we ought.*] I ſaid, I ſhould be glad to ſee that Liturgy which you ſay 1. was then formed; And 2. was to be continued in the Church. 3. To know whether the Holy Ghoſt doth help our infirmities by any other Liturgy or not. 4. Whether they do not pray as they ought, who know not where to procure that very Liturgy, which you ſay was formed in the Apoſtles times, and to be continued in the Church. 5. Whether the Common-prayer-book be that very Liturgy.

Sir, Mr. *Reynolds* told me you wanted direction about your firſt-fruits; if your brother will procure L. Gen. *Cromwel* to ſpeak to Sir *H. Vane* junior, it is in his power to relieve you. Forgive the abruptneſs of

Your faithful Servant

Francis Cheynell.

In this outward Paper was incloſed as follows.

SIR,

SIR,

I Was not much taken with your notion of Juſtice, but I ſhall gratify your deſire, being now *invited to charity by your ſerious promiſe and preparation of mind* to entertain the truth, if God be pleaſed to diſcover it to you by ſo weak an inſtrument as I confeſs my ſelf to be. You have changed and mollified your phraſe, you did not ſtoop ſo low in your Letter, as you do in your Rejoynder (as you are pleaſed to term it) to *beg an account:* Truly Sir, I did ſtumble at thoſe hard words, *exact account*, conſidering that you have exerciſed juriſdiction heretofore in a Countrey, where I am now ſeated by the Parliament. You complain of *falſe ſuggeſtions*. I pray God forgive them that ſuggeſted ſo many falſe accuſations againſt me to you, who have (as I perceive) more worth in you, than to believe them.

1. It is reported that I complained of you to my Auditory, becauſe you did not handle the Trinity in your Catechiſm, nay, *that there was not a word of the Trinity in that Catechiſm:* I believe Mr. *Digle* will be ſo candid, as to aſſure you that this is a falſe ſuggeſtion. But give me leave, Doctor, to deal plainly with you; there is an accuſation framed againſt you by your own Apology, for you ſpeak in the language of you know whom, when you tell me, that I need not *wonder if the ſpeculative myſtery of the Trinity be not handled in a Practical Catechiſm.* Believe it, the Doctrine of the Trinity is a Practical myſtery, the very foundation and ground-work of the myſtery of godlineſs. The bleſſed Trinity is not only the object of our faith, but of our Worſhip too; nay, the Doctrine of the Trinity hath by Gods bleſſing a comfortable and quickning influence into the main paſſages of the life and converſation of all Orthodox and judicious Chriſtians. I hope, I need not remember you of your Baptiſm, or tell you that a Sacramental Covenant is Practical. Sir, rectify that miſtake, and I will forgive the ſuggeſter.

Your next reaſon concerns the Church-Catechiſm, I ſuppoſe you mean that Catechiſm in the Common-prayer-book: now truly Sir, I muſt confeſs that I like that Catechiſm far better than your Practical Catechiſm: and your Friends will tell you, that you might have contented your ſelf with that Catechiſm, unleſs you could have made a better.

To your third reaſon I anſwer, that I did once in *London* ſhew that paſſage, which you cite out of your prayer, to aſſure a friend of yours, that you did acknowledge the Trinity, though you maintain many errours, broached by them that deny the coeternal Trinity in unity. I haſten to your ſecond report.

2. Concerning your expoſition of the third Commandment, I ſaid, the youths, *&c.* had learnt the Art of ſwearing as perfect as their Catechiſm; and added, that I did not wonder at it, when I read ſuch a paſſage in a Practical Catechiſm printed at *Oxford*; as you may alſo read, if you begin at the eighth Section of the ſecond Book (I adde theſe words now, becauſe I have ſent home the *Oxford* edition, and cite it according to the laſt edition,) where the eloquent Author (to whom for parts, gifts, learning, I acknowledge my ſelf far inferiour) being deſired by his Scholar to weed out the vice of ſwearing, leſt it ſhould take too deep root in young men, and get into faſhion, doth aſſure his Scholar that after this Preface, Ye have heard, *&c.* the firſt part of the Precept, *Matth.* 5. 33. [Thou ſhalt not forſwear thy ſelf] is clearly the third Commandment: but the latter part [But ſhalt perform, *&c.*] is taken out of other places of the Law to explain the meaning of the former, and to expreſs it to be (as literally it ſounds) againſt perjury or non-performance of promiſſory oaths: where note, there's liberty enough for aſſertory oaths, for the third Commandment is not meant of aſſertory oaths, as is plainly ſaid afterwards. But leſt the Scholar ſhould think that this was not the *full meaning* of the Law ſent by *Moſes*, he is prompted to put the queſtion home, whether there *be no more* meant in the third Commandment than [Thou ſhalt not forſwear thy ſelf?] The Catechiſt anſwers ſadly and peremptorily [No more undoubtedly.] This is a flat denial indeed, which requires full aſſurance of belief in the Scholar, as it doth note confidence in the Teacher, *no more*, and *undoubtedly* no more. I fear that the *doubtful* [*perhaps*] *and imaginary ſuperaddition* following (of which I may have fair opportunity to ſpeak more hereafter) will not be ſo effectual to reſtrain the Youths or Doctors from ſwearing, as the unqueſtionable command of God. I hope, this expoſition of the third Commandment is not generally received in this Univerſity, and doubt not but ſome will be ſo ingenuous as to proteſt againſt it.

Sir, I have no more than this in my notes concerning that paſſage in your Catechiſm, though I was ſufficiently prepared by meditation to have diſcourſed at large upon that Argument: whether the clock ſtruck, or what other diverſion there was, I know not; I believe I ſaid not much more, but whether I delivered more or leſs at that time, I am not able to give you an exact account, it was not a buſineſs worth a deſign to paſs over ſuch excuſes as you alledge for your ſelf.

1. A total univerſal prohibition of ſwearing it ſelf, and making it as unlawful now as perjury was before, is a doctrine which you cannot prove, unleſs you mince your *total* and *univerſal* with ſo many qualifications, that at laſt you loſe the total in a cypher. You ſay, as [a] *Smalcius* and the reſt do, that I muſt not take an oth but for Gods glory and the publick good: now this is not to forbid ſwearing it ſelf, but *unneceſſary ſwearing*: what's become of your *total* now? Did the perfect Law of God give men leave to take [b] vain oaths, ſo vain as that God ſhould have no glory, nor men any good by them? Why, ſure, it was by this Argument lawful to lift up the ſoul to vanity in a ſence intolerably bad. 2. Concerning our difference, it is this: you undertook to prove that by the third Commandment, there was *no more meant*, than that a man ſhould not forſwear himſelf. Can you conclude this out of all your premiſes in the Catechiſm? your ingenuity would not permit you to frame ſuch a concluſion, and therefore you conclude that anſwer of yours which begins [c] C. *No more undoubtedly*, &c. thus, [By all which it is clear, that to take Gods name in [d] vain is to forſwear ones ſelf.] You do not adde, [and no more] which was the point in queſtion, between the Scholar and

[a] *Chriſtus perfecit tertium mandatum, nec in ribus veris nomen Domini invocare permittit, niſi tale quid à nobis exigat dei gloria.* Vide Smalcium de Divinit. Chriſti, & Catechiſm. Racovienſ.

[b] *Non aſſumes nomen Domini Dei tui gratis, fruſtra, temerè, in ullum vanum, uti viri diſſuſiſſimæ eruditionis paſſim. Mendacium prohibetur hoc in loco, quia mendacium eſt gratis dictum, vanum, nihil.* [c] The laſt edition at *London*, pag. 120. [d] שוא *Aleph. eſt loco Hi, litteræ radicalis; eſt proprie vanitas, tam verborum quam rerum; ſæpe adverbialiter ſumitur pro* fruſtrà, temerè.

and the Catechiſt, and therefore that ſhould have been proved, and in the concluſion inferred. 3. You appeal to Chriſt the beſt Judge. Chriſt ſaith; that whatſoever oath is unneceſſarily taken (ſo you muſt ſay, as I have proved before) cometh of evil, *Matth.* 5. 37. ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ ἐστιν, if you will, of the evil one, or of the Devil. Now Sir, did not the third Commandment forbid all evil; or all deviliſh oaths? 4. That the word is rendered [falſe] ſometimes, I grant; that it is as properly, if not more properly, rendred [e] [vain] you cannot deny; and if you conſult [f] *Aben Ezra*, *R. Selomo*, &c. they will aſſure you that we are not to lift up or take the name of God vainly: I need not go about to prove that the Jews ſaw this truth as clearly as we do, but I can prove that they ſaw and acknowledged it, and that is ſufficient for me to prove againſt your aſſertion. 5. Conſult the *Septuagint*, and ſee how they [g] render the word, *Exod.* 20. 7. *Deut.* 5. 11. 6. You know, that the primary and principal ſignification of the word is not [falſe] but [vain,] and [h] every man that hath looked into the Hebrew, gives you inſtances enough. 7. You know, that [i] others tell you, that if the primary intention had been to forbid forſwearing, divers other words or phraſes would have been uſed, in all probability, ſuch as the holy Ghoſt uſes in other places; learned men are bold to name divers, but I am not ſo bold. I might ſay a great deal more, if I had a mind to wrangle with you about the primary intention: but that is not the queſtion between you and me; only, you have acknowledged in a manner that the edition of your book printed at *Oxford*, had in the judgment of Learned men ſomewhat queſtionable. You tell me of the laſt edition of your Book at *London*. I anſwer, 1. That I ſaw one edition printed at *London*, and compared it with the *Oxford* edition; what difference there is between them, it is your part to ſhew. 2. As for that edition you talk of, ſold in *Oxford* about a month ago, that was a fortnight before I preached; truly I bought that edition alſo. You ſee I was at ſome coſt and pains to know your mind. 3. I read this laſt edition, and ſaw no difference between that and the other in this point about the meaning of the third Commandment. 4. I asked others and they told me that there were ſome additions at the end of this laſt edition. I peruſed thoſe additions, and then concluded that I might take it for granted that was your opinion which was to be found in all three editions. 5. You now refer me to that laſt edition, and tell me that you have *added* ſomewhat to thoſe words [No more undoubtedly] by way of explication; good Sir, ſay, Retractation. 6. I have looked over thoſe additions once again, with the beſt eyes I have, and find nothing about the primary intention of the phraſe; You ſay, you added it; and where ſhould I look for an addition, but amongſt your additions? you ſee how hard it is to find your explication. Your Printer and you may well make a confeſſing apology; for the additions to the 120 *page*, concern nothing but perjury or ſacriledge. 7. I looked on, to ſee whether it was not inſerted afterwards, till I came to the end of your additions, and there I found ſome alterations, your laſt reſerve, which (I confeſs) I did not peruſe, before I preached: my reaſon was, becauſe you call them [*Leſs remarkable alterations*] and therefore I thought very innocently, that you had only corrected ſome literal miſtakes; but contrary to my conjecture, I there find not only ſome alteration, but (what I bleſs God for) a direct recantation of ſundry particulars, and I hope you will ſee cauſe to recant much more. I will continue my prayers for you, and do what I can to help you to ſome new light to diſcern old ſpiritual rules which were given by God in the time of *Moſes*. Sir, ſeriouſly conſider the carriage of this buſineſs, and tell me whether your patience or mine hath been more exerciſed? Take another Commandment, the ſixth if you pleaſe, will you ſay there is *no more, undoubtedly no more* meant by that, but the actual taking away the life of a man? no, you anſwer more fairly, *pag.* 99. and why then could you not have interpreted the third Commandment as clearly? 3. Conſider that there are three editions of your Book abroad, every man will not be at the ſame coſt and pains that I have been; do you make the ſad and woful inference. 4. Look into the Treatiſes of Learned men; do any ſay there is no more, undoubtedly no more meant in a Commandment but what is directly *primâ facie* preſented? is that which is to be reduced to a command, not meant in that Commandment, to which it is properly reduced? 5. In theſe X words or Commandments, words ſhould not be too much reſtrained, but taken in their latitude. 6. Is it proper for a man that hath ſaid, *No more, undoubtedly no more is meant*, to come in with a *doubtful perhaps* afterwards, and ſay perhaps there is more meant? 7. Your leſs remarkable addition is a plain recantation. 8. It is more for Gods honour and yours, to make a free, noble, ſolemn recantation, and (now you have deceived the Kingdom with three editions) to do all things like your ſelf, ingenuouſly: a worthy action loſes its grace, and our Brethren loſe their ſhare of benefit by it, when done with ſo much reſervedneſs, that others cannot well take notice of it for their edification. Pray Sir, let your recantation be as remarkable as your ſeduction; do not put it at the fag-end of ſome *leſs remarkable alterations*, acknowledge that you were ſeduced by — into this opinion, and recant with obſervation, leſt others be ſeduced by ſo many hundred Catechiſms as are diſperſed throughout the Kingdom.

But it may be that you will deny that you have made a recantation. Truly Sir, firſt, the addition of thoſe words [*in the primary intention of the phraſe.*] 2. The putting in of [*Idle*] and blotting out of [*perhaps*] which did much affront your [*No more undoubtedly.*] 3. The change of theſe words [the particular matter of *Moſes* his Law was of Promiſſory (not Aſſertory) oaths] for theſe [The matter was peculiarly of promiſſory, not only of aſſertory oaths,] all theſe three together will amount to a round recantation, conſidering that in three editions you had ſaid, there was *No more, and undoubtedly no more* forbidden in the third Commandment, than the breach of promiſſory Oaths.

Ninthly, conſider, that if this amendment had been before *Oxford* had been taken, or if you would ſay that it (as well as another edition of your Book) was intended, before you were in danger to be called to an account for this and many things of worſe conſequence, your recantation would be more ſatisfactory. I ſpake to you as a friend, and ſpeak not out of my own breaſt, for I do but repeat the cenſures of other men. For my own part, you have made a ſolemn profeſſion under your hand to give me ſatisfaction, but how will you ſatisfie other men? 10. Yet I muſt profeſs, that I do not like that expreſſion of yours [Never thinking to deny or doubt, but that vain oaths *would be* forbidden there alſo.] Do you mean that they were forbidden by God when *Moſes* publiſhed the Law,

[e] *Omne mendacium eſt vanum, ſed omne vanum non eſt mendacium.*

[f] שוא *exponunt per Kinnom & Hebel. R. Selomo*, &c.

[g] ὀνματαίῳ. LXX.

[h] *Vide Stegman, Photin.*

[i] *Non aſſumes nomen Domini gratis ſive fruſtra, ut ſi non jures in ejus nomine niſi ob neceſſitatem; etiam veritas non eſt juranda niſi ob neceſſitatem.* Vide Pagnini theſaurum, curâ Mercceri editum, *pag.* 2186.

Law, or would be forbidden afterwards by a ſuperaddition? *Would be* is not ſo clear an expreſſion as is deſired. 11. I do not underſtand that expreſſion of yours, when you ſay, [That in kindneſs and ſubmiſſion to the meaneſt, the Author thought fit to add] If you mean it of me, I take it kindly, for I did ſpeak to your Friends at *London* about you, and they promiſed to tell you poſitively of it, and I ſpoke for that end; for I do reſpect you more than you think I do: and ſome worthy friends both of yours and mine know, that near upon ten years ago we did exchange ſome Letters about your opinion concerning certain vacuities in the moral Law of God. 12. But Sir, you ſhould conſider, that Learned men have told you of this errour, and therefore ſay, in ſubmiſſion to better Judgments. 13. Say, in ſubmiſſion to the greateſt, even to *Jehovah*, the God of glory, I will abaſe my ſelf, recant my errours, and acknowledge the perfection of his moral ſpiritual Law. Surely it is meet to be ſaid to God, *&c. Job* 34. 31, 32. I beſeech, that you will weep over thoſe two Verſes, and then read that paſſage, *John* 6. 38. Chriſt came down from Heaven to do the will of God, *&c.* Oh, do you come down from your Criticiſms, come down from your notions, your imaginary ſuperadditions; which you look upon as a kind of heaven; and endeavour to do the will of your Father, revealed in his perfect and ſpiritual Law, and I'll warrant you you'll find it ſo perfect, without any ſuperadditions, that your Evangelical obedience ſhall not excel or tranſcend that excellent rule; nay, you will confeſs that you cannot ſee an *end of its perfection*, and you *will hate every falſe way*. Pardon me, if I ſeem to preach to you; the Lord ſet it home upon your heart.

3. The next report is, *that you made inclination to ſin an infelicity, not a ſin:* I ſaid, that the Author of that Catechiſm did acknowledge that godly ſorrow was to be conceived *for all kinds and ſorts of ſin:* but when he deſcends to particulars, he ſpeaks with ſo much irreſolution, as if he doubted whether our aptneſs to fall into all ſin, were an infelicity only or a ſin.

Sir, your expreſſion is inexcuſable, and your apology doth no way ſatisfie. Truly Sir, you muſt fall down at a Throne of grace, and beg pardon of God, and you muſt ſpeak more poſitively, or elſe you will not be able to give ſatisfaction to impartial men.

1. You ſpeak of pollutions of nature: ſure that expreſſion is more proper to denote actual ſins, than original ſin, which is one entire, univerſal, and natural pollution. 2. Every one that is of age to conceive godly ſorrow, hath actually conſented to the corruption of his nature, he hath cheriſhed it, and been pleaſed with it. 3. You ſeem to imply, that there muſt needs be ſome conſent given to every actual ſin; Sir, that is yet to be proved on your part; for you are too magiſterial, and ſo much given to dictates, that you may well ſtand to be perpetual Dictator in Divinity; every point of a Catechiſm ſhould be exactly proved. 4. You ſeem either to recant what you ſaid before, or at leaſt to doubt whether theſe pollutions be infelicities only, or ſin. 5. The danger is the greater, becauſe you expreſs ſuch a grand point Sceptically; there are indeed too many that ſay, *The corruption of our nature is rather an infelicity than a ſin*; do you expreſs your ſelf thus doubtfully, that you may comply with them? indeed if you were compoſing ſuch a Liturgy as ſome have wiſhed for, that Proteſtants, *&c.* might join together, I confeſs you have ſufficiently ſerved that deſign: but ſure it was your duty, eſpecially in a Practical Catechiſm, to have declared your ſelf freely and fully againſt that dangerous errour. 6. If you are of their mind who maintain the corruption of our nature to be only an infelicity, not a ſin; it was not fairly done to blind your Reader with an Orthodox expreſſion in the beginning of your anſwer, that you might afterwards tempt him into a dangerous errour. 7. It is abſurd to ſay, that godly ſorrow is to be conceived for an infelicity *quà ſic*, meerly as an infelicity. 8. There is no doubt but that every ſin ſhould be bewailed *quà ſic*, as a ſin: an inconformity to a ſpiritual Law, and a proneneſs to actual rebellion againſt God, and all the commands of God, ought to be bewailed even with tears of bloud; you need not ſpeak timorouſly or doubtfully in ſo weighty and clear a point. 9. I found the more fault with this doubtful expreſſion, becauſe you write a Practical Catechiſm, and you know that the corruption of our nature hath great influence into our practice, and therefore you ſhould have been moſt clear and expreſs in this point, that by Gods grace this proneneſs to ſin might be both bewailed and mortified. I need not tell you, how many dangerous conſequences have been inferred from ſome doubtful expreſſions in Catechiſms or Confeſſions about original ſin, but I haſten to your laſt report, which is about juſtification.

4. It ſeems you are moſt to ſeek here, you deſire me to help you out. Sir, I never ſaid that faith was a *Phyſical Inſtrument* of juſtification; ſure juſtification is no Phyſical thing. You do grant, at leaſt *in terms*, that faith is a *Moral* inſtrument of juſtification; but if you deny it to be a *Real* inſtrument in receiving Chriſt, then ſure what you grant in terms, you deny in deed. No man ever dreamt that *faith doth pardon ſin*, but a ſinner doth by faith receive a pardon: 1. Faith doth receive Chriſt really, but ſpiritually, not corporally, or phyſically. 2. That which you call a ſufficient acknowledgment, is not ſufficiently clear; be pleaſed to explain what you mean, when you ſay [that faith is an inſtrument in receiving of Chriſt, and all *other acts of the man as Chriſtian*, and only a *condition* or *capacity* in the ſubject to make capable of Gods act upon him in juſtification.] 3. You ſhould diſtinguiſh, as the Apoſtle doth, between receiving of Chriſt, and walking in him. 4. If you mean, that all other acts of a Chriſtian, namely acts of repentance, charity, and in a word, all acts of Evangelical or new obedience, are Moral inſtruments of juſtification, I deſire a proof of that. 5. Doth my receiving of Chriſt make me capable of Chriſt, or rather make me poſſeſt of Chriſt? 6. I think you will not deny that Gods act in giving Chriſt, giving a pardon, *&c.* is in order of nature before my receiving of Chriſt, and a pardon. 7. You have not yet clearly expreſſed, what is the true notion of faith in your opinion, and what Dr. *Preſton* ſaith to confirm you in it, and where he ſaith it. 8. If you conceive that a cordial aſſent to Chriſts commands hath any influence into our juſtification, be pleaſed to unfold that riddle: you know, it is confeſſed by all, that the true believer doth give a cordial aſſent to Chriſts commands; but is he juſtified by that aſſent? 9. How do you prove, that any ſoul whilſt it remains unjuſtified doth cordially and wholly give up it ſelf to be ruled by Chriſt? I confeſs it to be a good evidence of juſtification, but not an antecedent to (much leſs a Condition to make us capable of) juſtification. 10. If a cordial aſſent to Chriſts commands, and a reſolution of obedience, are moral inſtruments of juſtification, be pleaſed to ſhew

what efficiency theſe inſtruments have in juſtification; whether the *Terminus* of that efficiency be a capacity in the ſoul, which doth formally make the ſoul capable of Gods act in pardoning ſin, and pronouncing the perſon juſt and righteous? 11. If a reſolution or vow of obedience be ſufficient unto juſtification, without the actual performance of the vow, why do you wind in *all other acts of a man as Chriſtian*, into a diſcourſe of the very firſt act of faith, in receiving Chriſt, and forgiveneſs of ſins? 12. If, on the other ſide, God juſtifies the ungodly, how doth a conſtellation of Goſpel-graces, and all the acts of grace put a capacity into the ſubject to make a man capable of juſtification?

Sir, that which I took exception at, was your confounding of faith and works in a diſcourſe of juſtification. 2. That you do frequently imply, that we are juſtified by faithful actions, acts of ſincerity and obedience, that they are the *Condition* of juſtification, and that God doth abſolutely require them as the *only things by which a man is juſtified*, p. 12. you ſay, the condition which makes us capable of pardon of ſins, is poſitively the new creature, or renewed, *&c.* obedience to the whole Goſpel, the performing, *&c.* —— and Conſtellation of Goſpel-graces, *&c.* I need not tranſcribe your words, in your * laſt edition they are to be found, in the 8 *page*. 3. You ſay, that faith without the addition of ſuch works, ſuch obedience Evangelical would be unſufficient to juſtification, *&c.* The words following are as bad or worſe, *page* 14, 15. and the like you have *page* 19. Sir, I proved that faith was ſufficient to be an inſtrument of juſtification, without the addition of Evangelical works unto that purpoſe, and in that act; and that we were not juſtified by a righteouſneſs inherent in us, or any acts of repentance, charity, or new obedience performed by us. I am not aſhamed, yet am not now at leiſure to repeat my arguments to prove that we are juſtified by the obedience of Chriſt alone, freely imputed by God, applied and reſted on by faith only.

* In this Edition *page* 3.

For Mr. *Cheynell.*

SIR,

I Received your returns, and the Letter that encloſed them; and ſhall (as briefly as I can) give you my ſence of both. And firſt to your letter, I ſhall tell you truly that you are the only man in the world that ever I knew to have endeavoured the confuting one ſyllable of that Catechiſm; and therefore the addreſs I made to you, I acknowledge to have made to you only. If by your *reverend brethren* you mean thoſe which are here with you employed at this time, I ſuppoſe your periphraſis hath told me who they are, and then I am confident they are perſons which would have communicated to me any ſuch advertiſements, wherein I am ſo nearly concerned (to diſcern whether their diſlikes were cauſeleſs or no) before they had publickly accuſed me for them: which becauſe they have not done, I muſt not yet believe that refutation was publick, or ſuch as could be capable of my notice; though I muſt acknowledge to expect from either of them that which is, as you ſay, much more ſolid than yours, and heartily wiſh it were either of thoſe to whom I am now writing: for then I ſhould make no queſtion, but the ſatisfaction (mutually) would be much greater. But as it is, I muſt undergo my fate, and cannot be deceived in the ſucceſs of this paper, more than I now find my ſelf to have been in the reception of my former, which when I had kept my ſelf within thoſe limits, which I ſuppoſe far from all motion toward diſtemper, and only asked (and as you ſay beg'd) an exact account of what you had ſaid of that Author, and given you the plain reaſons of my requeſt, is yet charged by you to have *fallen foully* on you: To this reproach of yours I reply not one word (being not ſo much in love with that part of your ſpirit as to imitate it; which yet both here and hereafter I beſeech you not to miſtake for a no-ſence of it) but conceive it as true that I have done ſo, as that the errours, ſo ſtiled by you, are either errours, or dangerous. I will not doubt of your employments or diſturbances, nor think your returns are too ſlow, I wiſh you had more leiſure, and more perfect tranquillity of thoughts at all times, eſpecially when I have the luck to diſcourſe with you. In the mean, I beſeech you to believe, that what queſtion ſoever may depend concerning the Meſſengers delivering his errand (whom yet, upon his aſſeveration that he did it aright, I muſt believe) there can be none of the words in my letter, or conſequently of the addition in yours, *viz.* of the [*this night*] wherein I conceived you obliged to give me that account, when you have my paper by you to aſſure you, that I did not.

The words which you affirm to have taken notice of in your *Carfax*-Sermon, I acknowledge to be in the Catechiſm, and muſt ſet them down again in this paper, that you may judge, while I adviſe with you, whether you miſtook them, or no [*The holy Ghoſt was our advocate in ſetling a Miniſtery to pray and intercede for their ſeveral congregations (and enabling them in the very Apoſtles times to form a Liturgy to continue in the Church to that end) and thereby helping our infirmities, and teaching us to pray as we ought.*] You ſee Sir, and muſt acknowledge, the parentheſis in the midſt of the ſentence; and (I ſuppoſe) know the meaning of that, that it is ſo ſet, that it may unite the words after to the words before it, not pretend to joyn them to it ſelf; So that the ſentence without the parentheſis is this (and not altered by it) *That the holy Ghoſt was our advocate in ſetling a Miniſtery to pray and intercede for their ſeveral congregations, and thereby helping our infirmities, and teaching us to pray as we ought.* Only 'tis added by the by, that the holy Ghoſt that thus ſetled that Miniſtery, enabled them in the Apoſtles times to form a Liturgy to continue in the Church to that end, *viz.* of praying and interceding for their ſeveral congregations. To either of theſe thus ſet (as only theſe words can be ſet in conſtruction) your queſtions are wholly impertinent, *i. e.* do no way ingage him that had ſaid theſe words, to ſatisfie your ſeverals, (and I am not over willing now to engage my ſelf to anſwer any more than the matter requires of me.) For firſt, the ſaying that the holy Ghoſt enabled the Miniſtery in the very Apoſtles times to form a Liturgy to continue in the Church, doth not

conclude

conclude that that very Liturgy was to be continued, as in the second and fourth question you change the words, which you needed not have done, unless you meant to get advantage by it, and from thence to conclude it my opinion, that there was some necessity, that that Liturgy formed in the Apostles times should be continued in the Church, as I am told you collected thence: but, you see, I said not, and profess not to have meant in those words [*to continue*] but only that it *might* continue (*i. e.* if the Church thought good) either so as it was, or with such additions or alterations as the Church should think fit; as he that leaves lands to continue to his heirs, obliges not them from ever alienating them, or exchanging. You see, the utmost that these words [*to continue*] on which all the weight of your exceptions lie, can be extended. And that comes not home to your [*was to be continued,*] nor to your questions, which are built upon it. I need say no more to your second *quære*; And yet if I thought you sought for any thing but exceptions in my Papers, I would adde freely, as to a Scholar, or friend, my whole sence of this matter, as a little conversation with ancient Writers hath made it up to me. For once, 'tis this; That the Apostles, and those that were by the holy Ghost consecrated to the planting of the Church, had the gifts of miracles; not every one all, but one one, another another, poured on them; That, among these, in those first times, there was χάρισμα ἐυχῆς, the gift of prayer, (that gift a miracle, as the gift of healing, prophesying, *&c.*) That this was bestowed εἰς ἕτα τίνα, that did pray for the rest, and ask those things that were useful for them, and teach others how to pray; That some of the prayers thus conceived by them, which were fit for the common perpetual uses of all Christians, were received and kept by those whom they thus taught; That those are they which the Ancients mean by Liturgies of Saint *James*, Saint *Mark*, &c. Though I believe not, that either all these are in those Liturgies which now we have under their names, nor that all that are under their names are those; That in the celebration of the Sacrament, which they daily used, some forms were constantly observed by them, no new occasion making it fit to alter them: Of which sort I little doubt of the Lords prayer, the ἀναλογία anon mentioned, from [lift up your hearts,] to [therefore with Angels, *&c.*] *inclusivè*; after that a prayer, called * ἐπίκλησις; then the words of consecration, taken from the Gospel: These, I suppose, I have good authority to think constantly used among them, and the blessing of God hath brought them down to us. Beside these, I make no question but variety of other prayers according to the exercise of that χάρισμα were poured out by him that was so endowed, and those I call not (as I would do the other, and whatever else there was of that nature) set forms in the Apostles times, but plainly exercises of that gift. But then as those forms were preserved and continued, so when those extraordinary χαρίσματα ceased, there was need of somewhat else to supply that place; and that would not be in any reason to permit every man to pray as he would (for that was the thing for the preventing of which, and the unhappinesses consequent to it, the χάρισμα ἐυχῆς had before been given, which but in that respect had not before been useful) but set prepared forms for the daily constant wants, and those provided by the Governours of the Church, Apostolical men, which had so benefited under the prayers of those that had the χάρισμα, or perhaps remembred some forms of theirs, at least the method and manner used by them, that their forms might well deserve to be heeded by, and so continue in the Church, at least were likely to be fitter for the turn than the unpremeditated effusions of them that now had not the extraordinary χάρισμα, and of all whom it cannot be presumed that they have the ordinary wisdom to pray always as they ought. I conceive, I can satisfie any reasonable man for the main of what I have now said, upon those grounds that are fit for a matter of this kind. I mean it not for a new ball of contention between us; I shall satisfie your exceptions to the Author without it. And that is all my answer to your second *quære*. And for your first, I say, that speech concludes me no undertaker, nor obliges me to shew you that Liturgy, any more than my telling you, that as Christ taught his Disciples to pray, so *John Baptist*'s before him taught his, will oblige me to tell you what the *Baptist*'s form was: The Disciples tell me, the *Baptist* did teach his Disciples to pray, and 'tis possible they could not, I am sure they did not help you to the sight of that prayer: and the Authors meanness, or his being so far less authentical than those Disciples, though it may make it more fit for you to dis-believe his report that they formed a Liturgy; yet will it not, to think him more obliged to give you a copy of it, or to acknowledge it temerarious to have said that they did form one, because he hath it not ready to shew. Other reasons, beside that of clear ocular demonstration, may be thought worthy our heeding in matters of fact; the testimony of men nearer those times than we are: And under that head I conceive there are many things to be produced; for whether the Liturgies that go now under the name of St. *Mark* and St. *James* are the very Copies compiled by them or no, it is to me no improbable argument that that age which first acknowledged them to be theirs, had been taught by Story that there were some written by them, upon which they thought fit to father those upon them. Besides this, you have been shewed in another place from 1 *Cor.* 14. 26. that in the Apostles times some of the *Psalms* of *David* or *Asaph* were used ordinarily in their devotions, and that St. *Paul* found fault that they did not all join in the same *Psalm* at the same time, which would, saith he, be best for edification: and if it were mended upon St. *Paul*'s admonition, the use of those very *Psalms* were (at least a part of) a publick divine service, which is the English of *Liturgy*. Secondly, that, if we believe Stories, St. *James*, made choice of some special prayers most frequently used by the Apostles, shortned again by St. *Basil* and St. *Chrysostome*; all which the *Greek* Church, which is fitter to judge (in this matter done among them) than we, do still retain, and make no doubt of the Authors of them. Thirdly, that there is famous mention of a short form of St. *Peter*'s, used alone, they say, for a great while in the *Roman* Church. Fourthly, that 'tis clear, that St. *Augustine* speaking of *Sursum corda*, &c. saith, that they are *verba ab ipsis Apostolorum temporibus petita*, and so the compiler of the Apostles Constitutions, which imitates that antiquity, and makes use of that form, must be thought to have believed, or else he had been much mistaken in his imitation, and had put off his disguise, even by putting it on. 5. That the same words with those in our Liturgy, are not only in the Liturgy which is said to be St. *James*'s, and those other of St. *Basil*, and St. *Chrysostome*, but are recited by St. *Cyrill* of *Jerusalem* (in his Catechism) one of the Ancientest Authors we have. If it may be with your leisure

* τῆς ἀναπομπαίου, after which, οὐκ ἔτι ἄρτος λίτος, ἀλλὰ χειροτ. *&c. Cyr. Cat.* 4.

View of Dir. *pag.* 14.

(though, as I ſaid, I undertake not to demonſtrate, yet) to offer to your judgment, not to breed you more controverſies or diſturbances, I ſhall not only refer you to *Caſſander* to prove that to Chriſts words in the Lords Supper, the Apoſtles added the uſe of the Lords prayer, (which though it were not much, is more than nothing of ſet form, or Liturgy, and might doubtleſs have been accompanied with much more, though I am not able to ſhew it you) but alſo go a little farther with you, upon occaſion of that laſt mentioned form, and that Father.

The form of doxology, following thoſe verſicles of *ſurſum corda*, &c. in our Book, is, you may remember, this, [*therefore with Angels*, &c.] of which there is little queſtion, but that it is the form which was called by the *Greeks* χερυβικὸς, by the *Latines Præparatio* (*viz.* of the Sacrament, as 'tis ſtill in our Church) that αἶνος or δόξα, which, ſaith *Juſt. Mar.* precedeth the Euchariſt, or bleſſing of the elements, *i. e.* prayer of conſecration; ὑμνωδία, ἀινολογία. δοξολογία, ὁ ἐπὶ Σεραφὶμ, by *Cyril* of *Jeruſalem*, which as it is there placed after the εὐχαειτία, *i. e.* (not the Sacrament, but) the giving of thanks, (as with us it is after the [*Let us give thanks to our Lord God*]) ſo it is before the prayer of conſecration; (which other-where, as even now in *Juſtin*, is called by that title, and the Sacrament ἀρτος εὐχαειτηθεὶς) as with us alſo, and is the very καθολικὴ ὑμνωδία, which, ſaith that ancient Author, under the Apoſtolical diſguiſe of *Dionyſius*, the whole Church profeſt before the Sacrament. And this I have ſaid, to ſhew you (if you delight in it) ſome part of that Liturgy (and being in our book you may yet ſee it) which was by thoſe Ancients uſed: And to bring it yet nearer home to the point in hand, 'tis that ancient *Cyrill*'s affirmation of this very form, that it was παραδοθεῖσα ἡμῖν; which words, in the uſe of thoſe Ancients, moſt commonly note the thing they ſpeak of to be delivered them from the Apoſtles, or Apoſtolical men; and being ſpoken by *Cyrill* who was not long after thoſe times, and S. *Auguſt.* ſaying expreſly of *ſurſum corda* (which may very probably extend to this whole ἀινολογία after it) that they were delivered down from the very Apoſtles times: I conceive this, with the other precedent teſtimonies of it, may amount to a proof tolerably ſufficient to perſwade a prudent man that they were ſo. I will prevent a miſtake in this matter of *Cyrill*'s words, which I do not think probable you would fall into, but yet am willing to ſerve you by preventing it, that the *Greek* [παραδοθεῖσαν ἡμῖν ὑπὸ τῶν Σεραφὶμ ἀινολογίαν ταύτην λέγομεν] imports not, as I conceive, that it was delivered by the Seraphim, (for then it would be ἀπὸ; and though that were more than an Apoſtolical, even an Angelical tradition; yet it would rather look to the [*Glory to God on high*,] &c.) but that it is an hymn taking in the Angels to join in lauds with us, (to which I conceive S. *Chryſoſtome* referred in his μετ' ἀγγέλων ᾄδεις, μετ' ἀγγέλων ὑμνεῖς, and the *Greeks* that call it χερυβικὸς, and *Amalarius*, when he ſtiles it *hymnus refertus laudibus Angelorum*,) and this hymn delivered down ἡμῖν by (our *i. e.*) that *Cyrill*'s anceſtors at leaſt, which who they were likely to be, I before gave you reaſon to conjecture. That this thus mentioned by St. *Cyrill*, is that very part of our Liturgy, which I noted it to be, is clear enough by the words that follow in him [ὅπως κοινωνοὶ ἡμῖν ὑμνωδίας ταύτης ἐπουρανοπίους γενώμεθα σωτηρίους,] compared with our [*With all the company of heaven we laud and praiſe*, &c.] and that they are placed as we place them, by the ἵνα ἁγιάσαντες ἑαυτοὺς διὰ τῆς πνευματικῶν τούτων ὕμνων παρακαλῶμεν τὸν φιλάνθρωπον θεὸν τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα ἐξαποστεῖλαι ἐπὶ τὰ προκείμενα, &c. noting this Hymn to be immediately before the * conſecration, and to prepare men for it; which the Liturgick Writers mean by calling it *præfatio actionis, & hymnatio præcedens confirmationem ſacramenti*, and ſo with us it is continued. If I ſhould proceed to give you any more arguments, to perſwade you that the Apoſtles did uſe ſet forms of publick divine Service, and mention thoſe forms to you, I ſhould hope but for little thanks from you, and therefore ſhall abſtain from that profuſion, remembring that all that I am this minute about to prove, is, that I am not bound to ſhew you that Liturgy which was ſaid to be formed in the Apoſtles times. And having ſaid this, I ſuppoſe you will diſcern what my anſwer would be, (if I were obliged by my former words, to give you any, as you ſee I am not) to your other queſtions; or for fear you ſhould miſtake again, I will, *ex abundanti*, return you my opinion; To the third, that he doth; To the fourth, that they may, (I wiſh I could adde, they always do; but I am not obliged to that;) To the fifth, that it is not, if you mean by [*that very*] the ſame without any change: but yet in the ſence that *Theſeus* his ſhip came home the ſame that it went out, and is an inſtance in Logick of one notion of *idem numero*, I conceive it, if poſſible, more than the very ſame, having ſome of the ſame ribs remaining in it (as even now I inſtanced, and profeſs to be perſwaded by thoſe Authorities,) when that is ſuppoſed to have never a one.

* Or that Prayer that I told you was called ἐπίκλησις, wherein they prayed for the ὑποφήτησις, or ἐπίλεψις πνεύμα]ος ἐις τὰ προκείμενα. An ancient form of which we have in St. *Baſils* Liturgy, Σὺ λάμπθα, &c. ἐλθὲν τὸ πνεῦμά σου τὸ ἅγιον ἐφ' ἡμᾶς, καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ προκείμενα δῶρα ταῦτα, καὶ ἐυλογῆσαι αὐτὰ καὶ ἁγιάσαι καὶ ἀναδεῖξαι.

I have no occaſion to add any more in anſwer to the Letter, but to thank Mr. *Reynolds* and you for your willingneſs to give me directions about my firſt-fruits; though the truth is, I am returned from *London*, and did ſpeak to my Brother to ask L. Gen. *Cromwels* aſſiſtance; but Sir *Henry Vane* junior is not of that Committee. Sir *Henry Vane* ſenior was in the Chair, and I delivered my caſe to him, and he fully conſented to the juſtice of my requeſt: and then your ſaying, Sir *Henry Vane hath power to relieve me*, ſhall be ground of hope to me that he will.

NOW for the longer, and ſo ſadder part of my task, wherein you are not ſo courteous to me, as you were in that concluding line of your Letter, I muſt proceed to that.

In the entrance I muſt have leave to be ſorry, that I have to deal with a man that will profeſs himſelf not much taken with that notion of Juſtice (which I ſaid obliged me to deſire an exact account in writing from you, of that wherein that Author was nearly concerned, and could no otherwiſe be ſure not to think any thing of you cauſeleſly.) If this were not juſtice to you, or may not yet be believed ſo by you, I deſpair of ever doing any thing acceptable in your preſence. Our humours, or our principles, will be ſo contrary, that whatever I ſhall ſay, I ſhall have reaſon to ſuſpect you will not be much taken with it; yet I ſhall farther adventure to give you one relation, which will not only clear my former notion of juſtice to you, but offer to your conſideration whether there be not ſomewhat due from you by that notion of juſtice (or ſome other) to that Author, to others, yea and to your ſelf.

There

There fell out in ſome Lay-company in this Town, ſince your Sermon fore-mentioned, a diſcourſe, Whether it were not lawful to ſwear, ſo that that which was ſworn were exactly true; one of the company inſiſted rightly, that it was not, the other was confident it was, and produced for it the Authority of that Author; and to prove that again, ſaid, that the Preacher at St. *Maries* read it out of that Book. Of the truth of this he was ſo confident, that he preſently reſolved to make uſe of that liberty, which he believed from your citation to be the opinion of that Author, more than his carnal heart did permit him to believe the truth of what you added (if you did any thing beſides the reproaching of that Author) in confutation of that Doctrine, and thereupon he ſwore a great Oath, that that which was before him was a candleſtick, and perſwaded himſelf that he had done no hurt in doing ſo.

Now Sir, when I have again told you, and all the world; that that Author hath written moſt ſtrictly againſt ſwearing, (and only differs from you in that queſtion concerning the primary intention of the words of the old Commandment) and ſaid in plain words, 1. That idle, fooliſh, wanton uſing of Gods name, (which if it be not in oaths, is leſs than ſwearing) ſure profane uſing of it, (which in all the editions was in, and abſolutely belonged to all kind of unlawful oaths) might be reſolved to be forbidden there by reduction: And 2. That under Chriſt (which again I tell you, belonged to all to whom that Catechiſm could ſpeak,) there is a total univerſal prohibition of ſwearing it ſelf, making that as unlawful now, as perjury was before. 3. That to ſwear in ordinary converſation is utterly unlawful. 4. That all voluntary, eſpecially promiſſory oaths, are now utterly unlawful for a Chriſtian. And 5. thoſe voluntaries defined to be thoſe that have their impellent or principle from my ſelf; when I have, I ſay, told you all this, then for Gods ſake ponder ſadly with your own heart, in caſe that poor ſoul be ever tormented in hell for that vain oath, (as, without Gods mercy upon repentance, undoubtedly he will) how much you have to charge upon your ſelf for giving him confidence that that Author had ſaid what he learnt from you: eſpecially ſeeing your Sarcaſm in that phraſe of *the much admired Catechiſm*, might tell you that it was poſſible ſome poor, paſſionate, ſinful creature, might thus unhappily admire it. I conjure you, not to think there is any jeſt in this, but believe from me, that I am able to produce the perſon that heard it, (and that had that care and love of piety and of truth, and that particular knowledge of my deteſting all oaths, as to come in ſome paſſion to me for ſatisfaction,) and that I have already ſeriouſly ſent to diſabuſe the offender, leſt that ſin ſhould be laid to his charge, which you have made that Book be the occaſion of; and when you have laid this to your heart, the God of all grace direct you to do your duty in this particular.

I will not confute your opinion, that I have ſtooped lower in my Rejoinder than I was in my Letter, by begging what I did before but deſire, (I will be very willing to do ſo always, and ſhall yet be more vile than ſo, if that may perſwade you to do me juſtice;) and yet it may be obſerved, that in your judgment to deſire and requeſt (which I did before) is ſo much lower than to beg, (which is but a nicety,) that until I did beg, as well as deſire and requeſt, and again re-inforce my requeſt, you did not think fit to grant me the leaſt crumb of that juſtice which I deſired from you.

At the phraſe [*exact account*] you affirm your ſelf to have ſtumbled, and call it [*thoſe hard words.*] If this be ſo, I cannot tell how to behave my ſelf ſo cautiouſly, as either to ſpeak plainly enough to you, or to keep you from ſtumbling. For [*exact account*] is ſo plain to be underſtood, and ſo unlike *juriſdiction*, unleſs you miſtook it for exacting an account, (which you are too ſubtle to do, when the word *deſire* went before it,) that if ever I had exerciſed juriſdiction over you, or any other, (which I never was in place to do, the Office for which my firſt-fruits are required, being without a juriſdiction annext to it;) yet you could not have been tempted by that to this miſtake. I ſuppoſe you were pleaſed to be merry, when you imply you were; and therefore muſt friendly admoniſh you, that there is a ſhrewd diſeaſe, in which *Irenæus* had ſo much skill as to pronounce ἢ πλέον γελῶσι τάυτῃ μᾶλλον κακῶς ἔχουσιν, and therefore I ſhall briefly deſire you, that hereafter you ſpeak, 1. So properly as not to ſay, *deſiring* is *exerciſing juriſdiction*; And 2. Seriouſly, (for truly I am not in jeſt, when I write to you, and that would have kept you ſafe from ſtumbling. Yet becauſe you are at ſuch leiſure as to remember I had an Office in your now Countrey, I ſhall tell you that there is a ſeal belonging to that Office, from which, if you had induction to that Living, you may read in your Wax, μακάριοι ὅταν ὀνειδίσωσιν, and then you will ſoon diſcern how many men, as well as me, you have helpt to make happy. I bleſs God, (and will never curſe you,) that I am one of that number.

In your next Section, you pray for them that ſuggeſted ſo many falſe accuſations againſt you to me. But firſt, you affirm not above one to have been falſe; and that I confeſs to be ſo, and need not to be told ſo back again. As for your new accuſation, which you are reſolved to pay me in ſtead of that former, I deſire you to know that I defie it, and know no danger or ill found in the language of *Speculative myſtery*, nor acknowledge any Author of it whom you can ſuſpect; particularly, not him whoſe name you blotted out, ſo that I might read; I mean, neither *Smalcius* nor *Socinus*, whoſe doctrines in the buſineſs of the Trinity I do heartily diſclaim; and am ſo far from being tainted or tempted by them, that I cannot ſay I ever permitted my ſelf to read any Tract in them, or any other of that ſet, (unleſs in the *Racovian Catechiſm*) on that ſubject. And you will never repair the injury, if you uſe arts to faſten it on me, or to perſwade any man that I was ever inclined towards it. For your nicety by which you except againſt my calling the doctrine of the Trinity a *ſpeculative myſtery*, ſaying that it is *practical*, and giving your reaſon, [becauſe the bleſſed Trinity is the object of our worſhip, as well as of our faith;] I ſhall make no ſcruple to acknowledge the Trinity to be the object of our worſhip, (and to that end I directed that concluding act of my worſhip to that bleſſed object) and every point of that which in the Catechiſm is made due to God, I ſuppoſed there, and now profeſs to be perfectly due to the Trinity. But then you might remember, that you acknowledge it the object of our faith; and of that there be many parts which will not be diſparaged by being ſtiled myſteries and depths of ſpeculation, and in that ſence, or as they are ſo, I then ſpake, and only ſo, and need not acknowledge any impropriety in that ſpeech; becauſe though a ſpeculative doctrine may be alſo practical in another reſpect, as the knowledge of the cauſes of diſeaſes is a practi-

cal

cal knowledge in reſpect of the cures it will help to work; yet as that is ordinarily called the *Theory* of Phyſick, and is preſumed before Students aſcend to the practical; ſo I told you the Author ſuppoſed the ſpeculative underſtanding of that myſtery in the Church-Catechiſm, before he came to the Doctrines in this Book, which are the practical. You remember me, that a Sacramental Covenant is practical; and I may as well remember you that there are *credenda* propoſed to the vower in that Sacrament, as well as *facienda*.

On occaſion of mention of the Church-Catechiſm, you ſay, you like that better than my Practical, and I confeſs my ſelf to do ſo too; ſo vehemently, that I believe 'twill be long ere we ſee a better in its ſtead. But yet I conceive, that he that hath learnt that, may be capable of more, at leaſt of directions to make uſe of that knowledge imbibed to the amendment of his life: elſe, moſt of our preaching were in vain; nay elſe, both that Catechiſm ought never to have been expounded, and every one that hath written any thing elſe for the benefiting of youth or men, muſt lie under the prejudice of that inſolence of thinking himſelf able to make a better, as well as this Author.

For your juſtice in that anſwer to the third reaſon, I am not to thank you, nor can I think that any man that was in any meaſure my friend, needed to be told by you or any, that I acknowledged the Trinity. If he did, examine your own heart, whether you know not ſome body, who had helped to defame me in that particular, by ſaying I was a *Socinian* or the like, or by ſaying I maintain many errours broached by ſuch; If you do not, I will thank you for the good office you mention; and ſo haſten alſo, (and wiſh heartily I could make more haſte to get into ſome more delightful imployment) to the ſecond report.

In that, I ſee, I met with no falſe accuſation of you, but in you enough of injury to that Author, by picking out what might make him odious, and preſent him an eloquent learned diſciple of yours, to be taught, that ſwearing is a ſin; or rather a prophane deſigner, and corrupter of the Nation, that hath given Boys a liberty of ſwearing in their Catechiſm. I have ſufficiently told you, and all men, that that Author is moſt guiltleſs of that charge, and if you will not yet acknowledge it, I muſt leave it to God to judge betwixt us; as alſo, whether he produce not the unqueſtionable command of God againſt all ſwearing, aſſertory or promiſſory; and whether you do not imply, that he doth ſo, in ſaying againſt him that [*the perhaps imaginary ſuperaddition*] (which you know are no other than the words of Chriſt) *will not be ſo effectual to reſtrain, as the unqueſtionable command of God.* Sir, doth he queſtion the Command of God to be againſt ſwearing? doth he not ſay that all prophane uſe of Gods name is ſure forbidden under the third Commandment of the Law by reduction? (or is not all unlawful ſwearing, aſſertory as well as promiſſory, a prophane uſing of his name?) that I may not add that he produces, and earneſtly inſiſts on the direct clear command of Chriſt againſt all voluntary oaths, which is unqueſtionably a Command of God to any that is not worſe than a *Socinian*, and denies Chriſt to be God at all. And whereas you obſerve by the way, that there is liberty given by this Author for aſſertory oaths, do you think there was not that liberty for ſome ſort of them? or doth the Author ſay there was for all ſorts of them? or for any that were voluntary? He ſuppoſes the primary intention of the third Commandment (and of theſe words, *thou ſhalt perform*, &c. againſt non-performance of promiſſory oaths) to be againſt perjury; Under that, by reduction, to be forbidden (not ſwearing ſimply taken, and ſo not all aſſertory oaths, but) all prophane uſing of Gods name, which ſure contains aſſertory oaths, though not them only, or all of that ſort, becauſe ſome others do prophane Gods name; and of theſe, all do not, but only thoſe that uſe it unneceſſarily. This is ſufficient indeed to conclude all kind of aſſertory oaths, not to be the particular matter of *Moſes* Law, and indeed no ſort of them to be ſo much as reducible thither, but only thoſe where his name is unneceſſarily uſed; but ſure thoſe that are ſuch, it doth not give any liberty to, nor can you think it did, without pronouncing at the ſame time, that 'twas contradicted in the next page, which I muſt ſuppoſe you were able to ſee, becauſe you lookt ſo narrowly here to find this hole, which I am perſwaded never any the moſt carnal man ever took notice of, to encourage himſelf in his ſin, till you directed him to it. By which you may ſee, that ſome men are more induſtrious in finding faults to accuſe their brethren, than others in ſeeking pretences to excuſe themſelves.

To your Arguments I ſhall endeavour to ſay little, partly as not apprehending the force of them, partly ſuppoſing that we now talk of a matter of fact, which may be tried by evidence; the Book being ready to prove the truth of what I affirm from it; and then 'tis not in the power of a thouſand probable arguments (much leſs of a few diſ-jointed) to wreſt any man out of ſuch a certainty. I ſhould willingly venture them to any Reader to do their worſt on him, eſpecially your firſt, whereby you would ſhew that he cannot prove the Doctrine of a total univerſal prohibition of ſwearing it ſelf, and making it as unlawful now, as perjury was before, unleſs he loſe the total in a cypher. Where ſure, Sir, 1. If a man would bind you to your words, you are now much leſs an enemy to ſwearing *in univerſum*, than the Author was: for otherwiſe that would not be objected, that he prohibits more of that kind than he can prove. And 2. for mincing the total into a cypher, you will have no reaſon to fear, for though he ſhould mince the total ſomewhat, and ſay with (I aſſure you, not from) *Smalcius* (for who doth not ſay ſo too?) that I muſt not ſwear, but for Gods glory, and the publick good; yet is not that all cypher, I hope, for it prohibits all ſwearing in communication, as utterly unlawful; all voluntary, eſpecially promiſſory oaths. But then, Sir, you muſt know that a total prohibition of ſwearing it ſelf, contains all ſwearing by any creature, as well as by God, and that is no cypher neither.

As for your queſtion, Whether the perfect Law of God did give men leave to take vain oaths? he is willing moſt clearly to ſatisfie that, and aſſure you of his opinion, that it did not; and becauſe by the whole period I cannot poſſibly conclude any thing but only this, that you know not why I uſed the word Total, (*a total univerſal prohibition of ſwearing*) I will tell you that too; becauſe Chriſt had ſaid, μὴ ὀμόσαι ὅλως, *ſwear not at all*; which what it ſignifies, is here ſufficiently explained, thus, not only not by God, but not by any creature of God neither.

2. In the difference, as you ſtate it, betwixt us, you are very unjuſt, in ſaying I undertook to prove, that by the third Commandment there was no more meant, than that a man ſhould not for-

ſwear

ſwear himſelf. This is falſe; I never undertook it, but profeſs that what is forbidden by *reduction*, is meant as *truly*, though not ſo *evidently* propoſed, as what is *expreſt*, and therefore you muſt be content to open your eyes, and ſee what is the queſtion between the *Scholar* and the *Catechiſt*, (and the ſame alſo is the concluſion) *viz.* not what is meant, *i. e.* what is the *full adequate importance* of *that Commandment*, or what it contains under it; but what that is, *i. e.* what the words ſtrictly ſignifie, or, as 'tis now expreſt, what is the *primary intention* of the phraſe; and to that queſtion the anſwer is made [*no more undoubtedly but forſwearing*;] as if the queſtion were askt of [ὁ μοιχεύσεις] is that no more than that *thou ſhalt not commit adultery?* I ſhould anſwer, *no more undoubtedly*; yet never fear that any man would think that I affirmed, that *fornication*, and *all other villany* was not there forbidden, eſpecially when I had alſo added, that it were by *reduction*; and ſo in like manner, to take the queſtion that you after ſet, whether I will ſay there is no more meant by the ſixth *Commandment* than *taking away the life of a man*; I anſwer, that the word *killing* is no more, and that was all the Author ſaid of the third *Commandment*, *viz.* that the *Commandment* in *Exod.* (that is, the *words* of the *Commandment* (which are there ſet down) *Thou ſhalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain*) is no more than *forſwearing*; that the *words* were the ſubject ſpoken of, 'tis plain by the proofs produced of it, from the uſe of thoſe words in other places. This is ſo probable a truth, that I could not have thought it needful to have given it illuſtration to any man elſe.

3. When I appeal'd to *Chriſt* as Judge, and thought I had made good my appeal by producing his words whereby he renders that *Commandment*, οὐκ ἐπιορκήσεις [*thou ſhalt not forſwear*;] you attempt to argue and prove againſt me, but never take notice of my proof, which is abſolutely againſt law of pleading or diſputing. And for the argument you confront to it, I aſſure you it perſwades me nothing, but that you thought πονηρῷ was to be written with ε. For though I ſhall tell you that all Oaths, that come from evil or from the Devil, are not from thence concluded to be evil or deviliſh, becauſe the Oath that I take lawfully in Judicature may come originally from evil or from the devil in *another*, and muſt not needs be from evil in the *taker*, ſo I have no need to anſwer you with that, but plainly confeſs, that all evil and deviliſh Oaths are forbidden in the third Commandment.

I need not deny but that שוא may ſometimes be rendred vain, and ſo ſometimes 'tis, even when it ſignifies a *Lye*, (as μάταιον in the *Bible* hath a peculiarity ſometimes to denote *Idols*, thoſe greateſt lies in the World.) All that I was to conclude was, that *Chriſt* having expreſt it by a word which Saint *Matthew* here reads ἐπιορκήσεις, there was nothing in that *Hebrew* phraſe, but what was agreeable to this, and that is true, though it ſhould be granted to ſignifie *vanum*, becauſe it doth *falſum* alſo. But you ſay, you need not go about to prove that the *Jews* ſaw this truth as clearly as we do, but you can prove that they ſaw and acknowledged it, and that that is ſufficient for you; and then let me tell you, you have fought blind all this while, and now you may ſee, if you will, that foraſmuch as concerns this Author (unleſs you will fight on, when you ſay you need not) your great quarrel is at an end; for he that ſaid in general of all this *Sermon* in the *mount*, that *Chriſt* added either *new precepts*, or *new light*, promiſed to be ſatisfied with either of them: and though he conceives the * *Greek Fathers* to have generally affirmed the former, and the *Latin* alſo, for the firſt 400 years, (particularly in this matter of ſwearing, *Theophylact*, οὐκ ἦν πονηρὸν τότε. μετὰ δὲ χρόνον ἐστὶ πονηρόν· expreſſing his opinion to be, that ſome ſwearing was πονηρὸν under *Chriſt*, which had not been ſo before) yet he hath obliged himſelf to be content with the latter, which now, you ſay, you need not deny, (I would you had never needed to oppoſe one ſo violently, that aſſerted no more, than what you need not deny;) and therefore I will now adde only thus much, that, 1. This is the meaning and effect of affirming it [forbidden there, not by the *primary* intention of the word] for from thence it is that the clearneſs ariſes; that which is forbidden by *reduction* only, being not ſo clear, nor conſequently ſo deeply obliging thoſe to whom it is not (ſuppoſing ſtill that it is not their fault, that it is not) ſo clear. 2. That if it were granted, that *Chriſt* gave a *new precept* here, it would not yet follow, that all unlawful ſwearing by *Gods name* was not forbidden before: becauſe there is another thing which he may have added to the third *Commandment*, the not ſwearing by *any thing elſe*, as well as not by *God*. But, you ſee, I need not now affirm this; I will give you leave to think that I am ſo awed by you, that I am not willing to ſpring you any new game of controverſies. I confeſs I like not the ſport ſo well, as to ſollicite your company any further.

* See the teſtimonies of the Fathers both Greek and Latin in the Catechiſm p. 37, 38. not thought fit then to ſwell up this Letter.

For the *Septuagints* διὰ μαλαίᾳ, I gave you an hint by the way, that that will gain you but little.

For my knowledge of the primary ſignification of שוא you muſt not judge, for he that ſhall but look into *Schindler* (as venerable an Author ſure as *Pagnin*) will find that he ſaith 'tis uſed *de re falsâ*, *vanâ*; Firſt *falsâ*; but if you had pleaſed, my argument of the uſe of the word in the *ninth Commandment* (as fit to expound the *Second* as any) might have been thought as fit to be conſidered, as what you have inſiſted on in ſtead of it.

You do well to abſtain from the *negative* argument of [he might but did not.] But then it is not true that the queſtion betwixt you and me is not about the *primary* intention of the phraſe: for whoſoever reads that *Catechiſm*, theſe letters, or even many of your arguments, will know it is; or if not, I make no ſcruple to pronounce, what I have done ſo oft, that I have no other quarrel to you in this matter, ſave only the injuries you did me at Saint *Maries*, and every one that believed ought of it from you. But ſure, Sir, I have not acknowledged in any manner, that the firſt edition of that Book had any thing in it queſtionable in the judgment of learned men; I told you it was [*in kindneſs and ſubmiſſion to the meaneſt*,] and that *kindneſs* and *ſubmiſſion* intimates no more acknowledgment of queſtionableneſs, than the word *meaneſt* intimates the *learnedſt*. I would now add, that I might have done it to prevent cauſeleſs quarrelling, but that I now ſee that it will not do that neither.

As for your long deduction and magnifying of your coſt and travail through the Additions, *&c.* of that *Catechiſm*, you might have been leſs Playſome *in re ſeriâ*. If you do not already know that you have prevaricated herein, you may read and remember the *Printers* Poſtſcript (which I think you cite alſo, and ſo have read, I ſhall now but adviſe you to remember it) and you cannot chuſe but ſee, find, I hope, acknowledge) that all your Fable vaniſhes, and your Hiſtory ends in this plain brief, that will bring no ſcorn on the *Author*, *viz.* that he prepared a new edition of the *Catechiſm*; added a third

third part more; and, to ſerve the meaneſt, explained every thing that by any advice or hint he obſerved to need explaining; call it *altering*, if you will, for *to alter from worſe to better* he profeſſes himſelf to think an amiable, imitable quality, and will never be aſhamed of it: yet muſt not now aſſume it to himſelf, having, I aſſure you, no right to it, any further than it ſignifies *explaining*. This edition had long ſince been Printed in *Oxford*, could the Printer have gotten down ſo much Paper. When the City was rendred 'twas carried to *London* to that end, where againſt the Authors will or knowledge three editions had been made by the firſt Copy, one of which was juſt then ended; and by that means the *Printer* had been at greater loſs than I was willing to be cauſe of to an enemy, if another new impreſſion had been then made of it. This, God knows, was the cauſe it is now ſet out ſo troubledly (the *Printer* being willing to put out the additions thus, rather than not at all; and to put this *inconvenience* on the *Reader*, than loſs upon *himſelf*) for which, though I was very ſorry, yet I never foreſaw that I ſhould be thus chid and reproacht, and triumpht over for it. I hope ſome of the μακαριοι in Chriſts Sermon may be the portion of them that ſuffer without a cauſe, though it be not upon that excellent ſtile [*for righteouſneſs ſake*:] I am ſure, this of mine is not for unrighteouſneſs. And now as ſeriouſly you ſhall judge of the thing called *exerciſing of patience*, and never expect to be thankt for your charges, unleſs it had brought in to me more juſtice (I need not ſay charity) from you. And if after this, nothing will ſatisfie you but *recantation*, ſo oft repeated *recantation*. (O that this φιλοτιμια might be changed into that of the Apoſtles, of the ἁρπαζειν) get me but ſome Expedient that lying ſhall be no ſin, and that no other ſin in you or others ſhall be conſequent to it in this, and for the other part of it, if it can delight you more than the calling for it hath done already, you ſhall have my moſt willing conſent towards it.

For the latter end of the ſheet, of *deceiving the Kingdom*, of *ſeduction*, &c. and what follows in the next, to the end of the report, I am ſenſible of it, and I thank God I have received grace from him to pray that I may make the ſame uſe of it, that *David* doth in the ſtory of *Shimei*'s reviling, 2 *Sam.* 16. 10. I pray alſo, and deſire the prayers of all good men, that God would ſhew me the ſin which hath now brought this portion of calumny upon me, and that is all I would ſay to it. And yet, after this reſolved ſilence to that part, I ſhall again anſwer to you ſome few things. 1. That when in your fourth conſideration you ſay [*meant in a Commandment*] you ſhould ſay, *ſignified by the words of a Commandment*. 2. That which you call, *taking in a latitude*, I call *reduction*. 3. That my explications were deſigned by me to be as remarkable, nay much more than the firſt edition was: for I deſigned a full impreſſion, and many other things to make them ſo. 4. I never had any thing to do (not ſo much as the knowledge, at that time) with the ſetting out any edition of that Book, ſave only of thoſe additions, and of printing the firſt few Copies at *Oxford*, for the uſe of thoſe that were more willing to be at that charge, than at a greater in tranſcribing it. 5. I ſay moſt diſtinctly, that every emendation in that Book, that to my utmoſt remembrance I can ſpeak of, was intended long before ever the Town was near taking: and for danger of being called to an account of any thing ſaid in it, God knows my ſimplicity, I was never near dreaming or thinking of it, and am now in courage enough to fear neither men nor Angels in that particular. 6. That I know not, that ever I have made you a ſolemn profeſſion under my hand to give you ſatisfaction; and my moſt careful recollecting what I have wrote, cannot bring it to my remembrance: certainly you dreamt of that together with the *round recantation*. If it were any thing above endeavouring it, certainly it was a very raſh promiſe; and if ſo, I beſeech you remit it to me, for I would not willingly take any more pains about it. For other men, I am more ſecure: and if you once be ſatisfied, I ſhall ſuppoſe all men, that know it, will think it time for them to give over quarrelling. 7. That by [*would*] I did in effect mean, were forbidden alſo by God, when *Moſes* publiſhed the Law; and have oft told you how I meant ſo. 8. I have already told you, that you came not into my heart, when I thought or ſpake of ſubmiſſion to the meaneſt: and wonder as much, that you ſhould think the alterations were made in *ſubmiſſion to you*, as that you ſhould now rank your ſelf with the meaneſt, who have not ſupererogated in humility ſince I met with you. Truly, Sir, I do not think, meanneſs is the cauſe of your miſ-underſtandings, nor did I ever from any friend at *London* hear of any particular you diſliked in it: or if I had, by any ſuch meſſage, I would have found out ſome way to have offered you or any man living a friendly debate about it. For your reſpects, I find little ſigns of them now, and by the ſubjects do believe that there were little expreſt in thoſe letters of yours ten years ago about me. I can, and do freely forgive you all: but know not that I am bound to thank you, till ſome body elſe tell me ſo. 9. If any learned men ever told me of that opinion about *Chriſt improving the Law*, and expreſt themſelves to think it were an errour, I am confident I have given them ſuch a ſtate of my opinion in that matter, that no good Chriſtian can find fault with, or lay any charge on it of hurt or danger to any mans manners, if it were ſuppoſed falſe. And beſides, you may know, that as Learned as any this age now hath, both of Ancients and others, are fully of my opinion: And let me tell you, that ten years ago I had no objection againſt my opinion, but that it was by ſome men fathered on *Socinus*: but knowing, that I believed it long before I ever ſaw one word (I think, had heard the name) of *Socinus*; and that the Scripture and Fathers, and other the like means, which taught me all my other Divinity, taught me that too; and ſaw, that if it were a miſtake, it could make no man live worſe, (as the contrary opinion might do, if it were ſo) I reſolved to deny my ſelf in that phantaſie rather than objection; and ſpeak what I thought might edify, what diminution of credit ſoever it brought after it. I ſhall add my thanks for your counſel, which I would fain think to be in great earneſt, but that I ſuppoſe you cannot believe that I look upon *Criticiſms* as a kind of heaven, nor that you would think fit to ſend out in the ſame breath true Chriſtian earneſt, (for, above all things, I account admonitions ſo) and Sarcaſms. I ſhall only deſire, that I may ſtudy the Moral Law, as I find it delivered from that ſecond Mount: and I will obey you in all other motions, and (as you deſire) not cenſure you for this part of your Sermon, how bitter ſoever it is, but thank you for all the good you meant by it. But whatſoever you ſay of the Moral Laws perfection, I hope it muſt not ſo be underſtood as to deny that Chriſt (as he gave more grace than was ever allowed in the ſtate of Nature, or by the Law, ſo) might, if he pleaſed, improve the obligations which either

either the natural Law, or that given by God through *Moſes*, had laid on men; and whether by new precepts, or new light, call us to a higher degree of perfection (and oblige us to it) than others had by any particular precept thought themſelves obliged to. As for the *imaginary ſuperadditions* you talk of, you will I hope conſider, that 'tis as dangerous to detract from the Word of God, as to add to it; and to deny Chriſt to have added, if he have, as to affirm him, if he have not. I am ſure, the conſequences may be more dangerous. As for your ſtile of *perfect and ſpiritual Law*, I ſhall in the plain word acknowledge it, that it was both perfect (in reſpect of the ſtate of men to whom it was given, whether by *Moſes* to the Jews, or by the God of Nature to all men) and ſpiritual alſo, extending to the ſpirit or ſoul of man, and not only to the outward actions. But this, I am perſwaded, hinders not but that Chriſt that gives more grace than was brought into the World by the Law of *Moſes* or Nature, and that disburdened all men of that ſad yoke that lay on the Jews, and that is content to accept of ſincere without not-ſinning obedience, may have leave to advance his diſciples to an higher pitch of ſpiritual perfection (whether by new laws or new light) than the Law in the former delivery of it had advanced them: And to ſet up this pitch, whatever it is, as a precept, (not only a counſel of perfection) to us Chriſtians, was the utmoſt of my deſign and endeavours in that Sermon you ſpeak of ten years ago, and is of this Author now; and I never imagined it poſſible that this doctrine could give any man liberty to think worſe of the Law of God, or practiſe leſs of it; but have reaſon to think (and could give an experimental account of what I ſay) that the not teaching it, might flatter men ignorantly to believe that there was leſs required of them than I conceive (and deſire, they ſhould conceive) there is. And do you conſider alſo, that he which is πονηρὸν, and moſt cunningly reſiſts all the reſtraints that obſtruct or undermine his temptations, is ὁ διάβολος & ἀντίδικος alſo; can plead againſt, accuſe, and calumniate any man or doctrines that are contrary to him. And ſo I humbly take leave of the ſecond report, the Lord forgive you for it.

In the third report it ſeems I was not miſtaken neither, nor in my expectation, that plain poſitive affirming the things you would have affirmed, would not ſatisfie you. I told you, that the Author under the general phraſe of all kinds and ſorts of ſin, ſets in the front the weakneſs, frailties, and pollutions of our nature, our proneneſs and inclination to ſin. This your Sermon ſaid was ſpeaking with irreſolution, as if he doubted, *&c.* I told you once again this is no irreſolution; and he doth not doubt but that this aptneſs to fall into all ſin is a ſin, to wit, an averſion of our faculties from God, which ought wholly to be converted to him; will this ſatisfy you? I have reaſon from your former carriage not to be over confident that yet it will; for if it doth, you ought in all reaſon to have been ſatisfied before, where it was ſet down as a firſt *ſpecies* of ſin. You ſay, my expreſſion is inexcuſable of [*as infelicities*, if not as *ſins*,] you, it ſeems, are reſolv'd it ſhall not be excuſed to you, and therefore will not interpret it by the words that went next before it, or ſo as it may be reconciled with them, but will force it to a ſence directly contradictory to what went juſt before it, and ſo muſt ſuppoſe *me mad* (for ſo is he that can affirm contradictions at one) only becauſe you will not be juſt; any thing that is moſt irrational muſt be believed of another man, rather than an expreſſion be excuſed by you. But, Sir, I do not yet think it inexcuſable, if I deſired to bring all thoſe men on their knees (in humiliation and godly ſorrow for their inclinations to evil) which do not believe them, when they are not conſented to, to be other than infelicities. Men that will not be of my opinion in all things, I can be content to ſerve and miniſter unto, and labour to do them good upon their own (if they will not permit me upon my) principles. But then 1. it ſeems I muſt not ſay, *pollutions of nature* (I ſaid, *of our nature*, and you ſeldom leave out the leaſt word by chance, or but when you have ſome deſign in it,) or if I do, that expreſſion is more proper to denote actual ſins, than original ſin, which is one entire, *&c.* I ſhall put it to the queſtion, whether *pollutions of our nature* be at all proper to denote actual ſins, which are pollutions of our perſons; whether not moſt proper to our natural averſions from God, or inclinations to evil: If the wiſeſt or meaneſt would have that better expreſt, I deſire to hear from them, and it ſhall be conſidered againſt another edition, which will again (after all your triumph on that occaſion) ſtoop to ſerve the meaneſt in explaining.

2. For him that (as you ſay) hath *conſented* to the corruption of his nature, that hath cheriſhed and been pleaſed with it, I ſhall ſuppoſe him to have committed an actual ſin, and then ſure his evil inclination was not the thing which could be capable of the title of infelicity in any mans ſence, for that title ſuppoſes poſitively that they are not conſented to. And though every man that is of age hath ſometimes ſo conſented, yet ſometimes, and in ſome one act, I ſhall by Gods grace ſuppoſe it poſſible that he hath not; and then, that his act of non-conſenting will be a piece of Chriſtian victory over that ſinful inclination; and the ſinful inclination, though it ſhall ſtill continue a ſin, and be matter of humiliation, yet ſure will not paſs with you for a ſin cheriſhed at that time, and conſented to.

Your third quarrel grounded on the conceit that I ſeem to imply, *that there muſt needs be ſome conſent given to every actual ſin*, did make a very hard ſhift to be a quarrel; and in ſtead of being managed with blows, ſtands ſtill, and falls out into contumelies; and concludes that I ſhould prove, but it ſelf ventures not to diſprove any thing: otherwiſe (if I ſaw your grounds of ſcruple) it may poſſibly be believed, that this Divinity might be cleared to you, without pretending, as you ſay, to *Dictatorſhips*.

4. I do neither recant what was ſaid before, nor doubt whether *inclinations to ſin be ſins*, *i. e.* averſions from God; and then it matters not what you ſay I ſeem to do: I ſaid this before, and ſo I ſay ſtill, and (how humble ſoever the diſlike of your behaviours towards me may by Gods grace help me to be) this is not recanting.

5. For the danger, I ſhall acknowledge it, when I acknowledge the thing, but to ſet down inclinations to ſin in the front of the *ſpecies* of the general phraſe [*all ſorts of ſin*] is not to ſpeak ſceptically. How many ſoever there be that teach otherwiſe, you ſee I am not one of them; And why that Author uſed the word [*if not*,] you have been told ſo oft already, that you could have no excuſe to ask the reaſon of it again, but your deſire to lay a new accuſation on me of complying with the

Socinians. Which, Sir, is, as your accuſation, ſo your calumny again, if you meant any other thing by *compliance* than the deſiring more to bring all to humble themſelves before God for their inclinations to ſin (on what principles ſoever they went) than at that time, in the midſt of a *Practical Catechiſm*, in the matter of Repentance, to fall a diſputing with all comers about original ſin. For the *Liturgy* you ſpeak of, if you know not my mind, let me tell you, 1. That I would have the Litany continued in the Church, the firſt part of which is ſufficiently contrary to your [*&c.*] and this you may gheſs by a Book which I profeſs to ſubſcribe to in that particular, *viz*. *The view of the Direct. pag.* 25, and 26. Then ſecondly, that I would have the *Doxologies* continued, and how that would become ſuch a Liturgy you may ſee, *View of the Direct. pag.* 32, and 33. Yet farther, that I would have the *Creed* continued, yea, and *kneeling at the Sacrament*, among other reaſons for this, (on which the Proteſtants in *Poland* forbad ſitting,) becauſe I would not comply with the ancient or modern *Arians*, or any other that make our Saviour a mere creature. For which I ſhall direct you alſo to that *View of the Direct. pag.* 28. I ſhall not now ask you, which is more compliant to your [*&c.*] the New Directory, or Old Liturgy; nor whether a *Socinian* may not more conveniently officiate now (and ſo, in that caſe, thoſe of his opinions join with him) than they could ſix years ago, when the whole Church ſervice was appointed to be read conſtantly in every Church. I am not willing to trouble you with any new queſtions, but only to be ſatisfied by you in matter of fact what wrong you have done that Author in your Sermons, and to ſhew you that it is wrong. As for reparations from you, I now know you better than vehemently to expect any, and by your carriage in this particular, and your *If I were compoſing ſuch a Liturgy*,] I am for the future arm'd to be content with what now I find, and to expect that when you want even words in the Author to cavil at, (as it will be long before thoſe will be wanting,) and I remember to have ſeen an art of cavilling that turn'd every word of the *Creed* into hereſy, or blaſphemy, or Atheiſm, and then what ſhall become of this poor mortal frail Catechiſm, when ſuch an artificer is reſolved to triumph over it?) poſſibilities, and jealouſies, ſuch as the [*If you were compoſing*, &c.] ſhall be ſufficient to rob that Author of his little reputation. That that [*if*] could have no ground but in your deſign *quocunq; modo* to defame him for a *Socinian*, you will gheſs, when again I tell you that the placing inclinations in the front of ſins, was a declaration free and full againſt that errour.

6. I am, you ſee, neither of their mind that think inclination to ill no ſin, nor therefore did I blind, but inſtruct my Reader with that *Orthodox expreſſion*, as you call it; and 'tis hard that a man cannot uſe Orthodox expreſſions, but he muſt be accuſed for doing it, upon ſuppoſition that he did it to this end that he might afterwards tempt others to an errour. God knows our hearts, and muſt only judge that of me; and till he have done ſo, and revealed it to you, 'tis want of charity in you to ſay I have not done fairly.

7. If it were never ſo abſurd, to ſay that godly ſorrow were to be conceived for an infelicity *quà ſic*, merely as an infelicity, yet it might be conceived for it [*as an infelicity if not a ſin*;] *i. e.* by them who doubt whether it be a ſin or no, or who, though they are not certainly perſwaded that it is a ſin, when unconſented to, yet acknowledge it ſo, when it is conſented to, and then grieve for it as for a ſin; and when it is not, acknowledge it to be an infelicity, and grieve for that alſo. Beſides, an infelicity may be ſuch an infelicity, that it may be matter of godly ſorrow, though not *quà ſic*, merely as an infelicity: as, in this point, I may have ſorrow that I have a vitious impure nature about me, which is juſtly thought by me an infelicity, eſpecially in compariſon with that pure ſtate of them that are with Chriſt; and this ſorrow is *κατὰ Θεὸν*, a ſorrow according to God; and the interpretation of deſiring or loving the appearance of Chriſt, and ſo a godly ſorrow: and he that doth not poſitively reſolve that this having a vitious nature is more than a pollution and an infelicity, taking neither of them for a ſin, may yet mourn for it *quà* a pollution, not *quà* an infelicity; and make good that he doth ſo, by profeſſing ſincerely, that he would undergo any infelicity, on condition to get rid of this pollution. And yet laſtly, (which is the only anſwer neceſſary for you to conſider to this point) if that which you ſay is abſurd, were ſo indeed, it would rather prove, that which is called [*an infelicity, if not a ſin*] were indeed a ſin, when 'tis ſaid of it in that very place, that it muſt be matter of contrition or godly ſorrow; than that it is taken to be no ſin, when 'tis both affirmed to be one, and to be matter of contrition. If I ſhould ſay, that I may have ſorrow for ſomewhat that is an infelicity, and call that a godly ſorrow, an errour this might be, but I hope not a dangerous one; or if it were, not ſuch an infectious one, as to turn every other affirmation of mine into a non-affirmation, or make me guilty of other errours, of which I profeſs (and 'tis clear at that time by other evidences) that I am not guilty. Thus hard is it for fleſh and blood to lay down a quarrel or a jealouſie, when 'tis once engaged. Otherwiſe, plain words might deſerve to be heeded to prove a man Orthodox, as well as ſuppoſed conſequences to arraign publickly, and condemn him for errours. In how much more quietneſs have poor creatures poſſeſt their ſouls, that have learnt from thoſe words (and ever ſince daily practiſed) the humbling of themſelves for their very inclinations to ſin, than you that have thus uſed your skill, unhappily to limbeck, extract, and force poyſon out of them?

8. I acknowledge, that every ſin ought to be bewailed as a ſin, and that inclinations to ſin ought to be ſo bewailed; and I meant by contrition, or breaking of the heart to pieces, as much as your *tears of blood* amount to: And of this I neither doubt, nor fear to profeſs my ſence. Yet ſure they that do not agree with me in that particular, may be adviſed to have true grief and ſorrow for them on their own principles.

9. That the corruption of our nature hath ſpecial influence on our practice, I am as confident, and have conſidered as ponderingly as you: and this whole Catechiſm was deſigned to obſtruct thoſe fountains, as much as was poſſible, and to help to purify unto Chriſt a peculiar people zealous of good works; and according to my beſt underſtanding, I deſigned a ſcheme that might be inſtrumental to that end: and whatever your method would have been, and what your commands for the particulars that might be more expreſly cleared, I could not divine, and had liberty to uſe my own method. This only I know, that inclinations to ſin are there expreſt to be ſins, and that clearly enough, that

he

he may discern it who hath so much leisure from quarrelling as to bewail them. And indeed you need not tell me what dangerous consequences have been inferred from doubtful expressions in Catechisms, &c. For I have an example before mine eyes of one that will infer those consequences from one word in such a Book, that the whole sence of the place contradicts directly, as much as sin and no sin are contradictories, and then 'tis but reason a man were allow'd pardon (and not triumph'd over presently) for being willing (when 'tis by anothers fault become so necessary) to explain. And so much for the third report.

The fourth (*that about faiths being, whether a condition, or instrument of Justification*) I cannot observe by your words that you have at all insisted on in either assembly; for though you deny it not, yet also you affirm nothing, as in the two former, which you own; and as in the last you are pleased to do. Either then you spake to this particular, and then although it be a fault in you not to acknowledge it, yet till I am sure of it, and that my reputation is concerned in it, I have no reason farther to importune you; or else you did not speak to it, and consequently did me no injury in that particular, and then I truly cannot accuse you, having no authority that you did, worth my depending on, and that which I had, contradicted by others, as the others of the Trinity which proved untrue, and so the rather inclines me to believe that this is so also: On these grounds I have no temptation to add more to this matter, because the whole business which brought us now together, was to vindicate my self from (and that made it necessary for me to know what had been) your accusations, and not to render you at this time (which I can spend much more profitably to my self and others) an account of my faith, save only where you have calumniated it. Yet because it is possible that the questions here proposed by you, may through some mistake or ignorance of the grounds that I go on, be matter of some scruple to you, and it may be my duty to prevent those mistakings, I have now thought fit to tell you, what is the general ground that I build on in this matter, by analogy to which you may form an answer to those questions, and reconcile those seeming differences which you may have taken notice of. My grounds are these, 1. That justification is divine acceptation, and pardon of sin. 2. That the mercy of God, through the satisfaction and merits of Christ, is the sole cause of this justification. 3. This work of justification is of such a nature, consisting merely in Gods pronouncing us just, accepting and pardoning, a work of God without us, upon us, concerning us, but not within us, that consequently nothing within us can have any real proper efficiency in the work: for then that, whatever it is, must be said to justify, *i. e.* to accept, and pardon, which nothing in us can be said to do, though but *minus principaliter, secundariò*, or *realiter instrumentaliter*; for if it had any such efficiency, there might in strict speaking be some real vertue or force in that thing, and that proportionable to the effect in some measure, at least it must act *virtute primæ causæ*, and by the impulsion of that might immediately produce the effect; which any even grace, as it is in us, hath not force enough to do. For either it must do it as an inferiour meritorious cause, subordinate to Christs merits, or as an inferiour efficient cause, subordinate to Gods pardoning and accepting; and then, as I said, that must pardon and accept also immediately, though not principally; as the knife cuts immediately, though the hand or the man principally. 4. This work of Grace in God through Christ thus justifying, is not every mans portion, some qualification or condition there is required in the subject, in the person whose sins God will thus pardon in Christ, or without which God that justifies the sinner, will not yet justify the impenitent infidel: the promises of God, though general, being yet conditional promises, and the promise of pardon being one of them, as shall be proved at large if you think fit. 5. This condition is set down in several phrases in the Scripture, Conversion, Repentance, Regeneration, but especially receiving of Christ, faith in the heart, an embracing of Christ, the whole Christ, taking him as our Priest, whose sacrifice, and whose intercession to depend on; as our King, whose throne to be set up in our hearts; as our Prophet, to submit our understandings to his doctrines, and captivate them to the obedience of faith. 6. This grace of faith hath many excellent offices and efficiencies; one principal one, laying hold on the Promises, laying hold on the Λύτρον; others also of subduing the passions, mortifying lusts, overcoming the world. In all these, being works wrought in us, by God principally, instrumentally by this grace, Faith is an efficient. But all this doth not at all conclude it to be in any propriety of speech an efficient, or any kind of logical proper cause in the act of justification: because there is no need of any such, God being ready to do his work, to perform his promise, *i. e.* to justify the penitent believer; and whensoever by his grace that qualification is wrought in the heart, or there but truly rooted, God pronounces that man just.

I have out of my heart set down my sence, which I suppose, you will find every where scattered in the Book. I desire not that it may prove a μῆλον ἔριδος between us, (in case there be any word hastily let fall, which though to me, that understood my own meaning, it be plain, to you, especially if you delight to be captious, may want explication;) but yet I would be glad to hear, if there be any poyson in any of these propositions; and whether, and wherein I am mistaken: If not, I suppose you will be able to answer all your twelve *Queries* out of these premisses, or discern that it was impertinent to ask them, these grounds being thus supposed. I shall, I think, onely need to adde, that as soon as ever this new creature hath life in him, at the first cordial receiving the whole Christ in vow, or resolution sincere, *i. e*, at the first minute of conversion thus to God, the person is justified; not one of those in time after the other, but in order of nature, as naturally the condition must be undertaken, before the Covenant belongs to me: but at what minute soever this is done, God puts away his wickedness, &c. *I have sinned*, saith *David*; *and the Lord hath put away thy sin*, saith *Nathan*; *I said I have sinned unto the Lord, and thou puttest away the iniquity of my sin.* This thus pre-required I call sanctification *in semine*, or ἁγιασμὸς, (the direct Greek for that word) *without which no man shall see God*; and consequently, without which no man is justified; for whosoever is so, is in that condition at that minute, that, if he die in it, he cannot miss of glory. Beside this notion of sanctification; there is another for the acts, and fruits, and state of sanctification: and that I acknowledge a consequent of [illegible]ification, and an effect of that grace that justifieth the ungodly. And having added this, I conceive I have clear'd the way to your last particular.

In which, it ſeems, you took ſome exceptions, which, by what hath been ſaid, will appear to be your fault, not the Authors of the Catechiſm. For 1. Faith and works are not confounded in the diſcourſe of juſtification, any otherwiſe than Saint *James* and Saint *Paul* confound them; Saint *Paul* ſaying, *Abraham* was juſtified by Faith, and Saint *James*, by works, and the way of the reconciling them punctually ſet down there. 2. What he doth ſay of being juſtified by faithful actions, as it is after the very ſtile of Saint *James* [Abraham *was juſtified by works*;] ſo doth the word [*by*] ſignify onely a *condition*, not an *efficient*. And whereas you mention obedience to the whole Goſpel, conſtellation of Goſpel-graces, *&c.* and think ſtrange that they ſhould be affirmed the condition of juſtification, you muſt remember that thoſe phraſes denote them onely in the ſeed, or firſt life of all theſe, proportionably to the firſt notion of ſanctification, and then I ſuppoſe you can make no ſcruple of that affirmation. 3. You ſcruple that Faith without the addition of ſuch works, ſuch obedience Evangelical, would be affirmed unſufficient to juſtification. Wherein perhaps you think [*works*] ſignifies actual performances: but that is not the meaning of it in that place, but the word is taken in another Scripture-acception of it, for ſuch obedience as the Goſpel now requires, and for that which the Story of *Abraham* once makes the thing on which he was juſtified, *i. e.* reſolution to obey God in the ſacrificing his Son, not the actual ſacrificing of him: this is there called in the *Catechiſm*, *pag.* 20. Evangelical obedience, and is ſet as the explication of works; and without this, I acknowledge to believe that faith would be unſufficient to juſtifie; meaning Faith in any other notion but that which doth contain this receiving him as a King, and giving up the obedience of the heart to him. And you muſt give me leave a little to wonder why you ſhould add, that the words following (in that place) are as bad or worſe than the former, (and yet 'twas but civility and prudence not to name them) when they are but a direct citation of a place of Scripture. Thus [the ſame is called in a parallel place, *Faith conſummate by love*, *Gal.* 5. 6.] (for ſo the Greek ἐνεργουμένη is rendred by the *Syriack*.) The truth is, the laſt thing by you excepted againſt, was in effect a place of Scripture alſo, *James* 2. 22. [*Faith made perfect by works*,] ſet down in ſome words of paraphraſe; and then this in the *Galatians* might be as bad or worſe than that, (I ſhall mollify the harſh phraſe for you, and add) more contrary to the *Antinomians*, and *Fiduciaries*. As for your diſproving that doctrine, I ſhall not need conſider that, becauſe the doctrine is new ſet when it comes to be diſproved, and in thoſe terms which you ſee I acknowledge not: for I do not ſuppoſe the neceſſity of adding Evangelical works unto that purpoſe, and in that act, to make Faith the inſtrument of juſtification. For 1. I acknowledge not Faith an inſtrument of that, any other than a moral inſtrument, by which I expreſs my ſelf to mean a condition accepted by God to juſtification; and a logical or proper inſtrument of receiving Chriſt, (which Chriſt, not which faith, juſtifies.) 2. Evangelical works, in the notion wherein I ſuppoſe you now take them, for fruits of faith, performances of obedience, I affirm not to be either inſtrument or condition in the act of juſtification, or to that purpoſe; but I require them afterwards when occaſions and opportunities of exerciſing that faith, of performing thoſe reſolutions, do call for them. And therefore 3. I make no ſcruple to acknowledge that we are not juſtified by any righteouſneſs inherent in us, as I oft have ſaid, but only by the righteouſneſs of Chriſt imputed: Only that infuſion of new righteouſneſs (which when 'tis infus'd and rooted, is inherent in us) is the condition without which we ſhall not be juſtified; not taking it again for the actual performances, or acts of righteouſneſs. Yet in the three laſt lines you have now again changed your queſtion, and made it ſuch an one, that I cannot blame you not to be aſhamed to repeat your arguments, or to maintain; For I ſhall moſt joyfully conclude with you in the very words, the truth of that you ſay you uſed thoſe arguments to prove, *viz. That we are juſtified by the obedience of Chriſt alone, freely imputed by God, applyed and reſted on by Faith only.* For whatever other qualifications be required as conditions in the ſubject, 'tis the work only of Faith to apply in that ſence, *i. e.* to reſt on Chriſt. And having ſo well agreed in the concluſion, one would wonder how we ſhould ſo differ in the premiſſes. Certainly there was ſome fault ſome where. Was it not a willingneſs to find faults in that Book that made it appear ſo full of errours, and a heat (that might have been ſpared) which turned the Pulpit into a *Paſquin*, or *Morforius*, on which that Author was to be defamed?

That which I have now affirmed, I am confident is the ſumme of what is ſaid on that Point in more words, and with more proofs and clearings in that Catechiſm; and not now minced or dreſt anew by your directions, or for your palate. Yet if it may now pleaſe you, and you will ask God forgiveneſs for your ſlandering of me, and conſider me ſo much, as to think that that reputation was valuable to the Author which you unjuſtly laboured to rob him of, I ſhall moſt heartily (as I do already forgive you the injury, ſo) conclude this Paper, and take leave of you, and continue

Munday night,
Oct. 19. 1646.

Your Servant

H. Hammond.

I deſire to hear what opinion you have of this large trouble, thus unexpectedly multiplied upon my hands.

SIR,

SIR,

I Am ſent for away from hence in great haſt to my dear Mother, who is very ſick, and ſo am forced to dictate to an ill *Amanuenſis*; if greater Letters than an a be miſtaken, I muſt crave your pardon. If you think fit to reply, be pleaſed to ſeal up your notes, and Mr. *Wilkinſon* (who lodges at *Merton Colledge*) will convey them to

Your Servant

Fr. Cheynell.

SIR,

I Conceive your Letters are meant, (as they are by the ſuperſcription directed) to me only: yet I thought it my duty to direct you to ſome that are equally engaged, and able to give you better ſatisfaction. You will not believe me, and I have done. As for your diſcourſe about deſiring an exact account; truly Sir, I do ſeriouſly believe, that when you were at higheſt, you would ſhew as much civility towards any Miniſter of Chriſt, as you did towards me. It may ſtand with the ſtate of an Arch-deacon to deſire an account, if he add, exact account. The greateſt General will give Orders to his Officers in as humble a ſtile; Theſe are to deſire. But enough, if not too much of that. If your challenge made me ſmile gravely, yet ſure you are too angry when you ſay, I have reproached and ſlandered you; you endeavour to make me as happy, as you conceive your ſelf to be. Sir, I never thought that there had been ſo much advantage to be made of a Parentheſis; I do not deſire to miſtake your meaning, and am ſorry to read your uncharitableneſs. Your judgment is, that I ſeek for nothing in your Papers but exceptions; you intimate that I am no Scholar, and to your ſelf no friend; yet you are ſo courteous as to communicate ſome part of your mind to your unlearned enemy: but you profeſs, that you do not caſt up a ball of new contention between us, only you are pleaſed to refer me to another Book called the *View of the new Directory.*

I acknowledge that I have heard, what I now begin to believe, that that Book is yours, becauſe you ſmile upon it, as Fathers uſe to do upon their pretty Babes.

The Author of that view of the new Directory lays down this rule, *pag.* 2. [*Nothing is neceſſary in the worſhip of God, but what God hath preſcribed*;] Pray, Sir, let us know how many ſeverals of the Common-Prayer-book that are purpoſely left out in the Directory, are preſcribed by God.

2. The ſaid Author abuſes both Presbyterians and Independents; but whether he doth anſwer the ſeveral Arguments propounded by either, I leave to you to conſider. Sir, if you have any thing to ſay againſt our Learned and Reverend brethren of *Scotland*, they are of age to anſwer you, try their ſtrength.

3. If you pleaſe to undertake the anſwer of Mr. *Cottons* arguments againſt ſet Forms, you may have liberty to ſpeak your mind; but truly Sir, till you have performed this task (I mean, till you have ſhewn how many things are preſcribed by God, and rejected by us in this Directory: 2. Till you have anſwered our brethren of *Scotland*, and Mr. *Caton*, to ſay nothing of others) you have no temptation to triumph, unleſs you mean to triumph before the victory, as that Author doth. You ſhould not refer us to Mr. *Hooker*, now the ſtate of the queſtion is ſo much varied.

4. If it be granted to you, that ſome ſet-Form may, by ſome perſons, at leaſt for ſome time, be lawfully uſed; how will you prove it neceſſary that any whole entire ſet Platform of Liturgy ſhould be rigorouſly impoſed upon all the Miniſters of theſe three Kingdoms of *England*, &c? is not that the thing which you do ſo paſſionately long after, and earneſtly contend for? if it be not, I confeſs I am much miſtaken; and if it be, let it be clearly and undeniably proved.

5. In this laſt return, I do not find you willing to own what your words ſeemed to import, [*That there is ſome neceſſity, that the Liturgy formed in the Apoſtles times ſhould be continued in the Church.*] For you give the preſent Church leave to judge of the Liturgy compoſed in the time of the Apoſtles (as you pretend) and to make what alterations or additions, alienation or exchange ſhall ſeem fit to the preſent Church. But Sir, if thoſe Apoſtolical men were extraordinarily aſſiſted by the Spirit in compoſing that Liturgy, ſhall men of ordinary gifts take upon them to paſs a peremptory ſentence for altering, alienating, exchanging what was (as you conceive) compoſed by the extraordinary aſſiſtance of the Spirit, and is by a more than ordinary bleſſing and providence preſerved and tranſmitted to poſterity? Sir, take your words according to your own interpretation, that the holy Ghoſt who ſetled a Miniſtery, enabled them in the Apoſtles time to form a Liturgy to continue in the Church, to the end that the Miniſters might pray and intercede for their ſeveral Congregations; and you do certainly decline, if not ſtudiouſly, the maintaining of what you are engaged to maintain by your *View of the Directory*; if a Miniſter may pray as he ought in a Congregation, without the uſe of the Liturgy, which you ſay was formed in the Apoſtles time to continue in the Church, then ſure a Miniſter may pray as he ought in the Congregation, without the help of the late Common-prayer-book.

6. You name ſeveral Liturgies; which will you ſtand to, and avouch that it is without any interpolation or corruption?

7. Not to ſpend time about the miraculous gift of Prayer, you ſay there were ſome exercifes of that gift, and confeſs thoſe exercifes to be different from the ſet-Forms you contend for. Sir, is there no ordinary gift of Prayer vouchſafed to the Miniſters of Chriſt? ſhould not this ordinary gift be ſtirred

ſtirred up by meditation, and exerciſed in Prayer? ſhould not Miniſters of Chriſt give themſelves to pray, and ſtudy how to pray ſeaſonably, according to the ſeveral occaſions adminiſtred by the various turns of God's providence? How do you prove, that a man that hath not ordinary wiſdom to pray as he ought, is called by Chriſt to be a Miniſter of the Goſpel? Surely, Sir, I think a Miniſter ſhould ſtudy to pray ſeaſonably, as well as preach ſeaſonably; and if the Primitive method and manner of prayer be to be obſerved, it doth not follow that the Liturgies, which go under the name of Saint *James* and Saint *Mark*, and have conſtantly been ſuſpected by Learned men, ſhould be rigorouſly impoſed upon the Miniſters of the New Teſtament, who have an ordinary gift of prayer, nay, are indued with the ſpirit of Prayer.

8. You mention the uſe of Pſalms, and the Lords prayer. Why ſure Sir, you did view the Directory very ſlightly, if you took no notice of the Order about the publick reading of the holy Scriptures, and the frequent reading of the Book of *Pſalms*. We acknowledge the prayer which Chriſt taught his Diſciples to be of it ſelf a moſt comprehenſive prayer, and not only a pattern of prayer; And it is ſpecially recommended to be uſed in the prayers of the Church; if you pleaſe to call this a Liturgy (and, it ſeems, you can demonſtrate no more) do not complain that you are deprived of all manner of Liturgy; for now you have told me that *publick divine Service* is the Engliſh of *Liturgy*. Sure I am, the Parliament deſires that our publick ſervice of God ſhould be moſt divine and orderly; for their care hath been to hold forth ſuch things as are of divine inſtitution in every Ordinance, and to ſet forth other things according to the rules of Chriſtian prudence, agreeable to the general rules of the Word of God: and for the conſent and harmony of the Churches, there are general heads propounded, and if you obſerve the general heads, the ſence and ſcope of the prayers, and other parts of publick worſhip, you will have no cauſe to complain of diſorder and confuſion in our publick worſhip. But you tell me that we may pray as we ought, without the help of that Liturgy, which you conceive was formed in the Apoſtles time; and therefore I think I may proceed to the ſadder part of your task.

1. Concerning your ſad Story, I need ſay no more, but that I am glad you have diſabuſed one offender; I could wiſh that you would diſabuſe all thoſe whom you have abuſed with three or four editions of your Book, by a remarkable Recantation of your errour. Sir, venture my arguments to any Reader, I fear none; let your Book be witneſs whether I charge you juſtly or no: I mean your Book printed at *Oxford*, and all printed after that Copy; I except nothing, but your leſs remarkable alteration, which was not remarkable enough for me to take notice of in ſo ſhort a time; and therefore you muſt blame your ſelf, that your Recantation was no more remarkable; for when you told me that you added theſe words *In the primary intention of the phraſe*,] I looked over your additions more heedfully, and could not find it: and I did at laſt read even your leſs remarkable alterations, and the Printers Poſtſcript, or yours, for the excuſe of your ſelf and him.

Sir, your firſt anſwer in the eighth Section of your Catechiſm, explains the meaning of the third Commandment to be according to the literal ſound, againſt perjury or non-performance of promiſſory oaths; mark that [*Promiſſory oaths.*] Whereupon your Scholar is immediately prompted to ask whether the third Commandment, [*Thou ſhalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain,*] be no more (mark that, *no more*) than [*thou ſhalt not forſwear thy ſelf?*] your anſwer is, *No more undoubtedly*. The God of heaven judge between us; nay, your ſeveral editions do judge; there being not a ſyllable of the primary intention to be found in three or four editions.

2. I ſay, the queſtion is, What is meant in the third Commandment? Your firſt anſwer being an explication of the meaning of the Commandment: The ſecond queſtion is, whether the third Commandment be *no more?* that is, whether the meaning of it be no more, than that thou ſhalt not forſwear thy ſelf? this is moſt clear to me.

3. The queſtion is not of the intention of a phraſe; that's but a harſh expreſſion, which muſt be explained to be meant of the intention of the Law-giver; and it was Gods intention to forbid fooliſh and wanton ſwearing, as well as forſwearing.

4. We had not beſt diſpute what is primary and ſecundary in Gods intention; one intention is ſufficient, and that is to forbid both.

5. You are not able to make it good that that's the primary intention of the phraſe: and therefore I glanced at that by the way.

6. Your doubtful *perhaps* was that which troubled me: and ſurely Sir, you do ſee what reaſon you have to blot out *perhaps*.

7. Why do you ſay, *perhaps fooliſh* and *wanton*, *ſure prophane* uſing of *Gods Name* is forbidden? is it not as ſure that fooliſh and wanton uſing of Gods Name is forbidden as prophane uſing of it? or is not all fooliſh and wanton uſing of Gods name prophane?

8. Your remarkable alterations aſſure me, that you are convinced that you had not ſaid enough againſt vain aſſertory oaths, in any of your editions: for the words run thus in them all, the particular matter of *Moſes* his Law [*was of promiſſory* (not aſſertory) *oaths,*] which you alter thus, [*peculiarly of promiſſory, not only of aſſertory oaths:*] and if that be not a recantation, I do not know what a recantation means.

9. I ſaid truly that a doubtful *perhaps* would not reſtrain youths from fooliſh and wanton uſing of the Name of God; if Preachers be ſo timorous to cry, Perhaps it is forbidden, and that but by reduction neither, ſwearers will grow bold. I do not like your inſtance in this laſt Paper, when you ſay, that fornication is forbidden in the ſeventh Commandment by reduction; ſurely Sir, there needs no reduction to evince that fornication is forbidden.

10. You talk of the words of the Commandment; the queſtion is, of the meaning of God in the Commandment. Gods mind is to forbid fooliſh ſwearing in the third Commandment, and fornication in the ſeventh.

11. I did not take notice of your argument to prove that forſwearing is forbidden in the third Commandment, becauſe you prove what I never denied.

12. You ſay, the Oath which you take lawfully in Judicature, may come from the Devil in another.

ther. You are miſtaken; it is not the oath, but the vanity of the oath which comes from the Devil.

13. You come not off with honour, when you ſay, Firſt, that the ſuperaddition (which I call imaginary) is a command of Chriſt, and afterwards ſay, if it was not a ſuperaddition by a new precept, yet there is a ſuperaddition of new light. Your Catechiſm is, it ſeems, like the Tridentine Canons, capable not only of ſeveral but contrary interpretations. I appeal to your Book again, *Lib.* 2. *Sect.* 3. *page* 50. Firſt, your interpretation that Chriſt came to fill up the Law, as a veſſel that had ſome water in it before, but now is filled up to the brim; and that which is worſe, of a picture, *&c.* Sir, was there but a rude draught of moral perfection in the perfect Law of God? was it drawn in colours to the life, or as it were with a coal? Take heed, be not too buſy in imitating any Father in a dangerous expreſſion, or in excuſing the great evacuators of the Law. Secondly, though you pretend often to be very careleſs whether you prove a ſuperaddition or improvement of the Law to have been made by Chriſt, yet you confeſs that it is the foundation of a weighty ſuperſtructure, *ibid.* Pray Sir, declare what that ſuperſtructure is. Is it that you may be juſtified by obedience to theſe new ſuperadded precepts, and yet ſay that you are juſtified by a righteouſneſs without the Law? ſay honeſtly, is that the ſuperſtructure, or is it not? 3. Do you not tell us, that *light* is the *ſtate* and *doctrine* of *Chriſtianity*, *darkneſs of ſin and imperfection?* obſerve how untowardly that compariſon runs; though you do not bring it round, yet you go too far; you ſay, that before Chriſt, there was ſome mixture of imperfection, and ſome vacuities in the Commandments of God; you are ſpeaking of the moral Law; you ſay, *Theſe vacuities are filled by Chriſt*, *ibid.* Theſe expreſſions ſure have reference to new precepts, and not only to new light; if not, read *page* 51. to ſhew that Chriſt came to *fill up the Law*, ſay you; firſt he rehearſes the old Law, and thereby confirms it, and then annexes his new Law to it. What ſay you, who is blindfold now? is not this undeniable? 4. You ſpeak too doubtfully, *ibid.* when you ſay, that Chriſt under the Goſpel gives *higher or plainer promiſes:* you ſhould ſpeak with more reſolution in a Practical Catechiſm. 1. There was Goſpel under the Law, and the Spirit was miniſtred to all the elect then, during the time of legal adminiſtrations; divers Jews were penitent believers, and therefore under the ſecond Covenant before Chriſt came in the fleſh. 2. The promiſes were plain enough to them that were endued with the Spirit, as is evident by the Apoſtles diſcourſe in the 11 *Chap.* to the *Hebrews*, they were ſo plain that they ſaw them, were perſwaded of them, and embraced them; though the thing promiſed, the Incarnation of Chriſt, was far off, yet their light was ſo clear, and eye of faith ſo ſtrong, that they beheld Chriſt afar off. 3. We have no higher promiſe than that of being heirs and co-heirs with Chriſt in glory, and they had the promiſe of eternal life, the promiſe of being bleſſed for ever in Jeſus Chriſt. 4. The ceremonies which you ſay had nothing good in them, did direct to Chriſt, and therefore there was this good in them, that they did by Gods ordinance and bleſſing direct the elect of God under that diſpenſation unto Chriſt, in whom they were to enjoy all-ſufficient and everlaſting good things in glory. 5. No ſin was able actually to damn penitent believers during the time of legal adminiſtrations. And therefore I wonder at your diſcourſe in the 51 *page*. Pray Sir, is there any venial ſin? 6. You ſpeak too faintly, when you call the Evangelical diſcoveries before Chriſt, glimmerings of light, and inſert the ſceptical *perhaps*, *page* 52. of your Pract. Catech. Sir, there is no perhaps, no hap-hazard in this buſineſs; Jeſus Chriſt was ſufficiently diſcovered during the time of Levitical adminiſtrations to all the elect for their everlaſting ſalvation. 7. When you ſpeak of the glimmerings of the Goſpel, you ſay theſe things were not univerſally commanded to all under threat of eternal puniſhment, but only recommended to them that will do that which is beſt, and ſo ſee good days, *&c.* Obſerve 1. That you do here by conſequence aſſert, that there were counſels of perfection under the Law: I will not ſay works of ſupererogation, but the Jews were (it ſeems) encouraged to do ſomewhat more than was commanded. 2. Will you ſay, that to believe in the promiſed ſeed, to circumciſe their hearts, mortify their luſts, reform their lives, walk in new obedience, was more than was commanded in the time of the Levitical diſpenſation? 3. Will you ſay, that the Jews were not obliged to believe in the promiſed ſeed, circumciſe their hearts, and the like, under threat of eternal puniſhment? I might enlarge, but by your anſwer to theſe few propoſals, I ſhall be able to underſtand your obſcure Catechiſm; do not ſay, that there is a Sarcaſm in the Epithet. I hope, you will now confeſs that you did contend for *new precepts*; and therefore you recant once more, if you will be ſatisfied with *new light*. Sir, counſels give new light, but you ſay the ſuperadditions in the fifth of *Matthew* are all commands, and not counſels only; and you endeavour to prove it *ex profeſſo*, *page* 52. Surely the ſame things were commanded of old; then theſe are but imaginary ſuperadditions, as I called them: but if they be ſuperadditions, and not only counſels but commands, they are new precepts, and therefore you did not contend for new light only, but for new precepts. By this little that hath been ſaid, it is clear that you had ſome weighty ſuperſtructure to lay upon this ample foundation of new precepts, or elſe you did but ſweat and toyl in laying the foundation that you might have your labour for your pains, which you are too wiſe to do. *Sic notus Ulyſſes?*

All that I deſire is, that you would alter from worſe to better; for I join with you in profeſſing that ſuch an alteration doth declare amiable and imitable qualities: Finally, if you contend not for new precepts, then acknowledge that the ſuperadditions you dreamt of were, as I ſaid, imaginary; and I muſt remember you that the third Commandment, which is out of queſtion the command of God, and Chriſt, and the holy Ghoſt, will by Gods bleſſing be moſt prevalent to reſtrain men from fooliſh or wanton uſing of the name of God in aſſertory oaths, or any other idle uſing of Gods name when they do not ſwear. What I ſaid of Criticiſms was no Sarcaſm: I did but remember you that Criticks are apt to think themſelves ſo far above other men, that they do uſually contemn the ſerious admonitions of poor Country Preachers. But as high as the Criticks think themſelves, I hoped that you would not think them mounted to the higheſt heaven, and therefore called it a lower heaven.

You tell me, [*That you do only deſire to ſtudy the moral Law, as you find it delivered from the ſecond Mount*]

Mount] in your laſt return, *page* 14. So ſay the men whom you cry out upon, the *Antinomians*; and they give this for a reaſon, becauſe the Law of God publiſhed on mount *Sinai* doth not in their opinion oblige believers.

But you go beyond them in the next page, *page* 15. and imply, that no unbeliever is obliged under pain of damnation, to obſerve the moral Law. Your words are to this effect, [*That Chriſt, who gives more grace than was brought into the world by the Law of Moſes or nature, hath disburdened all men of that ſad yoke that lay on the Jews, and is content to accept of ſincere, without not-ſinning obedience.*]

1. I deſire to know what grace was brought into the world by the Law of *Moſes?* Doth not the Apoſtle ſay that grace came not by *Moſes*, but by Chriſt only? 2. How do you prove that all men, I mean, every one of mankind, is put under the ſecond Covenant? I ſuppoſe that is your meaning, becauſe in your Practical Catech. *page* 3. you affirm [*That Chriſt did ſatisfie for all the ſins of all mankind, and that all other parts of the ſecond Covenant are conſequent and dependent on that.*] And therefore I conceive that in your opinion there is a revelation of the Law of faith made, a pardon granted, and ſufficient grace given to every one of mankind to perform what is neceſſary now under the ſecond Covenant; becauſe you acknowledge that theſe are mercies made over in *Chriſt* by the ſecond Covenant, in the ſelf ſame page; and to whom are the mercies made over, but to them for whoſe ſins Chriſt hath ſatisfied? 3. I deſire to know how Chriſt could disburthen any man, or ſatisfie for the ſins of any one, according to your opinion, if he did only exerciſe the office of an Aaronical Prieſt by his ſacrifice? For it is certain that no Aaronical Prieſt did ever make any more than a Typical ſatisfaction by the exerciſe of his office; and you adde, that when the Scripture ſpeaketh indefinitely of Chriſts Prieſthood, or his eternal Prieſthood, or of his bleſſing us and turning of us from our iniquities, theſe expreſſions have no reference to his [*ſingle, finite, unrepeated ſacrifice upon the croſs, which belongs to his Aaronical Prieſthood,*] but they muſt be underſtood of his Melchiſedechian Prieſthood, to which he was conſecrated by his death, which you term an Aaronical ſacrifice, and look upon it as a rite and ceremony of the conſecrating of Chriſt to be our eternal High-prieſt, *page* 10, 11. You think you have gone far beyond the *Socinians* in this point; but hear what *Smalcius* ſaith, *Non eſt autem diſſimulandum nos non negare Chriſti mortem ad ejus ſacrificium pertinere*, Refutat. Smiglec. de erroribus nov. Arianorum, *lib.* 2. *pag.* 282. a word is enough to a wiſe man. Our caſe ſtands thus then, 1. Your doubtful *perhaps* will not reſtrain men from fooliſh wanton ſwearing; you did well to blot out that. 2. Your new precepts will not do it, and you do well to reſt ſatisfied without them. 3. Your total prohibition of ſwearing it ſelf will not do the deed; becauſe Chriſt doth only prohibit falſe ſwearing and vain ſwearing, he doth not prohibit ſwearing it ſelf; for if ſwearing it ſelf were prohibited, it would never be lawful to ſwear in any caſe; even as adultery it ſelf is prohibited, and therefore it is not lawful to commit adultery in any caſe.

I hope you will diſtinguiſh between vain ſwearing, and ſwearing it ſelf; if ſwearing it ſelf be prohibited, I muſt not ſwear for the publick good, becauſe I muſt not do any thing that is prohibited, though it tend to the publick good. You wonder to hear me ſpeak of *Smalcius*, and demand who is not of that opinion? Sir, remember that you ſay, [*Chriſt hath ſuperadded to the old Commandment a total univerſal prohibition of ſwearing it ſelf, making that as unlawful now, as perjury was before,*] *page* 66. Now for a man that maintains this, to ſay likewiſe that it is lawful to ſwear for the publick good, is to ſpeak like *Smalcius*, &c. Examine well whether you be not guilty of the ſin of dogmatizing: for I know if you did not condeſcend too paſſively to take up both opinions, you have reaſon enough to diſcern that theſe opinions do fight with one another. Sir, I have proved it already; take one argument more. If ſwearing it ſelf be as unlawful now, as perjury was before Chriſt came in the fleſh, then it is as unlawful to ſwear for the publick good, as for a man to forſwear himſelf for the publick good, which I hope you will not affirm. A man may be lawfully called to ſwear, but no man can be lawfully called to forſwear himſelf; *Ergo* ſwearing it ſelf is not as unlawful as perjury. If you wonder that rational men ſhould contradict themſelves, I anſwer they ſeldom do it but upon a deſign; and I could eaſily gheſs at the deſign, but you have taught me to be more reſerved.

In the 12 *page* of your laſt Anſwer, you ſay, *That what is forbidden by reduction is not ſo deeply obliging*; and therefore I ſtumble at your notion of reduction, conſidering that you ſay, *Fornication is forbidden by reduction* in the ſeventh Commandment. Sir, I think my ſelf as deeply obliged to abſtain from fornication as from adultery, I mean, by the ſame Authority. Moreover you plead there, that Chriſt may be ſaid to have added to the third Commandment, becauſe he forbids ſwearing by any thing elſe as well as by God. 1. Were men at liberty before Chriſt came to ſwear by any creature? 2. We may now in ſome caſes ſwear by God, but in no caſe by the creature; and therefore ſwearing by God is not totally and univerſally forbidden, as ſwearing by the creature is. You tell me that *Schindler* is as venerable an Authour as *Pagnine*; truly Sir, I am not aſhamed to profeſs that I have profited by that edition of *Pagnine* which *Mercer* put forth. If you conceive *Grotius* more venerable than *Mercer*, he will aſſure you that שוא *propriè ſignificat vanum. R. Iſaac Abarbinel* on the 20 of *Exod.* ſaith, the word is taken ſo largely in the third Commandment as to comprehend both vain and falſe oaths. If I had ſaid, falſe oaths had not been prohibited in the third Commandment, I would have conſidered your argument drawn from the ſignification of the word in the ninth Commandment. If you pleaſe to conſult *R. David Kimchi in libro Radicum*, he will prove by the *Talmud Jeruſal.* and *Onkelos*, that the word ſignifies *fruſtra, & ſine cauſâ*; and that he who ſweareth that figs are figs, is to be puniſhed for ſwearing in vain; he cites the 1 *Sam.* 25. 21. to prove that the word ſignifies *vain*, [*ſurely in vain have I kept.*] *David* doth not ſay he kept *Nabals* cattle *falſely*, but *in vain*; nay, you will find, that they tell you that a falſe oath is forbidden, becauſe what is falſe is vanity, and *Tohu*, and nothing. I cited *R. Abraham Aben-Ezra* on the third Commandment; and he will tell you, that one that hath accuſtomed himſelf to ſwear vainly, will ſwear in one day oaths without number; and if you reprove him for ſwearing, he will ſwear that he did not ſwear, and much more to this purpoſe. See *R. Solomon Jarchi*, if you pleaſe; you will find, they all come to this *non aſſumas nomen Domini gratis, fruſtrà, in vanum*; and therefore you need not reject, what was hum-

bly

bly tendered to you, with so much scorn and indignation. You say, by [*would be forbidden*] you did in effect mean were forbidden. I do not understand what you mean, when you say you did in effect mean it: but let that pass. I understand you better when you talk of ὁ παλαιὸς, & ἀντιθεσις: I forgive you: and if that be part of your Rhetorick, I do not envy you, and will not imitate you.

I pass on to your scanning of the third Report. 1. Sir, if you did not doubt, you did ill to speak doubtfully; for your doubtful expressions may help to make or keep others doubtful. 2. You acknowledge something worse than that I charged you with, namely, that you used that expression to serve them, [*Who think our natural aversion from God, and inclination to all sin, to be no sin, but an infelicity, unless actually consented to,*] by labouring to do them good upon their own principles. Sir, men cannot be brought to true repentance upon false principles; if mens principles are corrupt, refute their principles, and instruct them better, that they may be better principled; Otherwise if you build upon a false foundation, your building cannot stand, and they will be hardened in their impenitence by your connivence. Be pleased to take notice, that this corrupt opinion is not a soul-abasing principle, but rather a self-exalting errour; and therefore the pressing of such a principle upon them, will never humble them. If you had told them, that we are all by nature spiritually dead, in a polluted and cursed condition, this might humble them; but if you serve men upon their own proud principles, they will take it for granted that their principles are good, and grow the prouder. No man can conceive true godly sorrow for his actual sins, who doth deny the very root and fountain of all his sins to be a sin. 3. You suppose, that corruption is not cherished in some act, and conclude, *ergo*, in that act it is not cherished; just *idem per idem*. 4. You are desired to prove what you take for granted: is not that equal? I say, that original sin is truly and properly a sin in them that are not of age to consent to it; and that every actual sin in men of ripe years, is not actually and formally consented to; corruption is so strong in us, that it doth many times break forth without our consent; and I am ready to prove both propositions, if you doubt of them. 5. You were ill advised to pass a complement in a Practical Catechism, with men of corrupt opinions, contrary to your own principles. 6. You mention the *Socinians* very often; but let me intreat you to be wiser: do not provoke me to make a parallel between your expressions and theirs. I take not upon me to know any mans opinion, or his heart, any further than his words declare both. 7. When I spake of a Liturgy that was in design, you know I did not mean the Common-prayer-book. 8. For your *View of the Directory*, do not magnifie it till you have finished your task; never talk of the suffrages of the Jews, Heathens, or Mahometans, but speak to the point; I have shewen you the point in question. 9. You would have *Doxologies* and *Creeds*: is this worth answering? doth not the Directory take in the whole Scripture for a Liturgy? and are there not Doxologies enough, and Creed enough (even all things necessary to salvation) in the holy Scripture? When the confession of faith is published to the world, you will find this Reverend Assembly (so much scorn'd in that Book you subscribe to) be no enemies to any Orthodox Creed: and you may, amongst the rules and directions about the Sacrament, in the Ordinance of *Octob.* 20. 1645. see that we have not forgot our Creed. 10. I am not at leisure to dispute with you about sitting at Sacrament; the Parliament is not guilty of your illogical conclusions, though you would fain expose them to contempt in your *View of the Directory*, *View Dir. cap.* 1. *p.* 1. If it please you, we will put it to the question, Whether the Directory (in which there is the wisdom of two Parliaments, two Assemblies, which I oppose to your wisdom) or your Pract. Catechism give more countenance to *Socinian* errours and practices? I will dispute this question with you where you please, and when you please. 1. Shew me where the Directory doth enjoin all communicants to sit in the act of receiving. 2. Tell me whether all familiarity with Jesus Christ doth infer an equality. 3. Doth any *Socinian* think himself equal with Christ, or conceive that there is no more honour due to Christ, than to a mere man? Pray, do the *Socinians* no wrong, they will say as you say, That Christ did not bless us till after his resurrection, till he became an everlasting Priest; and ever since he was such a Priest, he hath all power in heaven and earth, a power equal to Gods power, and therefore Divine honour is due to him. *Sed tum cultum qui nunc Christo debetur postquam in cœlis esse cœpit, qui est, ut ipsi tanquam Deo confidamus, & omnia ab illo speremus, & petamus quæ ad salutem æternam pertinent, adeoque ipsam æternam salutem dicimus ei deberi, non propter qualemcunque, sed talem & tantam potestatem quæ par sit Dei potestati*, Smalcius refutat. prim. lib. Smig. de erroribus Arianorum, cap. 11. p. 109. Sir, I will give you a better Argument against the Directory, and for the Common-prayer-book; you may read it, *View of the Directory*, page 27. [*It is not necessary to exchange the pleasant easie course of our Liturgy, for the tedious, toylsome, less-profitable course in the Directory.*] Tell Prelates and Courtiers of ease and pleasure, and you win their hearts. This was a good Argument for an University Orator to urge, but this same word *Ergo* spoils all such Rhetorical arguments. I hasten to your discourse about godly sorrow: This is your first assertion. 1. *Godly sorrow may be conceived for the pollutions of our nature, as infelicities, if not as sins.* Be pleased to prove this proposition; and I will abide by it, and maintain the negative. 2. *He which doubts whether original sin be a sin, may conceive godly sorrow for it*, this is the second dictate. But your third Dictate is admirable. 3. *He that thinks inclination to sin no sin, but when he actually consents to it, may when he doth not consent to it, grieve for it as an infelicity.* Sir, the question is of Godly sorrow: is it godly sorrow, or is it not, for a man, to grieve for an infelicity, which, as he conceives, is no way sinful? 4. You say, *If a man look upon original sin as a pollution, though not as a sin, he may grieve for it with a godly sorrow.* I had thought that all pollution of the soul of man had been by sin only, *Mar.* 7. 23.

You are much mistaken, when you say, that they who think original sin no sin, may be advised to true grief and sorrow for it on their own principles. If by true grief you mean a godly sorrow, no man mourns for sin after a godly manner, but he that grieves for it as a sin against God. Sir, in a Practical Catechism you should have laid undeniable grounds of repentance; and therefore either plainly proved, or at least resolutely asserted original sin to be a sin, without any *ifs* or *ands*: For

where ſhall a man begin in his repentance; if he be not convinced that original ſin is a ſin? ſhould he not lay the axe to the root of corruption, and bewail the fountain of pollution? will not he be apt to doubt whether actual ſins be ſins, who doubts whether an inclination to all ſin be a ſin? ſurely ſuch an acute wretch will ſay, My inclination to ſuch and ſuch an act is natural, and not evil: *Ergo* this and the like acts, to which I am naturally inclined, are not evil. You know what I could adde; let me beſeech you to conſider what hath been ſaid, and I will paſs on to your fourth Report.

Your fourth Report concerns Juſtification. Sir, I did not deſire you to give an account of your faith, but I ſhould have been glad that you would have vouchſafed an anſwer to my *Quæres*. I thank you for your ſecond acknowledgment that you were miſinformed, and I thank you for your endeavour to prevent miſtakes. Truly Sir, I do not wilfully miſtake your ſence, nor do I deſire to take any advantage of an haſty expreſſion.

Your firſt Propoſition is, that *juſtification is divine acceptation and pardon of ſin.* I will not ſtand to ask you why you put acceptation before pardon; it is likely that was not done *de induſtria*; but I would know why you ſpeak of remiſſion and acceptation, and leave out imputation; I obſerve, that in your ſecond propoſition you do affirm that [*The mercy of God, through the ſatisfaction and merits of Chriſt, is the ſole cauſe of this juſtification.*] Do not think me too curious, ſince you deſire me to give my opinion of theſe propoſitions; you know, there are ſome that diſtinguiſh between a firſt and ſecond juſtification; and they do expreſs themſelves warily, and they will grant what you ſay, ſo you will give them leave to chuſe which they mean, this, or that juſtification. But I will judge charitably of you, hoping that by this juſtification you intend not to imply that there is another juſtification; and ſo, as they ſay, a firſt and ſecond juſtification. Give me leave to ask you a queſtion or two about the ſecond propoſition, compared with the fourth, and with ſome paſſages in your *Practical Catechiſm*, that by a clear anſwer to a few *Quæres*, many miſtakes may be prevented.

In your ſecond propoſition you ſay, *The mercy of God, through the ſatisfaction and merits of Chriſt, is the ſole cauſe of juſtification.* In your Catechiſm you ſay, *That Chriſt did ſacrifice himſelf for all the ſin of all mankind*; and yet in your fourth propoſition in this laſt return you ſay [*That this work of grace in God through Chriſt, is not every mans portion*] Sir, if Chriſts ſatisfaction be the ſole cauſe, and he hath made ſatisfaction for every man, the grace of God (which extends as far as Chriſts ſatisfaction) muſt be the portion of every man for his juſtification by the obedience of Chriſt alone. My firſt *Quære* then is, 1. Why the grace of God in juſtifying thoſe for whom Chriſt hath ſatisfied, doth not extend to every man for whom he hath ſatisfied? 2. Whether the qualification and condition, which you require in the ſubject, be beſtowed upon the elect abſolutely or conditionally? Regeneration you ſay is a condition which doth diſpoſe the ſubject for juſtification, that is, for acceptance and pardon, as I conceive, and you expreſs. Pray Sir, ſhew me what condition God requires unregenerate perſons to perform, that they may attain unto regeneration, which you take to be the condition of juſtification. I acknowledge, that God doth never juſtify an impenitent infidel *in ſenſu compoſito*, that is, the infidel doth not remain an impenitent infidel; but then you muſt grant on the other ſide, that God doth juſtifie the ungodly. 3. Whether there be any condition which doth ſo qualify the ſubject, as that you can ſay, by theſe habits, acts, vows, and theſe only I am juſtified? *Pract. Catech. page* 16. Sir, Learned men ſay that there is no condition required to diſpoſe the ſubject for juſtification; but there is a condition, namely Faith, beſtowed upon none but the elect, to receive the object of juſtification, Chriſt, and his compleat obedience, perfect righteouſneſs; and hence (as I conceive) ſome men (that meant well) ſay, there is a condition required, that is, to receive the object; and others ſay, there is no condition required, that is, to diſpoſe or qualifie the ſubject, ſo as that the ſubject ſhall be conſtituted righteous by that diſpoſition or qualification. I ſpeak as plainly as I can deviſe, that there may be no miſtake. God doth by his free and effectual grace work the hearts of his elect to receive Chriſt, that they may be juſtified; not by their own obedience, or vow of obedience, but by the obedience of Chriſt alone, freely imputed by God, and reſted on by faith only.

Pract. Cat. p. 3.

Moreover, Learned men do diſtinguiſh between diſpoſing of the ſubject to ſalvation (which is the laſt part of the execution of Gods decree of election) and diſpoſing the ſubject unto juſtification: though they grant that there is a condition to enable the ſubject to receive the object Jeſus Chriſt, who is *Jehovah* our righteouſneſs. And therefore Proteſtants do maintain, that all the habits and acts of grace which are in the beſt of men concurring together, are not ſufficient to juſtifie a man before God, and therefore faith concurring with a vow of obedience, or any faithful actions, cannot juſtifie us: Though faith alone be ſaid to juſtifie us Relatively, that is, in regard of the object received by faith. I acknowledge with you, that juſtification is Gods act, we cannot pardon our ſelves, and God ſitting as a fatherly Judge upon a throne of grace, doth juſtifie us τῷ ὑψει, as *Chryſoſtome* upon the 8 of *Rom.* 33. *verſ.* Sir, let me intreat you not to wonder, that I find fault with ſome paſſages in your Book, which you ſay are in effect places of Scripture. Sir, to abuſe the Scripture for the maintenance of any errour, is to my apprehenſion, a great deal worſe than to deliver any erroneous conceits in your own language. The Papiſts ſay as you do, that they ſay no more than Saint *James* himſelf ſaith. I did not dream that you thought *Abraham* was juſtified by the actual ſacrificing of his Son! *Socinus* ſaith, *Abraham* was juſtified by offering up of *Iſaac*. I do not think he means it in any other ſence than that which you repeat; namely, that *Abraham* was juſtified by a reſolution to obey God in the ſacrificing of his Son, not by the actual ſacrificing of him.

Sir, I am heartily glad to hear you acknowledge that you agree with me in the concluſion: be pleaſed to retract all that is contrary to that concluſion in your *Pract. Catechiſm*, and then I am ſure you muſt retract what I complained of. Pray Sir, do you not think that we are juſtified by a ſincere

vow

vow of obedience, as truly as we are by faith? that is, that our vow of obedience is a condition of Juſtification; I do not ſay an inſtrument, for you deny faith to be an inſtrument of juſtification. And therefore if a ſincere vow of obedience be the condition of juſtification, we are juſtified as truly by that, as by faith. 2. Conſider that you ſay in this laſt return, *pag.* 20. [*The condition muſt be undertaken before the Covenant belongs to me.*] This vow or reſolution of obedience is, as I conceive, that which you call the undertaking of the condition; why then ſurely obedience is the condition of the Covenant of juſtification, for obedience is that which is undertaken in a vow of obedience. 3. If by Covenant you mean the whole Covenant of grace, you muſt make ſome condition go before our regeneration alſo. 4. You know the Papiſts ſpeak as fully as you do any where for the meritorious ſatisfaction of Chriſt: but you know what they ſay of the *prævious diſpoſitions*, to diſpoſe and qualify the ſubject for juſtification; and you know what others ſay of the vow of obedience. 5. Though to give a pardon be Gods act, yet to receive forgiveneſs is an act of faith, *Acts* 26. 18. We do not receive a pardon by any act of charity, or by a vow of obedience, or receiving of Chriſt as King, and giving up the obedience of the heart to him; I believe you have not forgotten theſe expreſſions which are ſcattered up and down in your Catechiſm and Papers. If faithful actions be the only thing whereby a man is juſtified, as you affirm *pag.* 16. then are we not juſtified only by a vow of obedience. If faith be unſufficient to our juſtification, unleſs it be conſummate by love, that is, by acts of Chriſtian charity, or keeping the Commandments of God, as you expound that phraſe, *pag.* 20. then ſure you cannot ſay you plead only for juſtification by a vow of obedience. Unleſs you will make a firſt and ſecond juſtification, I do not ſee how you can come off. On the other ſide, if we are juſtified by a vow of perſonal obedience, then we are not juſtified by the obedience of Chriſt alone, or by faith only; I mean, by the obedience of Chriſt, as that obedience whereby we are conſtituted righteous; not by faith only, as that whereby we receive a pardon; receive Chriſt as *Jehovah our righteouſneſs:* and therefore truly Sir, I do not yet ſee how you can agree with me in my concluſion; namely, that we are juſtified by the obedience of Chriſt alone, freely imputed by God, applied and reſted on by faith only, unleſs you will retract thoſe paſſages in your Book, which were juſtly complained of, for the good of you, and this whole Univerſity. I ſpeak plainly and freely, as it becometh

Octob. 30. 1646.

Your Friend to ſerve you,

Francis Cheynell.

SIR,

ON *Saturday, October* 31. I received your Papers (dated the day before) by way of return to mine of *October* 20. That night I got a liberty from other avocations to read them over, and am now on *Munday* at the beginning of the week following on preparation to give you ſome account of them. Your letter which conducted them was but brief, yet was willing to take notice of one particular, that of your having written πονηῦ with ι, which though it be only a grammatical σφάλμα, and very extrinſecal to the matter in hand, yet ſeeing you are pleaſed to make it the only ſubject of thoſe few lines, I muſt in civility tell you ſomewhat of your manner of excuſing it. 1. That literal miſtake you know you were guilty of, and I only told you that you were ſo, and added not one word more. Inſtead of excuſing or confeſſing it, you now deſire me only to pardon the miſtakes of an ill *Amanuenſis*, and adde your reaſons that forced you to make uſe of him. Sir, I will do more than you deſire. Firſt, I will pardon that former miſtake in your ſelf alſo; and tell you, that in one that undertakes to be a Scholar, (and to be very ſevere to thoſe writings of other men, which many pious perſons have been willing to receive with ſome kindneſs, and now profeſs to ſee no kind of ground for your quarrels in them,) the not ſpelling ſo plain a word of Greek, would by very many men be hardly excuſed: I mean, it would take off from their opinion of your learning, as much as if you had written *impius* with a [*y*,] that is, more than many faults of a higher nature could be fit to do. Secondly, I will believe (or excuſe) your ſaying, that your haſte forced you to dictate to an ill *Amanuenſis*, when I have ſome reaſons to think it did not. 1. Becauſe you had had my laſt Return in your hands ten days, and I ſuppoſe the occaſion that cauſed your haſte, was not known to you all that time, or more days than one or two of them: for I profeſs to think your avocation ſo very urgent, and ſhould be ſorry to hear that I was the occaſion of detaining you one minute; but then before you knew of it, I ſuppoſe that did not force you to chooſe this ſhorter way. This was my firſt reaſon. 2. Becauſe the *Amanuenſis* was ſo far from being an ill one, that in the whole Paper I know but of one failing in the kind forementioned: and that is in the word Sacrifice, where inſtead of the letter *c.* there is *s*, which is in effect to write *facio* with *s*. But then upon the firſt ſight, this plainly appears to be your own hand, interpoſing this word in ſtead of another blotted out, as you know I can diſcern both by your former Letters, and by the like alterations in other places of theſe Papers. This again inclines me to believe, that the dictating you mention, might be deſigned a little to conceal ſuch ſlips which might poſſibly fall from you, and that it was not forced by your haſte only. My third Reaſon is; becauſe I conceive it a far more ſpeedy way to write from my own phanſie or underſtanding, (which may be done without any ſtay but that of inventing and writing,) than to dictate to another, wherein much longer time is required for me to dictate articulately, and for him after that to write, then again to recite to me what he hath written, before I can proceed to dictate. In this I can ſpeak but mine own, and ſome others ſence, and the common notion that I have of it;

but conſidering how far my notions are wont to be from pleaſing you, and that 'tis poſſible you might mean dictating out of your Note-Book, where you may have thrown together all your exceptions againſt that Authour (for that your *Amanuenſis* tranſcribed what you had formerly writ, I ſuppoſe you do not mean that by dictating,) on theſe grounds, I ſay, it is poſſible here may be ſome difference in judgment between us alſo. And therefore if again you tell me, that you have ſpoken your full ſence in this particular, I ſhall make all haſte to believe you, and ask you pardon for this importunity: Yet in the mean time I will tell you my reaſons alſo for my being ſo free with you *in materiâ non gravi.* 1. Becauſe I diſcerned ſo little in your future diſcourſe which would be more pertinent to the matter of my laſt return; having found, that after my having anſwered or laid grounds of anſwering near twenty queſtions in your laſt Paper, more than the matter in hand, or my leiſure engaged me to, you have thought fit to ſpring new matters of controverſie, and to that purpoſe (that you may never fail of the like matter) to catechiſe me in a ſtrange number of queſtions more; when the whole intention of my Paper was, that it might be conſidered, whether you had not wronged that Author in your firſt quarrels at that Book; and not to engage my ſelf in diſcourſe for ever with him that had ſo little pleaſure in any thing of mine. 2. Becauſe by ſome ſuch infirmities as theſe being repreſented to you, you might think it poſſible for you to miſtake in greater matters. For truly, I think it far more poſſible for a Scholar (that reads haſtily, and is intent to note and number faults) to impoſe cauſeleſly upon his Author, than to commit ſuch ſlips, (and not mend them at the review) when he writes as haſtily. And truly if I did not believe that this which I have written were fit to perſwade you that this were poſſible; and did I not hope, that being calmly mentioned to you, it would perſwade you, I would not venture it to your eyes, and if I am miſtaken in my belief or hope, do but tell me ſo, and I promiſe you to retract my errour, to ask you pardon in my next, and (to repair all the injury that can be poſſibly conſequent to the errour) to throw thus much of the Paper into the fire, and not to permit it to the eyes of any other Judge or witneſs, when you have thus ſignified your pleaſure to me.

I ſhall now proceed to your encloſed; and for your firſt period, [where you repeat only, and ſay you have done;] I anſwer, that I have done alſo.

In the repetition of the diſcourſe of *exact account*, &c. there is a great miſtake, *viz.* That, *becauſe when I was at higheſt I would have ſhewed as much civility towards any Miniſter of Chriſt, as I did toward you*, therefore *my preſent deſiring an exact account* of your ſpeeches concerning the Author of the Catechiſm was the exerciſing juriſdiction over you. I muſt needs tell you, that in my opinion height and dignity in the Church, is not a proper ground of leſſening civility, but an obligation to encreaſe it to all Miniſters of Chriſt, from that example of our Saviour, who when he acknowledges the title of Lord from the Diſciples to be well beſtowed on him, *Joh.* 13. 13. doth yet waſh their feet, and give them an example of doing the like, (*v.* 14.) when they are at the higheſt alſo, and ſo *Matth.* 20. 27. and in the parallel places, he requires them to expreſs their greatneſs in the ἔστω διάκονος, and ſets them his own copy of the οὐκ ἦλθε διακονηθῆναι, ἀλλὰ διακονῆσαι: and you ſhall have my opinion (and I ſhould be glad to be told of it, if my practice hath not been agreeable to it) that (as he that is not the more liberal and extenſively charitable for having received the benefit of Eccleſiaſtical preferments, ſo) he that is not the more civil and truly humble for having received any dignity in the Church, hath ſomewhat of the *Gentiles* κατακυριεύων & κατεξουσιάζων in him, and hath no countenance from Chriſt, or Apoſtolical inſtitution or practice, for that misbehaviour in his dignity. For hence Sir, I will leave (and not help) you to conclude, that how civil ſoever I would have been to any Miniſter in any degree of greatneſs, or how civil ſoever any General may be, if he pleaſe, to his ſouldiers; my being thus civil now, (and no more) is not exerciſing juriſdiction over you, ὅπερ ἔδει δεῖξαι, the only thing which I had then to demonſtrate: and ſo I have ſaid enough (and ſhall conſent to the truth of your [*too much*]) of that alſo.

Next for your grave ſmile, I ſhall not queſtion it, or deny you thoſe delights, ſo the *ridentem dicere verum* may go along with it, but ſure the graver the ſmile was, the more it became you not to impoſe on me the exerciſing juriſdiction over you then, or challenging you now, while I only deſired and begged, requeſted and re-inforced my requeſt, (that you would give me an exact account of what you had publickly ſaid of that Author) on purpoſe that I might think no ill of you cauſeleſly; Certainly Sir, ſuch a carriage as this, thus grounded and deſigned, will neither provoke a grave ſmile, nor paſs either for act of juriſdiction or for challenge; or if it muſt, no man ſhall ever be admoniſhed for having treſpaſſed againſt a brother, and ſo be brought to repentance for it, *Matth.* 18. 15. nor ſhall he that hears (or hath matter of ſuſpicion) that any injury hath been done him by another, have means of knowing ſurely whether he hears or ſuſpects with cauſe, or no. As for your affirmation, That *ſure I am too angry when I ſay you have reproached and ſlandered me, from whence you conceive, I endeavour to make you happy.* Sir, it is a heap of miſtakes. For, 1. by the grace which I meekly acknowledge to have received from God, I have been enabled (and I conceive, in ſome meaſure made uſe of the ability, by the help of the ſame grace) to hear that I have been reproacht by you, and to tell you ſo, without being too angry, and therefore you are not ſure. 2. I did not ſay you had reproacht and ſlandered me (your additions are always to ſome advantage of your own;) I only ſaid [*to this reproach of yours*] which I conceive was not ſaid without cauſe; For [to ſay that my deſiring an *exact account* of you, and not of others, (when I knew not of any other) was *to fall foul on you*,] cannot be leſs than a reproach; nay, your addition was true, (though then I did not ſay it, and now I tranſcribe it from your Paper, without any paſſion,) it was a *ſlander* alſo. 3. He that is too angry, doth not at all (by that act) endeavour to make him happy with whom he is too angry; at leaſt, not by the importance of that Text, *Matth.* 5. 11. unleſs the διωγμὸς or ὀνείδισμος be added to it; and that you do not in this pretend I was guilty of: of which yet I confeſs to have been as guilty in thoſe words, as of the too much anger. 4. It ought to be proved, that my calling your words *a reproach* was without a cauſe alſo (which you do not attempt to do,) or elſe from thence your concluſion had no right to be induced.

In the next buſineſs, concerning my return to the paſſage read out of the Catechiſm in your *Carfax-*

Sermon,

Sermon, you are in great haſt, paſſing through all the many pages which I had ſent you to ſatisfie you about that matter, till you meet with a citation of the *View of the Directory*: and then you think you have an occaſion to leap into a new field, and preſently tell me of my *fatherly ſmile* upon that *pretty babe*; (I beſeech you, be more ſolemn, and impoſe not on me either ſmiles or fondneſs to any creature of mine; or however, do not firſt feign ſmiles, and then build concluſions upon them:) and without more ado you ſpend four *Sections* in asking me queſtions, and ſetting me tasks about that *View of the Directory*, and ſeveral paſſages in that Author. I cannot think this is the way of replying; it is certainly at the beſt, diverting to another matter.

But Sir, in your ſpeedy paſſage to this other field, you ſcattered ſomething which I ſhall not deſpiſe ſo far as not to take up after you; and tell you, 1. That (whatever you did) you ought to have believed, from the very nature and importance of the word παρίθησις, that the advantage which I made of it was very proper to be made: and why you tell me you never thought it, and neither anſwer my reaſon, nor give me any to the contrary, I cannot imagine; in your haſte, that unimportant ſpeech of yours might have been omitted as well as any other. 2. For thoſe ſpeeches of mine (whereon you judge my uncharitableneſs, and are pleaſed to expreſs your ſorrow for it,) I muſt profeſs you have wholly miſtaken them; and I think that is done by you very unſeaſonably, at the very minute when you had ſaid you deſire not to miſtake my meaning, and are ſo kind as to be ſorry for me. For let me tell you, that ſuch miſtakings are leaſt incident to them that are ſuch lovers of truth, and ſo ſorry to ſee others uncharitable. Now for your miſtakes, I conceive they will be clear to any man that reads the words; I am ſure they are to me, that know my ſence: I ſaid, That *if I thought you ſought for any thing but exceptions, I would adde as to a Scholar and a friend*, &c. This no way intimates my looking on you as no Scholar, or no Friend to me, much leſs as on my *unlearned enemy* (which again you adde *ſupra computum*;) I beſeech you, do ſo no more, for there is difference betwixt no friend and an enemy, as betwixt poſitive hating and negative not-loving) but rather that I did look on you (and meant to deal with you) as both a Scholar and a Friend, if that only third thing, [*my thought that you did not ſeek for any thing but exceptions*] did not interpoſe and hinder me. From this 'tis clear, that the utmoſt that could be charged upon that ſpeech, was my *thought that you ſought not for any thing but exceptions*; which if I had been guilty of, I do not yet diſcern it had been uncharitable, becauſe in all the paſſages between you and me at this time, exceptions at that Author, and at my words, have been the whole affair diſcernible by me, and ſo there was no ground to oblige my charity to think (whatſoever poſſibility might be, on which to hope) any other of you. But I ſhall not need grant you that my former ſpeech intimated this neither; for my words, taken and joined with what follows, do not ſo much as intimate that I did poſitively think, *&c.* (for beſide that *ſuppoſitio non ponit*, and [*if*] is but a mark of a ſuppoſition) my doing the contrary to that which would have regularly been ſuperſtructed on that *thought*, (as it is apparent I do, by my freely adding my whole ſence in the words immediately following) makes that [*if*] to be far from an intimation by which you might conclude that I did think what is there mentioned. He that propoſes hypothetically [if a man were any better than a ſtone, then he would learn ſomething] and then aſſume not that he learns nothing, but contrariwiſe within few lines affirms that he doth learn very aptly, doth certainly not ſo much as intimate by that [*if*] that he is no better than a ſtone, but rather clearly affirms the contrary. Be pleaſed to apply it to the caſe in hand, and you will find you were too haſty to conclude me uncharitable, as before you were too willing to conclude me angry.

In the next place; whereas you adde, That *I profeſs, not to caſt up a ball of new contention, but only am pleaſed to refer you to another Book, the view of the Direct.* This, I ſuppoſe, was a product of your haſte alſo, for the former part of that ſpeech was by me delivered of one thing, *viz.* of that account given you *ex abundanti* of my ſence of that whole matter about Liturgy, among the Apoſtles, which therefore was not in any reaſon to become matter of new contention, for then there would be no end. But the ſecond thing (my reference to the *View of the Direct.*) came in afterwards, in my anſwer to your firſt queſtion, and that too with a [*beſides*] a note of an *ex abundanti* alſo, when I had before ſufficiently anſwered your queſtion, at leaſt ſo anſwered as that you reply not to it. What you meant by making this change, and mixing of things ſo diſtant; you will (I hope) upon examination of your ſelf remember. And I beſeech you, for my ſake to do it, that there may hereafter be ſome few leſs material paſſages in your diſcourſe, which may be paſt over by me without occaſion of confuting: For as yet you ſee there hath been nothing of any deep conſideration, and yet nothing that deſerved not ſome animadverſion.

Sir, I come now to the new field you deſire to lead me to, the ſeveral paſſages which you now newly mention in the *View of the Directory*, and the tasks and queſtions that you offer me on that new occaſion, without any the leaſt temptation offered by me to bring you to it (for they are not thoſe places which I had referr'd you to, to which you make theſe exceptions,) and which is moſt unreaſonable, before you had either ſaid one word in anſwer to what I had now produced on that matter, or confeſs your ſelf ſatisfied with it: I muſt leave you again to paſs ſentence on your ſelf for this behaviour; and to conſider, that you have no way encouraged me to undertake all your commands, or defend at this time every part of every Book which you ſhall have leiſure to except againſt. Yet Sir, I am reſolved to fail you in nothing that you can vouchſafe to think reaſonable for you to expect, on condition that for the future you will weigh your ſcruples better before you throw them into your Papers.

Firſt you ſay, the Author of that *View* lays down this rule, *page* 2. *Nothing is neceſſary in the worſhip of God, but what God hath preſcribed*] and from thence demand, how many ſeverals of the *Common-prayer-Book*, that are purpoſely left out in the *Directory*, are preſcribed by God?

This will be very admirable to him that looks on that 2 *page* of that *View*. For firſt, that which you ſay, that lays down for a rule, is there produced only as a ground of the adverſary with whom the Author of the *View* there diſputes, in theſe plain words [*I ſhall ſuppoſe it granted by them with whom I now diſpute, that nothing is neceſſary*, &c.] If I ſhall labour at any time to confute or anſwer you by

by an argument or anſwer *ad hominem*, by urging ſomewhat againſt you, that you take for a principle, and mention it as a thing which I ſuppoſe granted by you, would you ever think fit to impoſe this principle of yours as a rule laid down by me? If you will offer to do this, or now conceal that you do it, and make advantage of it, there is no diſputing with you. But then ſecondly, you muſt take notice what 'twas that the Author of the *View* was there a proving, not any neceſſity of retaining all or any of the ſeverals of our *Liturgy*, but that there was no *neceſſity of aboliſhing the Book*, &c. That was the eaſie task he had to prove againſt them that affirmed to think it neceſſary to aboliſh it: and you muſt not ſet that inanimate Book new tasks (as you do me;) or if you do, you muſt not thus expect to be obeyed. Now I have gone thus far; I do remember to have heard that you objected ſome ſuch thing to the Author of that *View* (under the title of *the ſame perſon who was the Author of the Catechiſm*) in your *Carfax-Sermon*, and challenged him to prove that our Liturgy was neceſſary. If the having ſaid it there, and having conceal'd it when you were pleaſed to give me an account of that Sermon, cauſed or occaſioned your inſerting it in this place, then though it be now a kind of reſtitution to give it me here, which then you were willing to keep from me, (of which nature I have heard of more, which I ſhall anon mention to you,) yet ſhall I not thank you for it, becauſe you do it under another *ſpecies*; but ſhall only complain, that both there and here you were either very unkind in not obſerving the main argument of that whole firſt part of that Book, or elſe very unjuſt, if you did diſcern it, and were willing to impoſe ſo diſtant a theme upon that Author.

To your ſecond accuſation, I muſt as briefly ſay, that that Author abuſes neither *Presbyterian* nor *Independent*; onely mentions the ſeveral influences which he profeſſes himſelf forced to believe that they had, the one ſort into the premiſſes, the other into the concluſion; and renders his reaſons for it, becauſe the concluſion is very diſtant from what the premiſſes would neceſſarily infer (*viz.* a neceſſity of aboliſhing our Book, when none of the three premiſſes aſcended near ſo high) and that which the *Presbyterians*, as he conceives, would not affirm, (for ſure all of that perſwaſion do not, or have not always thought it neceſſary to aboliſh ſet Forms:) and I now demand of you, whether in this thought he did abuſe them; or if not, what elſe he did ſay of them that can deſerve that phraſe from you. For the arguments propoſed by either] as far as the Book with which he undertook to deal did propoſe or intimate them, you know he hath anſwered them; and till thoſe anſwers are diſproved, they may paſs for good ones. For your challenge in the name of your *Reverend Brethren of Scotland*, I know not what occaſioned it, unleſs ſome citations out of Mr. *Knox*'s *Liturgy*: and if thoſe were not rightly cited, the pages are noted in the margent, and will preſently inable you to diſprove them.

To your third of Mr. *Cottons* arguments againſt ſet Forms, the buſineſs of that *View* tempted not that Author, nor doth our preſent matter of debate incline me to think them neceſſary to be taken in. It is not every mans work to do every thing at every time: yet perhaps it might be anſwer ſufficient to you, to tell you that it appears not to me by any thing that here you ſay, that you believe ſet Forms unlawful; and till you profeſs you do, you are perhaps as much obliged to anſwer Mr. *Cottons* arguments, as that Author; I am ſure, as much as he is obliged to ſhew how many things are preſcribed by God, and rejected by you in the Directory, when he looks not on the Liturgy which he defends, as any of Gods preſcribing, but only preſſes the no-neceſſity (from thence or from other grounds) of aboliſhing it, and after proceeds to ſome other particulars about it; but no where to the divine preſcription of it. If by the anſwering *your Brethren of Scotland*, you mean any arguments of theirs againſt ſet Forms (as you ſeem to do by joining them with Mr. *Cotton*) I am perſwaded by ſome part of that *View* (*viz.* by the Authors producing the practice of the *Scots* for ſet Forms) that he never dreamt they had appeared againſt them, at leaſt ſo far as to think aboliſhing neceſſary (which was his only point in hand,) and then you muſt excuſe him that he did not know firſt, and then not anſwer them. Yet after all this, what occaſion you had *to accuſe him of triumphing, or of doing it before victory*, (when you bring no objection againſt that victory, but only his not-anſwering Mr. *Cotton*, &c. (which were things to which his preſent task obliged him not, nor ſo much as intimated that it did;) and when you object not one word againſt his anſwers to that which he did undertake) I can no more gheſs, than at the reaſon why that Author might not (for ſome things which he had ſo particularly defended, and was never confuted by any) refer you to Mr. *Hooker*, or why the ſtate of the queſtion is ſo varied, as you ſay it is.

For the fourth charge and queſtion [*How it will be proved neceſſary, that any whole ſet Form of Liturgy ſhould be rigorouſly impoſed*, &c.] all that I ſhall need to ſay in vindication of that Author is, that he is never forced by the task before him to prove any ſuch thing; if it be not neceſſary to be aboliſhed, it is enough for his turn againſt his adverſary. And then for your opinion of the matter or object of my paſſionate longing, or earneſt contention (who, I thank God, am at this time neither paſſionate, nor longing, nor earneſt, nor contentious for any thing but that you would permit me to be quiet) I ſhall not need be much concern'd, becauſe all that you bring to prove all this againſt me, is, that if it be not true, you are much miſtaken: in which you cannot blame me, if I grant the concluſion, becauſe 'tis eaſier far than the other member, which you have left me, [viz. *to prove clearly and undeniably*,] which ſure is not every mans task, eſpecially when you are the perſon I muſt approve theſe proofs to. Only I muſt deſire you to remember, that to make it unlawful to uſe this ſet Form, is much more than to relaxate or forbid a rigorous impoſing; and the former of theſe had been poſſible to have been done, without the latter.

5. For my not owning a neceſſity, that the Liturgy formed in the Apoſtles times ſhould be continued in the Church, *i. e.* (as I there expreſs) *that that very Liturgy ſhould be continued without any alteration or additions*, I am content to join with you; but wiſh you had not mangled my words; 1. by putting in *alienation* and *exchange* (which is there applyed to Lands, not to Liturgy; and only uſed as a reſemblance to ſhew that he that ſaith, [*The holy Ghoſt enabled a Miniſtery to form a Liturgy to continue*] doth not affirm that it was neceſſary to continue, any more than he that leaves land to continue to his Heirs, obliges them from ever alienating, *&c.* which ſimilitude will enforce *à majore*, what

what I conclude from it, the no-neceſſity of not adding or altering that Liturgy; but (whatſoever it might do) is not there brought home to that of alienating, &c. becauſe it is not by him that brought it, applyed ſo far, (as you will ſee in the place.) 2. By ſaying, *That I give the preſent Church leave to judge of the Liturgy compoſed in the time of the Apoſtles, and to make* (as *what alterations and additions*, which only I did ſay, ſo) *what alienation or exchange ſhall ſeem fit to the preſent Church.* Wherein you have inſerted and impoſed on me almoſt every word recited particularly [*the preſent Church*, &c.] in ſtead of [*the Church*] (which ſignified quite another matter, *viz.* the Church either of thoſe Apoſtolical men, or thoſe next following them,) and the *Church* again not only in order to adding or altering as they ſhould think fit, but (which differs much from it) of aboliſhing, as the affair now ſtands; or, as you there ſay, *alienating and exchanging:* (not to mention, that I no where have yet given that Church leave indefinitely to judge of the Liturgy, much leſs the preſent Church to judge ſo far as to alienate.) Certainly a man may affirm, that the Church next after the Apoſtles times may have leave to alter ſomewhat, (as occaſions might alter,) and to add ſomewhat (as they thought fit) to the conſtant Forms uſed by the Apoſtles, and ſo to ſettle ſomewhat in the Church (by that adding) which might ſupply the place of the χάεισμα πνῶς which the Apoſtles had above the ſucceeding Church, and yet not give the preſent Church of *England*, or any perſons in it, which are not the preſent Church in any notion of it, leave to caſt out all ſet Forms, particularly thoſe which without any alteration, thoſe firſt Ages of the Church had delivered down to us from the Apoſtles. So again afterwards, you much vary the ſtate, when you talk of men of *ordinary gifts* taking upon them to paſs a peremptory ſentence for alienation or exchange. Who would think that [*the Primitive Churches thinking fit to add or alter*,] ſhould be ſo improved under your hands? (I beſeech you once more never to alter one word in the period with which you are diſpleaſed; for other men that are in any degree credulous, or not very wary, may be deceived by your doing ſo; though you ſee I am not altogether ſo ignorant of my own ſence, or of your wont, as to depend on you without examining.) You ſee now how little right your concluſion of that fifth *Sect.* had to be induced upon any words of mine: and yet let me tell you, that if it were granted you poſſible, That *a Miniſter may pray as in a Congregation without the uſe of the Liturgy formed in the Apoſtles times*, &c. nay, *without the help of the late Common-prayer-book*, yet will it not follow from thence, that it is well done to aboliſh (with this Liturgy) all ſet Forms, much leſs that it was neceſſary to aboliſh this.

To your ſixth you already diſcern my anſwer, that neither I nor the Author of the *View* are obliged to ſhew you any Liturgy, and avouch that it is (I ſuppoſe you mean) that formed in the Apoſtles times without any interpolation, *&c.*

In your ſeventh you will not ſpend time about the *miraculous gift of Prayer*, (which if you had done, and obſerved the uſe that I there made of that doctrine to the preſent purpoſe, it would have ſtood you in ſome ſtead, (at leaſt kept you from being ignorant of my ſence, and (the conſequent of it) your asking of more queſtions,) and I will not ſpend any more time about your ſeveral queſtions than to tell you, that all that I now, or the Author of the *View* contend for, doth not prove us concern'd in thoſe new *Quæres:* for were it granted, that there were *an ordinary gift of Prayer, and that to be ſtirred up and exerciſed, that Miniſters ſhould ſtudy to pray ſeaſonably*, (which I ſuppoſe is not to pray *ex tempore* becauſe you ſay *ſtudy*) *that he that hath not ordinary wiſdom to pray as he ought, is not called by Chriſt to be a Miniſter of the Goſpel*, (and yet ſure he that hath that ordinary wiſdom to pray as he ought upon premeditation, may pray as he ought not, upon ſudden effuſion; and the Liturgy would a little prevent that, and perhaps enable him to pray more to the edification of the people, than he is able to do, who yet is able in ſome degree to pray as he ought) and *that it doth not follow that the Liturgy under the name of* Saint James *and* Saint Mark *ſhould be rigorouſly impoſed*, nay, that it were true that there are ſome *endowed with the ſpirit of Prayer*, (as that is by you ſet, for ſomewhat more than the ordinary gift, and which it will be hard for any man to demonſtrate to others that he is truly poſſeſt of) were, I ſay, all this granted to you, yet ſure from all this heap of *data* (if they were *conceſſa* too) it would not follow that it was neceſſary, or ſo much as tolerably well done, to aboliſh all ſet Forms in the publick ſervice of God, which was the prime thing by that *View* inſiſted on.

To your eighth [*about Pſalms and uſe of the Lords Prayer*,] I was not to be accuſed for too *ſlight a view of the Direct.* but you for not obſerving to what purpoſe I now mentioned theſe. It was to ſhew the uſe of ſet Forms in the Apoſtles times, and then 1. You muſt mark, that the uſing of ſome ſet *Pſalms* by all the people as a part of prayer or thankſgiving, differs ſomewhat from reading them as any other piece of Scripture; and let me tell you by the way, that either the ſinging of them, or the manner of reading them *alternatim*, is a mark (though not inſeparable) of that difference. 2. That the recommending the Lords Prayer is not ſo much as the Apoſtles conſtant uſing it in their ſervice, (eſpecially of the Euchariſt) nor proportionable to our Saviours [*When you pray, ſay, Our Father*,] and yet I ſuppoſe you will not doubt to obſerve with me, that there are many that acknowledge it recommended in the Directory, that conſtantly abſtain from uſing it in their Pulpits. 3. That I conceive my ſelf to have demonſtrated more than the uſe of *Pſalms* and the *Lords Prayer* (if by demonſtrating you mean proving by the authority of Witneſſes *fide digni*, (which is the higheſt way of demonſtration, that matters of fact are capable of.) 4. That [*for your rule of holding forth ſuch things as are of divine inſtitution in every ordinance, and ſetting forth other things according to the rules of Chriſtian Prudence agreeable to the general rules of the Word of God*;] this is not the firſt time you have been told, that it is an excellent rule, and that it is far from concluding any neceſſity of aboliſhing all ſet Forms; or even all or any part of our preſent Liturgy. As for the cauſe I have of *complaining of diſcord and confuſion in your publick Worſhip*, I am not engaged by any thing I have ſaid to give you any anſwer; having not ventured on ſuch a degree of boldneſs, to ſpeak ſo groſly either againſt the general of the Directory, or againſt any of your particular exerciſes of your gifts. Laſtly, I acknowledge I did tell you, that we may pray as we ought without the very Liturgy formed in the Apoſtles times, and ſo nothing hinders but that I may go on alſo to the next particular; which you will

will give me leave to have called the *then ſadder part of my task*, becauſe it was then the *longeſt*, not becauſe it had any thing elſe beſide the length, and other things of that nature, (ſuppoſing ſtill that you mean not any ſolid exception, or any ſtrength of argument to be repell'd) which might make it either task, or ſad to me. In that I ſhall not find any fault that the buſineſs of the Trinity is at length diſmiſs'd, but ſuppoſe that you have received ſatisfaction in that point. Only it had not been any great matter if you had vouchſafed to tell me you were ſo ſatisfied. But I muſt not expect thoſe acts of grace from you. I ſhall therefore follow as you lead me. And 1. Sir, concerning *the ſad ſtory*, (as you pleaſe to call it) I am much tempted to wonder (but that I have for ſome time a little reſolved to give over that innocent quality, and learn with *Numicius* that *prope rem unam, Nil admirari*) that it ſhould produce but one thing in you, and that ſhould be gladneſs. For though the gladneſs, as you have faſtned it, I ſhall not think a fault in you, but be alſo glad with you, that *I have diſabuſed one offender*, (whoſe ſin no man but you, and his own ſoul was guilty of;) yet that it ſhould not be matter of ſome ſorrow or regret to you, to have been the occaſion of that offence in him, (which is certainly to ſcandalize your weak brother, and leave it ſtill poſſible for many other, through that ſcandal, to ſtumble and fall in like manner;) this muſt be matter of wonder and admiration to me, but withal of advertiſement what I am to expect from you by way of return to any act of Chriſtian admonition, and for that you ſhall give me leave to be heartily ſorry, though you will not.

For your command, [*That I ſhould venture your arguments to any Reader*, &c.] I profeſs my ſelf ready to obey you: and therefore ſhall now take boldneſs to tell you, that I do expect from you, according to the purport of this ſpeech of yours, that you will give your conſent that this whole matter be referred to others judgment; and to that end, that all that hath thus paſt between us be ſtraightway Printed; and I will then deſire no further ſatisfaction for the injury which I conceive my ſelf to have received from you. As for the witneſs you deſire the matter ſhall depend on, *viz. that Book as it was printed at Oxford*, I ſhall be as ready as you to ſtand to it, and by that to have it tried, whether the Author of that *Catechiſm* in that firſt edition gave any Chriſtian man any degree of liberty (more than you your ſelf confeſs is due) of ſwearing. This way of trial I ſhall never refuſe, but profeſs to you (what before I told you) that the advertiſing you of the addition in the laſt edition was perfectly *ex abundanti*, and that the Author was juſtified ſufficiently from the main part of that charge (*viz. giving youth liberty to ſwear*) without it. And therefore by the way let me tell you, that when that Author had in the ſimplicity of his heart put in thoſe words *of the primary intention* to prevent all miſtake in the moſt ignorant, (not queſtioning but that all ordinary learned or intelligent would underſtand without it,) for you to faſten peculiarly upon that one ſupernumerary anſwer of mine, and to make ſuch ſhews of triumph, and impute clancular dealing to that Author, and a great deal more, (on ſo no manner of grounds or probabilities, when all is laid together) is that, which you ought to lay to your heart, though you will not the ſad Story. What you add again to the ſame purpoſe, after ſo full an anſwer, is like all the reſt; and as I muſt not think that ſtrange neither, ſo I deſpair that my repeating my former anſwers will provoke or invite any better dealing from you.

In your next *Section* beginning with, [*Sir, your firſt anſwer*, &c.] you have, I conceive, one new miſtake. For by your [*mark that*] twice repeated, I ſuppoſe you would have it marked that that *Catechiſm* affirms no more to be forbidden by the third Commandment, than the *non-performance of promiſſory Oaths*. If you mean thus, you are much miſtaken. All that is toward that ſence is only this, that the ſecond part of the words cited by Chriſt, [*Thou ſhalt pay unto the Lord thy vows,*] *explains the meaning of the third Commandment to be againſt perjury or non-performance of promiſſory Oaths*. Do you now pleaſe to mark [*againſt perjury*] not denying but that the falſeneſs of aſſertory Oaths, which is alſo perjury, is there meant by the words of the third Commandment; but giving the non-performance of promiſſory Oaths, a ſpecial right to the negative part of that Commandment, as it is there lookt on by Chriſt. And I beſeech you conſider, and paſs your conjecture, what did or could move that Author to add that diſtinct mention of promiſſory Oaths in that place, but thoſe words which there Chriſt recites, [*Thou ſhalt pay*, &c.] and do you tell me, if they do not peculiarly (nay, only) belong to promiſſory, (for ſure aſſertory Oaths are not capable of being thus paid) and if the Author thus ſtrictly deſired to follow Chriſts method, ought this to be imputed to him? Certainly not, when he never made queſtion but that aſſertory Oaths were meant alſo by the third Commandment, and diſtinctly affirmed that perjury (which ſure contains that) was there forbidden. The conſidering of this might rather have ſuggeſted to you this truth, that that Author was careful to make it his firſt task, or part of his method, to weigh the literal importance of each part of the Text, and gain as much from each part, againſt the ſin, as he was ſure it would neceſſarily import, and then to build upon it, what by reduction, (*i. e.* by any thing but the primary literal importance) what by Chriſts ſuperadditions, (*i. e.* by the words induced with a [*But I ſay unto you*] whether they note new precepts, or only new light) would be as firmly ſuperſtructed. And your want of obſerving this method, this deſign of that Author, is the likelieſt thing, that in charity I can pitch on for the occaſion of your miſtake in any part of this matter; though for your affirming that this Catechiſm gave any Chriſtian, liberty of ſwearing, I cannot be juſt if I ſpeak ſo favourably. To this, which I conceived a new miſtake in you, I muſt add another old one in that Section, *viz.* that you will ſtill talk of my ſeveral Editions, (and not mean that laſt where the additions are ſet;) when you have been ſo oft aſſured of this truth (of which I can produce the confirmation of ſeveral Oaths) that I never had the leaſt knowledge of, or gave conſent to any other but the firſt *Oxford* printing of thoſe few Copies, and thoſe laſt additions.

For the ſecond thing, which is ſo clear to you, 'twill be acknowledged far from being ſo, if I again tell you that the meaning of thoſe words of the ſecond queſtion, [*Whether the third Commandment is no more*, &c.] is moſt preciſely this, whether the literal importance, (or if you will, the literal meaning) of the third Commandment be no more, *&c.* and that will well agree with the firſt queſtion, what is the meaning of the old Commandment, (*viz.* as 'tis delivered by Chriſt in theſe words ὑπ-

ὑποκρίσεως,

ἀποφάσεως, and the conſequents out of other places, *Thou ſhalt perform*, &c.) that is again the literal meaning, or the neceſſary importance of the words produced by Chriſt, agreeable to which is the anſwer, that *'tis ſet to expreſs it to be, as literally it ſounds, againſt perjury*, &c.

3. 'Tis not very reaſonable for you to over-rule all others, by ſaying the queſtion is not, when I have as much reaſon to know as you, (being ſo well known to him that ſet the queſtion) and affirm it is, or (becauſe with you *the intention of a phraſe* is a hard expreſſion) to conclude from thence, that *it muſt be explained by the intention of the Law-giver*, whereas I again tell you that the literal notation of the phraſe is the thing that was meant by it, and not the intention (I mean, the total full intention) of the Law-giver.

4. For the queſtion of *what is primary and ſecondary in Gods intention*, [*which you would not have diſputed*,] that you ought to have ſpared alſo: for again I ſay, 'tis about the primary or ſecondary notation of the phraſe. But you by drawing in (before) the intention of the Law-giver, found it an eaſie change into the intention of God; but neither of thoſe is the thing here ſpoken of.

5. I conceive, Chriſts rendring the third Commandment by ὐ πεποιήσεις, is, as I was then confident, (beſide others) a ſufficient proof that that is the primary intention of the phraſe: and I have reaſon to continue in that opinion, becauſe you have not dropped any word of anſwer to it, in all your tale of rejoinders.

6. For the doubtful [*perhaps*,] if I had reaſon to blot it out, you need not challenge me for doing what was rational: the truth is, I was not confident that every body was perſwaded or could be convinced, that all fooliſh, wanton uſing of Gods name (if without any kind of ſwearing) was forbidden in that Commandment, which only ſpeaks of taking, or lifting up Gods name, which with the Hebrews ſignifies ſwearing, and (if wiſe men may be believed) nothing elſe: and therefore I was (according to my judgment) more willing to put in [*perhaps*,] than to venture a quarrel with any body in that matter; but afterwards, conceiving the (*reduction*) would bear it, and willing to be as ſtrict in this matter as I could poſſibly any way juſtifie (God knows, far from any thought of being accuſed for giving liberty of ſwearing) I put in (*idle*) in ſtead of the word (*perhaps:*) and ſo you have, you ſee, the fate of ſhrifting me. I am not permitted to keep any thing from you; and yet deſire not to burthen you with a ſecret, or to deliver this my confeſſion under the reſtraint of any ſeal to you.

7. I have given you grounds to diſcern that 'tis not ſo ſure that fooliſh and wanton uſing of Gods name is forbidden by that Commandment (in caſe that fooliſh uſing it be without Oaths) as prophane or blaſphemous uſing it; the former of which you were told, I conceived to belong to Oaths, and thoſe unlawful Oaths, (and when not to ſuch Oaths, then to ſomething elſe which was equivalent to them) as [*to profane*,] ſignifies to uſe that commonly or unworthily, which is only to be uſed in holy matters, and ſuch are Oaths reſolved to be, and therefore called *ſacramenta*; and the uſing them in common talk, or to any but the ſacred uſe, is to prophane them; and ſo you ſee, that was a cauſeleſs exception alſo. For though ſome fooliſh wanton uſing of Gods name may be prophaning it, *i. e.* prophaning Gods name, or uſing it leſs ſolemnly, yet is it not the prophaning of a *ſacramentum* or Oath, which ſure is greater than the former.

8. Your concluſion, *truly*, is not true; all that can be juſtly concluded of me from thoſe alterations, is this, that I began to conceive that what I had ſaid againſt aſſertory Oaths, might be made more clear to all; though 'twere to me, that knew my own ſence, ſaid clearly enough before; and I ought to be thanked for this care, (eſpecially by you, if to you it was not clear) and not ſo oft to be reproacht for it. And I will once more profeſs, that to my beſt remembrance I made no one alteration in that Book, but only on deſign to explain, not to alter or retract any thing; or to alter the words that they might more fully ſpeak my ſence. I wiſh there were any thing would content you, but ſpeaking againſt my conſcience; I would not much care then, if you ſtill call'd it *recantation*.

9. You ſtill miſtake [*fooliſh and wanton uſing of Gods name*] for *ſwearing*: (and I will be ſo charitable to you, as to think this is it makes you ſo hard to be ſatisfied in this matter.) But I have oft told you, Gods name may be uſed without ſwearing, and that (not uſing, but) taking or lifting up his name ſignifies that. And then why ſhould the [*perhaps*] which is not affixt to ſwearing, but to ſomething elſe, contribute any thing toward the ſwearers boldneſs? I beſeech you diſcern what is ſo manifeſt and ſo oft repeated to you. The words there are, [*Prophane*, &c. *is ſurely there forbidden*] and that, I have oft ſhewed you, contains every unholy, unlawful Oath under it. For your diſlike of my inſtance of *fornication* in the ſeventh Commandment, there is no remedy; you will not like any thing that comes from me; and yet 'tis ſure enough, adultery cannot ſignifie fornication in the primary ſence, or ſave by reduction; and beſides, if to the particular of fornication you had a propriety of diſlike, the other inſtance of killing would ſerve the turn, and that you might poſſibly have either lik'd or confuted alſo.

Your 10th is but a recitation of what was oft ſaid before, particularly in the firſt, and ſecond, and ninth, and there you will find it anſwered.

Your 11th is no fair paſſage, for though the proving perjury to be forbidden in the third Commandment, be the proving a thing that you never denied, yet the inference of the argument there uſed being this, that to take Gods name in vain is no more in the prime ſence, or propriety of ſpeech, than to forſwear, that you know was the only thing denied by you, and therefore the argument in any reaſon ought to have been taken notice of.

In the 12th I pray be not too confident that other men are miſtaken; 'tis in this more poſſible that you may be. For when the incredulity of another man is the only thing that calls for my Oath from me in a matter which is not *materia legitima juramenti*, there the Devil having to do in the incredulouſneſs, the Oath may be ſaid to come from the Devil alſo.

13. My honour will ſufficiently be provided for in this particular alſo, after all your ſcoffs, for which ſoever the ſuperaddition is, of *new precept*, or of *new light*, the ſuperaddition, *i. e.* the thing thus inferred by Chriſt [*But I ſay unto you*] or Chriſts ſuperadding theſe words, *Swear not at all* (ei-

ther of which is a frequent ordinary meaning of the word ſuperaddition) is a command of Chriſt without queſtion. And therefore your *ſimile* of the *Tridentine Canons* muſt lie upon your hands; for this is not a place for you to put it off upon your Reader, or your ſervant (that takes all this pains and drudgery for you, for no other pay but of reproachful *ſimile's*) the Author of the Catechiſm.

But, O, that this ſo ſlight an occaſion ſhould, in the midſt of another engagement, give you hint or excuſe to break out from hence into that other large field concerning that whole matter of *Chriſts adding to the Law!* I wiſh you could have ſatisfied your ſelf with 13 degrees of confutation (which ſure you would have done, if any one of them had been ſolid, and if number had not been neceſſary to ſupply for weight) and not have thought it neceſſary thus to expatiate. But, Sir, I muſt not neglect you, or let you paſs unattended in any your moſt caſual notions; But clearly tell you to that whole matter, that I do produce the authorities of, and reaſons out of the Fathers (and confeſs my ſelf ſo weak as to be inclined, if not convinced by them) to confirm Chriſt to have improved the Law; and ſhall not count this to be *imitating a Father in a dangerous expreſſion*, but a full current of Fathers for many years, in a clear pronouncing. And whenſoever I ſhall underſtand that thoſe teſtimonies, or thoſe reaſons may be likely to perſwade with you, I ſhall (out of a very ill topical memory, being far diſtant from my Books) be ready to produce you ſome of them. But then though in the *Catechiſm* this be done, yet 'tis as clearly there ſaid that no man ſhall be contended with, in this matter, (a little practice of piety with peace, being valuable above a great deal of this kind of diſputing) ſo he acknowledge that Chriſt brought more light, and clearly convinced men of the unlawfulneſs of ſome things, *which by nature, or Moſes, men had not been convinced to be unlawful.* Thus much for the Doctrine once again. As for the ſuperſtructure that the Author meant to lay upon it, I ſhall ſatisfie your importunity, if it be but to get you into ordinary charity with him. 'Tis plainly and briefly this; A ſerious and hearty deſire that the utmoſt that Chriſts words in that Sermon can ſafely and properly extend to, may be now thought by men the duty of every Chriſtian; and that it may not either be put off (as a counſel of perfection, or a precept of Clergy-men only, under the ſtile of Diſciples) or be brought down again to the old Law of *Moſes*, or the fundamental of nature, (and being then either not conceived, or not found to be ſo ſeverely preſcribed there, be thought fit to be removed from the Chriſtian ſhoulders) or elſe be taken with ſome σῶον φάρμακον, which by reconciling it with the latitude thought to be allowed under *Moſes*, may take it off from all ſtrictneſs, and ſo from that height which I conceive now to be required, and which I deſired very earneſtly that all men would look on as their neceſſary duty, and ſo try by Gods help (and the force of the old *Pythagorean hemiſtichium* Δύναμις γὰρ ἀνάγκης ἐγγύθι ναίει) whether they might not poſſibly be able to perform it. This was the utmoſt of the ſuperſtructure by that Author deſigned or thought on, and that made me ſo wonder (from knowledge of my own ſence, and conſcience of my innocent intentions) that any man ſhould ſay, That *this Doctrine could deſtroy the ſumme and ſubſtance of the Goſpel*; and yet I confeſs, I have heard of one other man that hath ſaid that, and perhaps from him you may remember it, and not have ponder'd the truth of it. And ſo by my *honeſt ſaying*, which you call for, you ſee what ſpirit of jealouſy poſſeſt you, when you fancied ſuch an aereal ſuperſtructure for me, which I profeſs never to have dreamt of, and to wonder at the ſharpneſs of your invention, that could be ſo prompt for me. I plainly confeſs, That *Chriſt and his merits is the only cauſe on which I depend, and expect to be juſtified, without the righteouſneſs of the Law*; and the moſt obedient ſubmiſſion to his moſt elevated precepts can no more contribute toward juſtifying me, than the like obedience to the law of nature or *Moſes* would have done, if Chriſt were not conceived to have heightned that Law. When we have done the higheſt that Chriſt requires of us, we are but unprofitable ſervants; and by our new obedience have been far from doing more than was required of us, or making expiation thereby for that which we have not done.

In your third Section of that matter, I grant that which you would infer from *pag.* 50, 51. that the Author there produces arguments to confirm that part of the opinion for *new precepts*, and therefore I ſhall ſpare reviewing your proofs that he doth ſo: but inſtead of it, tell you, that after he hath confirmed it both by a remarkable Scripture, and the reaſons given for it by the Fathers, (which concludes their opinion alſo) yet he confeſſes to be content with the acknowledgment of more light; and that he will not contend with any that is contrary minded, ſo he will bring the Jews up to us, and not us down to the Jews. Which that it is the expreſs doctrine of that Book, you have oft enough been admoniſhed, and can never perſwade any man to the contrary, that ſhall after the places cited by you, have patience to proceed to the reſt of that matter.

But now Sir, you begin again, and would ſeem to ſay ſomewhat againſt that Doctrine;

As 1. That *there was Goſpel under the Law, and the Spirit*, &c. *and divers Jews penitent believers, and therefore under the ſecond Covenant.* Sir, all this is granted moſt willingly, and yet Chriſts coming in the fleſh did bring more light, more plentiful effuſions of the Spirit, and ſo might poſſibly be allowed to give new precepts alſo.

2. For the *promiſes*, how plain they were to the Jews, needed not to be diſputed by him who ſpeaks only of precepts (ſave only as the height or plainneſs of the promiſes, amongſt other arguments, apt to make higher precepts more ſeaſonable:) and yet that the promiſe might be cleared by Chriſt, and made more univerſally known, you will hardly deny or diſprove alſo. For though they were ſo plain that they ſaw them, yet 'twas afar off, in your own citation of *Hebr.* 11. and they that were preſent to Chriſt, (who was one of the promiſes) might ſure have a clearer ſight of them.

The ſame will be anſwer to your third argument, for that concerns the promiſes again: and in that reſpect 'tis ſufficient to add, that the promiſes, were they never ſo high before, were now ſure clearer under Chriſt; and that is all that is affirmed by that Author, and will ſuffice to infer his concluded obligation to higher obedience.

And ſo likewiſe the fourth will be anſwered, concerning the *Ceremonies*, which I acknowledge to have had ſome good in them, in order to Chriſt whom they prefigured; but yet many of them had

none

none in themſelves, I am ſure none when Chriſt is come, and hath removed the obligation of them, and ſo may be allowed to have added ſome new precepts in lieu of them: and I am as ſure they have not ſo much of goodneſs or eaſineſs, the χρηστὸς ζυγὸς or ἐλαφρὸν φορτίον, as now is in the very higheſt and ſtricteſt precepts that are given us under Chriſt; and therefore is there nothing like unreaſonable in the change.

In your fifth, ſure 'tis not ſo ſtrange that I ſhould mention the *pardoning of ſin now under Chriſt*; for though that was to be had for the penitent believer under the time of the Law of *Moſes*, yet was it 1. Not by the power or purport of the Law, but only by Chriſt; And 2. 'twas not at all to be had in the ſtate of nature, or firſt Covenant, which required unſinning obedience; and to the Law of nature that law of Chriſt was ſaid to ſuperadd, as well as to the Law of *Moſes*; and therefore that particular in the 51 *page*, was not impertinent neither, or capable of your ſad wonder. But how I am obliged to think your queſtion [*Whether there is any venial ſin?*] tolerably pertinent, or fit to expect any return from me at this time, I cannot gheſs, yet ſhall ὑποπτεύειν, and anſwer that alſo; that though no ſin have any title to pardon under the firſt Covenant, yet under or by the purport of the ſecond, many ſins not gotten out of infirmities, *&c.* ſhall be waſhed in Chriſts blood, and ſo be actually pardoned, (which is more than venial or pardonable in that ſence) whereas many other ſhall never be capable of that waſhing, or that pardon, without particular forſaking, but bring them that lie under them (impenitent unbelievers) into condemnation. This were abundantly enough, conſidering the call I have to the anſwering of that queſtion at this time. Yet to demonſtrate to you that I am not over ſhy of anſwering you a queſtion (though it be of ſome nicety) when you think fit to ask it me, I will go a little farther to ſerve you, and give you the ſtate of this queſtion (if you pleaſe, by way of ſuppoſition at large) in ſuch a manner poſſibly that no party will find much to object to it. Thus;

What is the meaning of this ordinary queſtion, [*an aliquod peccatum ſit ſuâ naturâ veniale?*] will appear by the anſwer that muſt be given (if it be ſatisfactory) to this argument, which I ſhall imagine produced againſt it; [No ſin is in its own nature mortal;] for that ſin ſhould be the cauſe of damning any, or that puniſhment eternal ſhould be due to ſin, is but an accident that the Law or Covenant of God brought in, either to *Adam*, *Quo die comederis morte morieris*, or after, *Behold I ſet before you life and death*, &c. for ſure had it not been for that Law of prohibition (that Covenant, with that penalty, on breach of conditions) ſin had never damned any one; and therefore thoſe irrational creatures to whom no ſuch Law is made, and Covenant given, though they ſhould be ſuppoſed to ſin againſt the Law of their creation, they ſhall not be puniſhed eternally for that. Now it is an old rule in Logick, that *Accidens advenit enti in actu exiſtenti*, and is not *de naturâ ſubjecti*, though ſometimes ſo ingraffed into it, that it becomes inſeparable from it, therefore this [*being mortal or damning*] being an accident that came in by Gods Covenant or Law, cannot be of the nature of ſin, what ever that ſin be: For if it were ſo, then God who cannot make contradictions true, nor conſequently take away the nature of the thing and preſerve the thing, could not take away the damningneſs of ſin from ſin (any more than quantity from a body) *manente peccato realiter*, which yet we know God can do, and ordinarily doth, by pardoning of ſin: for however it may be ſaid by way of anſwer to that part of the Argument, that Chriſt ſuffered and ſatisfied for ſin, or elſe God could not pardon any, (not to diſpute the truth of that, whether he could or no) it ſtill remains that the damningneſs of ſin is then taken from ſin, by what means it now matters not.

This is the Argument I meant to ſuppoſe made againſt that plain granted truth; and to this argument, he that had propoſed the main queſtion, and held it negative, if he will ever anſwer, muſt ſay that the Law and Covenant of God (whether that ſignifie the eternal Law, or even the eternal will of God, who wills holineſs as he is God, or in any other notion of Law) is a main ingredient in the conſtituting of ſin, the very *formalis ratio*, that makes that which is of its ſelf materially an act, to become *formaliter* a ſinful act; that makes the killing of a man, which is materially murther, to be alſo formally the ſin of murther; and therefore if by the Law or Covenant of God all ſin be made mortal, then may it truly be ſaid in this other notion or reſpect, or for this reaſon, that all ſin is ſo of its own nature.

This anſwer muſt be acknowledged to be pertinent and ſatisfactory, and ſo any Proteſtant will receive it: and inſtead of excepting againſt it, I deſire to ſtrike in and cloſe with both Diſputer and Anſwerer, and infer that then it ſeems this is reſolved on by that party that holds all ſins in their own nature mortal, that that is all one with this other propoſition [*All ſins which are by the Law prohibited under pain of damnation, are by that Law damning ſins, and none venial*;] this being ſo, I ask the oppoſite party, that diſputed even now, what he thinks of this propoſition [*All ſins which by the Law, or firſt Covenant were prohibited under pain of damnation, are by the tenor of that Law all damning ſins, none venial*] I am verily perſwaded he will conſent to it too. And having done ſo, what hinders now but that this Controverſie may be accommodated between Diſputers, being once rightly explained and underſtood? For that under the Law, or firſt Covenant every leaſt ſin was ſufficient to forbid a mans juſtification, and conſequently to damn, is apparently the words of Scripture, *Gal.* 3. 9. *Curſed is every man that continues not in all.* As for the Goſpel, or ſtate of Chriſtianity, or ſecond Covenant, ſtricken with us in Chriſt, we know there is pardon for ſin by the very tenor of the Covenant, and every ſin is not now ſuch, as that it ſhall either damn hereafter, or exclude every one that commits it from the preſent favour of God, but may be competible with a juſtified eſtate, and a hope of heaven. Goſpel-obedience is not perfect, exact, without ſinning at all, but only faithful, ſincere, impartial, without hypocriſie, or indulgence in any known ſin; not the righteouſneſs of him that never ſinned, but of him that believeth on Chriſt, that repenteth and amendeth his life, that of the new creature, [*He that confeſſeth and forſaketh ſhall have mercy*] and the like. This was ſo far ſeen and acknowledged by ſome Papiſts of the Learneder ſort, [a] *Gerſon*, [b] *Almain*, and [c] *Jo. Ep. Roffenſis*, that they have left their opinion in thoſe words to which no moderate Proteſtant will refuſe to ſubſcribe. The two former thus, *Peccatum mortale & veniale in eſſe tali non diſtinguuntur intrinſecè*,

[a] *Tertia parte de vit ſpiritSect.* 1.
[b] *Opuſc. tr.* 3. *c.* 10.
[c] *Reſut.* 32. *articulo Luther.*

intrinſecè, & eſſentialiter, ſed ſolum per reſpectum ad divinam gratiam quæ peccatum iſtud imputat, &c. The third, *Peccatum veniale ſolum ex Dei miſericordia veniale eſt.* I have now need to add no more but this, that if this do not prove acceptable to you, I have loſt my labour, eſpecially if it ſhould be matter of any new contention, thus to have been willing to pacify contenders.

As for your ſixth, of the [*glimmerings*] and the [*perhaps*] it was a little unlucky, not only becauſe 'tis ſaid of Chriſt in Scripture, *in terminis*, that he was *the day-ſpring* to give light to them which ſit in darkneſs, which is certainly as much as the [*glimmerings*] or the [*perhaps*] can be imagined to import, but alſo, becauſe thoſe glimmerings are mentioned by that Author clearly in order to the commands in that place (as appears by the queſtion that induced that anſwer) and you talk of the diſcovering of Chriſt to all the elect for their everlaſting ſalvation, which ſeems to me ſtill to reſpect the promiſes; or if it do alſo refer to the commands ſufficiently diſcovered under the Law, *&c.* yet that is nothing againſt our doctrine, which ſuppoſes the former light (for precepts) ſufficient *pro ſtatu*, and that men were then ſaved *non obſtante* this want of greater light; and only require higher obediences now from thoſe that are allowed higher light.

To your ſeventh, which again breaks aſunder into three under-charges or examinations, there will be little ſcruple to tell you, that though the things you mention were required of the Jews *ſub periculo animæ*, (*Viz.* belief, mortifying luſts, *&c.*) yet ſome other things, *viz.* ſome of the things propoſed by *Job* in his ſpeeches to his friends, by *David* in his Pſalms, eſpecially by the Wiſeman in his Proverbs, *&c.*) might be but glimmerings of the Goſpel-precepts, σκιαγραφίαι to this ζωγράφησις; and being 1. Not ſo ſtrictly and manifeſtly required of all as the commands of the Decalogue, *&c.* 2. Not delivered by theſe as Law-givers, but as wiſe men. And 3. being not by way of particular precept propoſed to all; they might then not oblige them (to whom they were not manifeſt, or not delivered *ſub præcepto*) under thoſe hazards, under which now the knowledge of our Fathers will by Chriſt involves us. Beſides, I ſuppoſe 'tis no news to you, that there were voluntary oblations among the Jews in *Moſes* his time, and many acts of ſtrictneſs after, wherein they that obliged all men to perform them, were ſaid to dogmatize: and though for ſo doing the Phariſees (that did impoſe them as neceſſary) were condemned, yet the חסידים or *Aſidæi*, that practiſed them, and yet not conceived them neceſſary, and ſo never ſo impoſed them on others, were never condemned, but thought fit to be commended and rewarded: and though the Jews were encouraged to the performance of theſe נדבות or ἐκουσιασμοὶ, yet is nothing of the doctrine of ſupererogation inferr'd by this neither. But 'tis now impertinent to enlarge on this ſubject; when all other difficulties that now depend are ſatisfied, I may chance be able to give you a juſtifiable account of that alſo.

And ſo how far ſoever the Author of the *Catech.* contended for new precepts, yet having expreſt what he would be content with in that matter by way of compoſition, rather than contend; and ſaying the very words that I have in that matter tranſcribed thence, I muſt be no more ſaid to recant this ſecond time than that Author did even at the firſt edition. Who by that one willingneſs to live peaceably with you and all men, muſt it ſeems, be condemned to that reproach of having recanted; and be triumpht over, only becauſe he would not quarrel with every man that is contentious.

And to go on with you, what if counſels give new light? may not commands do ſo too? or muſt I be reprehended becauſe I am no Papiſt? I mean, becauſe I conceive theſe in Saint *Matthew* to be no counſels, but precepts? I hope, that which I have ſaid will ſufficiently reſcue me from any more of your jealouſies concerning my weighty ſuperſtructures. I have told you my whole heart; you need not uſe any optick glaſs of your own providing to ſee that which is ſo naked, and τετελεσχηλισμένον before you.

For the ſecond page of your ſixth leaf, where you are pleaſed to mention the [*All that you deſire*] it is too wanton for me to return any thing to it; I have no leiſure to be playſome, or to conſider how *poor* you are, or how the Critiques have offended you, or what lower heaven they converſe in. Only I hope, I ſhall not now at laſt be condemned for an Antinomian, (becauſe I only think the whole Law of the Jews doth not now oblige us) much leſs to go beyond them, to be a hyper-Antinomian, for no more than theſe two plain aſſertions, that Chriſt hath rid us from the ſad yoke of ceremonies Judaical, and will now accept of ſincere, though it be not unſinning obedience. If this Divinity will not pleaſe you in any meaſure, I ſhall never approve my ſelf to you; but yet hope that you do not think in earneſt that the Antinomians errour is that Chriſt added higher precepts, or by more light encreaſed the obligation to obedience above that which the Law required. I ſuppoſe you meant that name only as a *mormo* to fright me; not that now, becauſe I am no Socinian, I muſt be an Antinomian preſently.

After the ſetting down the [*All that you deſire*] and that cloſed as I conceived with a [*finally*] it ſeems you have two deſires more (and one of them hath many more in it alſo:) and when your deſires do ſo increaſe upon you, I can ſcarce hope to give you ſatisfaction; and therefore ſhall deſire to be excuſed, if I proceed not to them; becauſe ſome parts of thoſe deſires I cannot imagine how I am obliged to anſwer at all, (as to tell you what grace was brought into the world by the Law of *Moſes*, when I make no doubt to acknowledge that grace came by Chriſt, and as I remember 'twas you (not I) that ſeem'd to ſay the contrary, in the top of the ſecond page of your fifth leaf of this laſt return, [*The Spirit was adminiſtred*, &c. *during the time of legal adminiſtrations*] which yet I would not there quarrel with neither, but think them reconcilable by a commodious interpretation) and other parts are utterly impertinent to any part of our point in hand; as that, Of all mankind's being under the ſecond Covenant, Of Chriſts ſatisfying for all, and ſo of pardon and revelation of the Law of faith to all, (which if it were the thing which brought in all the former, will be eaſily ſatisfied, by ſaying, that what was before ſo revealed ſufficiently *pro ſtatu*, was not yet ſo fully and clearly as now by the coming of Chriſt) and ſo that alſo of the Aaronical Prieſthood, wherein yet I perceive you conclude ſtrangely againſt that Author. For ſure he can very well think (what he doth) that Chriſt can ſatisfy for ſins, notwithſtanding that the exerciſe of his Aaronical Prieſthood conſiſts in his ſacrifice. For though that ſacrifice be a ceremony of his conſecration to his Melchiſedechian

Prieſthood

Prieſthood in one reſpect, yet as a ſacrifice (not in the ſhadow, but) of the ſubſtance, as a ſacrifice not of the bullock or goat, which indeed can make but a typical ſatisfaction, but of the Lamb and eternal Son of God, this ſacrifice may well expiate and ſatisfy, and ſo did indeed. And if you can get the *Socinians* to affirm this alſo, I ſhall never quarrel with you, I ſhould be glad you could thus make them your converts. But ſure *Smalcius*'s [*Non eſt diſſimulandum nos non negare Chriſti mortem ad ejus ſacrificium pertinere*] will not come home to it: For they can ſay this frequently, and yet not think that any ſatisfaction for ſin was made by any ſacrifice of Chriſt; nor that that ſacrifice conſiſted in Chriſts death, or was offered by his dying; but expreſs the meaning of thoſe words ſufficiently, that the death of Chriſt did only *pertinere* to that ſacrifice which was not offered up in his death. Which you ſee is not my ſence, but that the death it ſelf was a ſacrifice, and in it ſatisfaction made for ſin by the ſacrificer. I was afraid a word would not be enough to every wiſe man, and therefore I have been forced to add this alſo.

As for your ἀναπεφαλαίωσις of your conqueſts, you have liberty to uſe it ὡς ἀπόλαυσιν, and triumph as much as you pleaſe. For though the [*perhaps fooliſh wanton uſing of Gods name*] (which is not always in Oaths) *would not reſtrain from fooliſh wanton ſwearing*, (and yet methinks *à majori* it might) yet ſure the [*ſure all prophane*, &c.] and the expoſition of Chriſts μὴ ὅλως ὀμνύειν, may be allowed to do it; and ſo all had been ſafe, and to that matter altogether as clear, if the [*perhaps*] had never been blotted out. 2. Chriſts new precepts will do it, (whether they ſignify ſuperaddition of more precept, or more light, which infers encreaſe of obligation) and if they would not, I ſhould not by that be obliged to reſt ſatisfied without them. However, you ſee I do not reſt ſo ſatisfied, but only tell you what you are to underſtand by them, and that juſt agreeably (or *in terminis* the ſame) to what had been ſaid before in that Catechiſm. 3. For [*Chriſts not forbidding ſwearing it ſelf*] you will give me leave to have been long ſince of that opinion with you, meaning by it, that ſwearing for Gods glory or the publick good is not forbidden by Chriſt: and therefore ſure the meaning of the anſwer [*A total univerſal prohibition of ſwearing it ſelf*] was ſomething elſe, *viz.* of ſwearing at all by the name of any other beſide God, which formerly you might have believed, if you had pleaſed. But I am afraid Sir, you are fallen upon ſome new notion of [*the ſin of dogmatizing.*] For to the notion that I always have had of it (*viz.* teaching for doctrines or neceſſary duties the Traditions of men, or impoſing things as Doctrines of God, which are not ſuch) 'tis impoſſible your words can belong. Do not you mean by the ſin of dogmatizing [*tranſire in dogmata vel ſententias aliorum?*] I ſuppoſe you do, by what follows, of *my condeſcending too paſſively to take up both opinions.* This may poſſibly be a ſlip in you; I ſhall not upbraid you with it. By what hath now twice or thrice been ſaid, your new argument is ſuperſeded; and I am for all my aſſent to the anſwer in the Catechiſm, verily perſwaded that forſwearing my ſelf for the publick good were a far greater ſin than ſwearing truly in order to that end. But that that Author muſt ſtill be forced to have contradicted himſelf, is very hard, when the clear account of his not having done ſo hath ſo oft been given, and cannot yet get a little audience from you. I would, you would be but ſo well natured as to tell me the meaning of your *ſic notus Ulyſſes?* and what the deſign is that you could ſo eaſily gheſs at; This plain dealing would deſerve far more thanks (but indeed not ſet me out for ſo dangerous an undermining deſigner) than your ſuſpicious ſpeakings, and then affected reſervation. Speak out the deepeſt of your heart; 'twill be as ſeaſonable, and as juſt, I ſuppoſe, and in all reaſon as well taken as your queſtion about the weighty ſuperſtructure, or your collections in either Sermon.

For your ſtumbling at my twelfth *page* about *reduction*, I am ſorry, and ſhall labour to keep you from falling down right: By telling you, 1. That ſins forbidden by the ſame authority, may yet more or leſs clearly be forbidden by that authority, and under the ſecond of thoſe (*viz.* thoſe that are leſs clearly forbidden) that of reduction may come. 2. That the leſs the clearneſs of forbidding is, the leſs deep is the obligation to them to whom they are (and 'tis not their fault that they are) leſs clear: yet of things forbidden by reduction, ſome are much more clearly forbidden than others; and ſo fornication, than ſome other ſins forbidden by that Commandment: and I ſuppoſe you, to whom it is as clear that fornication is there forbidden as adultery, are as deeply obliged to abſtain from one as other; But then ſtill in other particulars, which are not by the light of the words, nor by any other means made thus equally clear to ſome men, to them they are not equally or ſo deeply obliging.

Then for your [*moreover*] about Chriſts forbidding ſwearing by any creature, (which if you had vouchſafed to have taken notice of, you might have left out much that went before) you will ſufficiently be anſwered: 1. That ſwearing by any creature will hardly be thought to be forbidden by the Command againſt taking the name of the Lord in vain, (becauſe he that ſwears by the creature doth not directly any ſuch thing) but might perhaps be better reduced to the former Commandment of not worſhipping the creature. 2. I do not believe that any command under the Law of nature, or of the Jews, will be produced ſo clear, or be acknowledged ſo convincing to thoſe that lived before the Law, or to the Jews, againſt ſwearing by ſome creature, that *Joſeph* which is brought in frequently in the ſtory ſwearing by the life of *Pharaoh*, without any mark of ſin on that form of ſpeech, ſhall be reſolved to have ſinned againſt conſcience in it. And therefore it may at leaſt be granted, that this was of that nature that it might be matter of Chriſts (ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν, μὴ ὅλως] and of the Fathers ἐκ τῶν πονηρῶν τότε, μετὰ δὲ χειρὸν ἔτι πονηρῶν. And therefore, 4. I muſt willingly acknowledge, what the Author doth, that a Chriſtian may in no caſe ſwear by the creature, and have told you that that was the meaning of that Authors phraſe of total univerſal prohibition, anſwerable *verbatim* to Chriſt μὴ ὅλως ὀμνύειν.

You are next pleaſed to proceed to the ſtrife about the word שָׁוְא, and 1. to change *Pagnin* or *Mercer* for *Grotius*, and tell me that he will aſſure me that שָׁוְא *proprie ſignificat vanum.* Where he ſo ſaith, you tell me not, nor will I deny it, becauſe I know not what in that place he may mean by *proprie*: but yet I muſt tell you, that it was a little unlucky, that I ſhould examine but one Author of your citing; and that ſhould prove ſo contrary. For I have lookt on that Commandment in *Grotius* his Notes on *Ex.* 20. 7. and there thus you may read, *In vanum*] *i. e. falſo. Non pejerabis. Idem*

dem n. e. שוא & שקר *ut in præcepto nono apparet, collato hoc Exodi capite cum altero Deuteronomii, ubi Græci ponunt utroque loco* ματαιαν ϯιυϛὴ. This is as plain a teſtimony as you could have ſuggeſted for my turn; and I hope you will now pardon me, if I abſtain from examining the reſt of your citations, being ſo ſure that the granting them all will not prove that Chriſt ſaid any thing which I may be aſhamed to ſay after him, when he rendred the third Commandment μὴ ταιοπιήσης, and when I acknowledge vain ſwearing by Gods name forbidden by that Commandment, and that שוא as 'tis ſometimes rendred *falſum* (as by the *Targum*, *Ex.* 21. 1. 'tis paraphras'd by דשקר *mendacii*, and by our Engliſh rendred *falſe*, and ſo in other places) ſo it is oft rendred *vain* alſo: which is the utmoſt can be proved by them. Whereas indeed the word, even when it ſignifies vain, hath a peculiar notation of vanity proper to this matter, *viz.* of a fair empty ſhew, when in words I ſeem to oblige my ſelf, but really do not; which fault is obſervable in ſome kinds of ſwearing, which are therefore clearly forbidden in that Commandment.

As for any *ſcorn* and *indignation* expreſt by me about this matter in my laſt, though I wondred to ſee it objected, yet becauſe my memory was frail, I lookt over thoſe papers (which truly I keep for the like purpoſes, to decide ſuch differences, that may be incident) and there can I not find one word that looks that way, or that I can imagine could bear that accuſation.

For the ſence of [*did in effect mean it*] I ſhall ſatisfie you; It was that I did mean that which is in effect all one with that other phraſe [*were forbidden.*] This you are ſo kind to let paſs, and with it ſome few ſides more, which I may therefore ſuppoſe had no greater difficulties in them, but am far from taking it ill that you let them paſs, but ſhall aſſure you that you might as well have paſt by that alſo of ὁ διάβολος & ἀντίδικος, which, by ſaying you underſtand, and by forgiving me, I ſuppoſe you think meant by me againſt your ſelf, to faſten ſome ſtrange ill character upon you. This I ſuppoſe you did by occaſion of the meaning of thoſe two words, which are not only titles of the Devil, but have a ſignificancy proper to them; the one to expreſs a calumniator, the other a plaintiff or adverſary ὁ δίκη. The former (I confeſs) of theſe, you might with ſome reaſon think I might apply to you, and perſwade your ſelf that I cannot but believe you to have been guilty of calumniating me, *i. e.* accuſing me falſely. But truly Sir, whatſoever I might think in that matter, I never meant to ſay any ſuch thing to you, nor to manage a diſcourſe (deſigned to a better end) with any paſſion or aſperity, though it were in ſaying of truth only. And therefore let me aſſure you, I was far from meaning or ſaying any ſuch thing of you; and was ſo little guilty in my own conſcience, that when I found it in your paper, I was a little troubled, till I had ſomewhat ſatisfied my ſelf with conſidering that you might poſſibly be miſtaken, and then by looking on the place in my Papers where I find the paſſage moſt clear from looking towards you. The truth is, I was a ſpeaking of the hurt that might come by teaching that Chriſt improv'd not the Law, and told you that I could give you an experimental account of it (Truly that refer'd to a particular perſon that was then in my mind, and is now in my memory, ready to be named to you, if you pleaſe) in one that by urging that doctrine, and ſo bringing down Chriſt to the perfect law of *Moſes*, became an advocate for a vile unchriſtian ſin. This I made no queſtion was a ſtratagem of the Devils, accuſing to him that Doctrine of Chriſts ſuperadditions for a falſe and dangerous Doctrine, and to that end calumniating all Authors for *Socinians*, *&c.* that were for that Doctrine, and by that means fitting him to the juſtifying of that his vile ſin, which otherwiſe he had not probably been guilty of. This is in more words the plain of what I then ſaid in thoſe few words, not of Rhetorick, but of plain ſence, and might (if you would) have been excuſed from the addition and length of this paraphraſe.

You lead me on now to the reviewing of what was ſaid on occaſion of the third report.

In that, I ſee, I have not yet the luck to pleaſe you neither, but have offended you more by my excuſe than I had done by the firſt crime; thus unskilful am I in converſation with men of your temper. This is, it ſeems, an errour in me; I am ſure, an infelicity. Well, I ſhall again endeavour to ſatisfie you in the reaſonableneſs of what I deſigned, in not diſputing with them that thought not all inclinations to evil unconſented to, to be ſins; but only affirming that they were, and rather bringing them to godly ſorrow upon their own principles, than falling to diſputation about it. The reaſon was, and ſtill is, becauſe I fore-ſaw every godly man (I mean, thoſe of whoſe piety I have no reaſon to doubt, and that in other things are very Orthodox, I am confident, truly humbled for their evil inclinations conſented to) was not of your opinion in this matter. 2. Becauſe it is a very nice point, which perhaps for want of clear ſtating may be miſapprehended between men of diſtant perſwaſions. I will ſet you a brief ſtate of it, and leave it to your judgment, whether I ſpeak reaſon or no. There is in a man a double faculty, to which this inclination may poſſibly be applyed, either the ſenſitive appetite common to men with beaſts, or the humane will. The ſenſitive faculty naturally inclines to the pleaſurable object, *viz.* to that which is agreeable to the fleſh; that this inclination unconſented to by the man, uncheriſhed, unliked, ſhould be a ſin, would be hard to affirm, though you mean by it but original ſin; becauſe original ſin is a conſequent of *Adams* fall, and this was certainly in our firſt Parents in the time and ſtate of innocence before the fall; as when the apple was ſo fair to the eye, ſweet to the taſte, *&c.* 'tis clear, the eye and taſte were then inclined to it; and nothing but the command of God to the contrary could quell that inclination. Suppoſe then, they had not eaten after this inclination of the carnal appetite to that forbidden fruit, had that inclination in that appetite only been a ſin in them? 'Tis very probable it had not; the conſent, or ſomewhat elſe, of the will, being neceſſarily required to make them thus guilty, and I now ſpeak abſtracting from any thing of that. Beſides this, there is another inclination, *viz.* of the *will*, (not a full conſent of the will (or a mixt) to the carnal propoſal, but) a bending of the will rather that way than the other; not a weighing down of the ballance to that ſide, but an ἑτεροζυγία (as that word is contrary to an ἰσοζυγία, from the word ζυγὸς, ϛαθμὸς (a pendulouſneſs betwixt the good and the evil, but rather bending toward the evil. This is it that I conceived to be an averſion from God; not fully, but ſo far as that it did rather bend to the carnal object; and this was it that I called a ſin: though being but the inclination of our corrupt nature, and not conſented to, I could not call it an actual ſin. Now the word *proneneſs*, or inclination to evil, being thus an equivocal phraſe, I

thought

thought not fit to be ſevere or importunate upon them who perhaps did not know how to diſtinguiſh it, nor again to trouble a Catechiſm with too much nice diſcourſe; but more groſly to bind the Scholar to humble himſelf for all ſins, diſtinctly for his evil inclinations, (to that purpoſe affirming plainly that they were ſins) or if he would be apt to diſpute, which might hinder his being humbled, (I mean, diſpute upon ſuch a nicety as was mentioned) yet ſtill to call for the concluſion, humiliation, upon his own principles, if he would not allow it upon mine. This I conceive, will clear that Author from any crime in his doubtful expreſſions, or connivence. For 1. the words are clear, that inclinations to evil are ſins; and (if he will be taught) that will inſtruct him in true principles; if he will not, yet will not the [*if*] following be a means to harden him in impenitence. Nor indeed can I conſent to you, that no man can conceive true godly ſorrow for his actual ſins, who doth deny the fountain of all his ſins to be a ſin, if you mean by that fountain, the natural inclination: For I make no queſtion but he that ſees, and fully diſcerns all his actual ſins, and looks upon them all as progenies of his will, and ſo his [ἐμὸν ἔγκλημα, ἐμὸν ἔγκλημα, ἐμὸν μέγιστον ἔγκλημα] that ſees nothing of nature, or neceſſity, or fault of others in it, but all his own villany, may have as true godly ſorrow for his actual ſins, as he would have if he were ſenſible of that other alſo. I ſay not, that he would have as much true godly ſorrow abſolutely, or for all ſins; (for ſuppoſing, as now I do, that he hath not ſorrow for thoſe inclinations as for ſins, you muſt not conceive that I ſay he hath it, ſave only as for infelicities) but I or he may have as true godly ſorrow for actual ſins, as the other would be likely to have for actual ſins. To which purpoſe I ſhall farther venture this one example and proof to you; Our firſt parents certainly might conceive true godly ſorrow for their firſt ſin, which was in them actual, yet muſt needs deny the fountain of that, and (conſequent to that) of all their ſins (their own free-will) to have been a ſin or ſinful, unleſs they will accuſe their Creator, which will be no proper companion or effect of godly ſorrow, and I ſuppoſe will not by you be expected from them. And ſo I had more reaſon for my expreſſions than perhaps you thought of. And ſo much for your two firſt objections in that point.

3. For your [*idem per idem*] which you impute to me, you are much miſtaken. For, ſuppoſing ſome inclinations to evil to be not cheriſhed, the thing that I concluded is, 1. That in that caſe 'tis victory, not ſin; And 2. that in that caſe, I hope you will not ſay, it is a ſin cheriſht or conſented to: which, if you mark, was paſſing an opinion how you muſt be fain to conclude (and that, a thing quite contrary to your former concluding) and not making any ſuch concluſion for my ſelf. You were at great leiſure when you obſerved that illogical probation.

5. For that [*which it ſeems, I ſuppoſed and proved not*] I muſt now give you an account. And it was, that *I ſeemed to imply that there muſt needs be ſome conſent given to actual ſin.* I confeſs I then proved it not, but promiſed to give you an account of it when I had your grounds of ſcruples; you have now mentioned them to me.

1. *That original ſin is truly and properly a ſin in them that are not of age to conſent to it.* 2. *That corruption is ſo ſtrong in us that it doth many times break forth without our conſent.* To the firſt I ſhall but need remember you, that 'twas every *actual* ſin to which I implied that conſent neceſſary, and I hope you are not ready to prove that *original* ſin in children (as you call it) is truly and properly *actual* ſin; and for the ſecond [*the breaking forth of corruption in adultis*] that doth (if again it be an actual ſin) certainly ſuppoſe ſome kind of conſent obtained, whether by ſuddden ſurreption, paſſion, *&c.* or by ſomething ſometimes that is worſe than one act of conſent, *viz.* by the cuſtome of ſin, and glibneſs toward it, contracted by many precedaneous acts of conſent to it, or the like. Beſides, there are two kinds of ſin, *omiſſions* as well as *commiſſions*, and there is a criminous conſent required to either of them; and he that is bound to uſe all diligence to ſubdue his corruptions, at leaſt to repreſs them; if he do not ſo, this indiligence of his hath ſome of his conſent: and that is a prime ingredient in the breaking forth of corruptions; which conſequently do not break forth without all conſent. And for me now to undertake the proof of that, that the Schoolmen upon *Thomas* have ſo fully proved, that every thing is ſo far ſinful or criminous (meaning ſtill actual ſin) as it is voluntary, the yielding of the will to the ſenſitive appetite being neceſſary to the conception of luſt, and that again to the bringing forth ſin, I ſhall venture the worſt of your cenſure, that I do not now proceed to demonſtrate more largely. For indeed actual ſin being a tranſgreſſion of the Law, will hardly belong to that faculty, or appetite, which is not capable of receiving the Law: and ſuch is that appetite that hath nothing of the conſent of the will in it.

For the complement you charge me with in the fifth, you had anſwer in mine to your firſt and ſecond of this ſubject.

[*For my mentioning of Socinians*] I confeſs I have been guilty of it in theſe Papers, and I think you know who was the cauſe of it; and therefore what want of wiſdom, or degree of folly ſoever that is, you ſhould not be the Author of it in me, and the puniſher alſo. As for any parallel Doctrines you can find between me and them, any farther than is agreeable to ſound doctrine, and analogy of Faith, I am not ſo humble, or ſo guilty, as to deprecate your threats. As for parallels between our expreſſions, 'tis poſſible you may do ſomewhat; and ſo perhaps with ſome ſtudy I could do the like between the Scripture and the Talmud: and to this I would not provoke you (though, I profeſs I know not yet of any one ſuch) becauſe it ſeems in your opinion [*calling the Trinity a ſpeculative myſtery*] was one of that kind, (and I doubt not but at the ſame rate there are many more to be met with) and then the provoking you might let open another ſluce or treaſure of your Animadverſions, wherein the ſins of your brethren are laid up, and among them one bundle of theſe parallels; and I tell you truly, I ſhall take little joy in ſpending ſo many ſheets more in proving thoſe (whatſoever you ſhall produce under that title) to be unfit parallels. Yet by the way, it is not ſo well, that you will do any thing upon a provocation, which you would not do otherwiſe: but I confeſs this ſets no ſuch character upon you, that I ſhould be willing to provoke you.

In

In your ſeventh, I confeſs to believe, that you meant not the Common-prayer-book by the deſigned Liturgy, (and cannot imagine why you ſhould think I did believe you meant it.) And therefore I conceive I inferr'd regularly, that I had nothing to do with that deſign, becauſe I deſired the continuing of the Common-prayer-book, and particularly thoſe parts of it which were moſt incompatible with that deſign; ſuch were the Doxologies, Creeds, Litany, *&c.* which no *Arian* or *Socinian* would join in. And I wonder you ſhould thus miſtake ſo plain an arguing.

In the eighth, where you take care *that I magnifie not the View of the Directory*; you might have ſpared your pains, for I can cite a Book for a matter of fact (and that is all that I do in that place, *by referring you to thoſe places in it, my conſent to which* teſtifies my diſlike of the deſign you ſpeak of) without any kind of magnifying it. But for the matter ſo fit for my humiliation, which you obſerve in that Author, [*The uſing the ſuffrage of the Jews, Heathens, and Mahometans*] that ſure will not much tend to your purpoſe, not only becauſe thoſe very particulars you pitch on are tranſcribed (and ſo profeſt to be) out of a Book of a *Learned member of the Houſe of Commons and your Aſſembly*, viz. Mr. *Jo. Selden*, but alſo for theſe two conſiderable reaſons more; Firſt, becauſe the ſuffrage of the Jews (from whence the other two are affirmed to have proceeded) doth carry ſome divine characters upon it, that whole Church and State having peculiar relation to the Theocraty, and ſo Gods judgment of the lawfulneſs implyed in their practice. And ſecondly, becauſe the Liturgy of the Jews was by the Apoſtles and Chriſt himſelf made uſe of, and out of it with ſome increaſes and alterations the Chriſtian Liturgies fram'd in the firſt age of the Church. If I thought it might be acceptable to you, I would ſerve you here alſo, and give you ſome obſervations to this purpoſe (very perfectly and eaſily reconcileable with what hath been formerly ſaid, but yet) which are not in the View of the Directory, nor yet mentioned in the haſte of my former Papers.

Du Pleſſ. de Miſſ. l. 1. c. 3. 'Tis the obſervation of a noble and a learned French Proteſtant, that the Apoſtles were ſent, not to deſtroy but eſtabliſh that pure worſhip or ſervice of God which was in the Synagogues of the Jews, which they therefore retained (after Chriſts example) as far as did not contradict the œconomy or diſpenſation of things under Chriſt: and therefore though they changed the Sacrifices, and the Sabbath, (Chriſt being the ſubſtance adumbrated by one, and the Lords day being appointed to take the place of the other) yet the ſervice it ſelf in other particulars they did continue. The grounds of this obſervation you have in the Scripture: Chriſt himſelf goes into their ſynagogues, and the Apoſtles ordinarily at the hours of Prayers; and certainly joined with them in their ſervice, as far as agreed with their preſent ſtate. And by this means ſome ſympathy hath been obſervable between the Jewiſh and Chriſtian ſervices. This is clear by the Jewiſh forms; for ſome of which, and for the rites of uſing them, we are beholding to a moſt excellent man (a Proteſtant alſo *P. Fagius*, and to ſome others ſince, who have made uſe of his collections. The firſt part of their ſervice was a confeſſion of the ſins of their people, (which was always ſolemnly uſed in their ſacrifices) a rule for which we have in the ſacred Writers, and in the Jewiſh Books the very *verba concepta*, the ſet conſtant forms mentioned by that Worthy on the Targum, *Lev.* 16. This they called *confeſſio* הדברים or *verbalis*; After that followed ſome Pſalms of *David*, &c. which were ſung the whole Pſalms together, as alſo ſome תודות hymns or givings of thanks, which, ſay the Jews, were inſtituted by *Eſdras*, who after the Babyloniſh captivity reſtored the ſervice of God. After that they had their leſſons out of the Law, which were divided into 54 *Sedarim*, or *Paraſcoth*, *i. e.* Sections, as alſo the leſſons of the Prophets diſtributed into as many *haphtaroth* or *Aperturæ*, or, as ſome render it, *Dimiſſions*, ſo divided that there may be one for every Sabbath in an intercalary year. Then again was the whole action concluded with prayer, *viz.* a general prayer for the neceſſities of the Church and State, publick and private, and in that many particulars. After theſe prayers the *Archiſynagogus* bleſſed the people, and diſmiſs'd them. Save only that on any great feſtival ſolemnity, the Paſsover, *&c.* there followed Benedictions particular to the occaſion, which on the Paſsover were pronounced by the mouth of the maſter of the family; a form of which, *Miſerere Domine*, &c. we have in *P. Fagius* on the Targ. *Deut.* 8.

Some *veſtigia* of this practice of theirs, in each part, we have in the New Teſtament; Of their confeſſion (ſaith that noble learned man) *Mat.* 3 6. *Mar.* 1. 5. *Acts* 13. 38. Of their leſſons *Acts* 15. 21. *Acts* 13. 14. *Luke* 4. 18. Of their pſalmodies and hymns, *Epheſ.* 5. *Col.* 3. where 'tis obſervable that the three words of Greek uſed by the Apoſtle are the very ſame which are uſed by the Septuagint to render the three Hebrew words uſed in the Old Teſtament, and ſo refer particularly to the practice of the Jews; Of their prayer for neceſſities (ſaith he) in the Lords prayer *Mat.* 6. which, with him, ſome other very learned men conceive to have had ſpecial reference to the *formulæ ſolennes* then among the Jews; Of their prayer for the Common-wealth, and all that were in place of power over them, 1 *Tim.* 2. 1. which words there in St. *Paul* ('twas St. *Auguſtines* affirmation) were *nominatim intelligenda de ſolennibus Eccleſiaſtici officii precibus*, &c.

* *Primi Chriſtiani huic officio ſe accomodarunt.* Morn. de miſſ. l. 1. c. 4. 4. For the practice of the firſt * Chriſtians, how agreeable 'twas to this practice of the Jews, will be eaſily diſcerned. St. *Baſil* in the deſcription of a Clergy-man officiating, *ad Cler. Cæſar. Ep.* 63. They go, ſaith he, to the houſe of prayer, and after the confeſſion, they prepare for the ψαλμῳδία, ſinging of Pſalms, (ſpeaking of the firſt Apoſtolical times; for now, ſaith he, we ſing the Pſalms in parts, or by turns: it ſeems they had not done ſo before, but all together) and by the intermixing of prayers, and interchange or variety of Pſalms, and hymns, they overcome or ſpend a great part of the night (ſpeaking of the *antelucani conventus*) and aſſoon as the day breaks, they offer to God the Pſalm of confeſſion, and ſo diſmiſs the Aſſembly. Beſides the leſſons out of the Old Teſtament, the Chriſtians (you will believe) added alſo others out of the new; and (ſaith *Morney*) *ejus particulam aliquam Antiſtes interpretari ſolitus.*

After Sermon they proceeded to the celebration of the Euchariſt (parallel to their cuſtoms on the great Feſtivities of the Paſsover, *&c.*) In it, 1. the words of the inſtitution were recited, with a thankſgiving or bleſſing, (as in *Juſtine Martyr* 'tis deſcribed) then the bread and wine (before received

ceived by the offertory of the people) was diſtributed to the people; after which a Pſalm was ſung, &c. Before the Sacrament, ſaith St. *Ambroſe*, was the prayer for Kings, *Et hæc regula Eccleſiaſtica tradita à magiſtro gentilium*, ſaith he, *de Sacra. lib.* 4. *cap.* 4. and of the uſe of that alſo *Tertul.* is expreſs, *Apol. c.* 39. After the Lords Supper the τειοάγιον or Doxology was taken up in imitation of Chriſt, who after Supper ſung an hymn with his Diſciples, not diſdaining to make uſe of the ancient Jewiſh cuſtom. One teſtimony more I ſhall only add out of St. *Cyprian de Orat. Dom. Ser.* 8. *Publica nobis eſt & communis oratio*, &c. [*Publick common Prayer*] *pro toto populo oramus*, for all the people, (as among the Jews for all Iſrael; and we for the whole Church, eſpecially for Kings.) And that men may mind nothing but that their preſent imployment, *Ideo ſacerdos præfatione parat fratrum mentes, dicendo, Surſum corda, ut dum reſpondet plebs, Habemus ad Dominum, moneatur nil ſe niſi Dominum cogitare debere.* I ſhall trouble you no longer than to deſire that the Liturgy lately uſed in this Church may be compared with the ſeverals here mentioned, from the Jews firſt; and after, the Apoſtolical Chriſtians: and as you will find the general form exactly continued in Confeſſion, Pſalms, Leſſons, Hymns, Prayers for all the Church, eſpecially for Kings, *&c.* (and no reaſon to doubt but that ſometimes the very words were continued alſo; aſſuredly ſet Forms then, as now, as appears by the *Surſum corda*, and *Habemus ad Dominum*; *Lift up your hearts, We lift them up unto the Lord*) So it was not without reaſon that the Author of the *View* thought fit to draw one argument of many from the practice of the Jews; to which the other two of the Mahometans and Heathens come in *ex naturali ſequelâ*, but as rivulets and derivations from that fountain.

But then beſides theſe ſuffrages, you know there are in that *View* many other arguments produced, which may chance to be more concluding to you. And though a mans arguments (as our own prayers) may ſerve the turn, yet the ſuffrages of others will do no hurt alſo. If the point in queſtion, which you ſay you have ſhewed me, be that which in this Paper you formerly mentioned, you may in my anſwer to that ſatisfie your ſelf that you were not very lucky in ſhewing. Before I part with this Section, let me beſeech you to tell me, whether 'twere only a fault in your memory, that when you were pleaſed to tell me what you ſaid at *Carfax* againſt the Author of the Catechiſm, you did not pleaſe to name this particular of the Mahometans, *&c.* eſpecially when I am told that you cited it as a work of that Authors who made the Catechiſm, and ſpake pretty tragically about that ſubject.

9. For your contempt of my mention of Doxologies and Creeds, it is not ſo very ſeaſonable, becauſe being mentioned only in order to prove that I was none of the deſigners of the new complying Liturgy, you cannot but ſay that they were pertinent to that purpoſe. And for your proof, *That Doxologies and Creeds may be left out, becauſe the Directory takes in the whole Scripture for a Liturgy, and there are Doxologies and Creeds enough in the holy Scripture*] it is a kind of arguing that I confeſs I underſtand not; for ſure for all that, (*or granting the Scripture to contain, as you ſay truly, all neceſſaries to ſalvation*) it will ſtill remain true, that ſerving of God and worſhipping him by praiſes, confeſſions, and profeſſions of our Faith, may be allowed to be duties of ſuch a value, that if they do not deſerve to be brought in, yet 'tis not neceſſary they ſhould utterly be caſt out from the ſervice of God. For your Confeſſion of Faith which you ſay ſhall be publiſhed by your Aſſemblers, if that be to be uſed in the ſervice of God, then muſt there be ſome new direction for it put into the Directory, and then perhaps the Creeds of the Ancient Church might have continued there as well. If it be only for other uſes, you know it belongs not to the point in hand. And which way ſoever, you know it concludes not againſt any thing that I was about to infer from Creeds, *&c.*

10. For the queſtion you there put, you do it I ſuppoſe but ſportingly. For if you will needs have a queſtion, the only one that can be pertinent to the matter there in hand (or which will be betwixt things of any like nature) is that which is there ſet, betwixt the uſing the Common-prayer-book in each part of it, and the putting it wholly (or in thoſe ſo many mentioned parts of it) out of the Church: and then ſure the ſo many obſtacles to *Socinian* errours being retained in one, and turn'd out in the other, the vote will be quickly reſolved on. As for your deſired parallel, the Cat. or the Directory, I ſuppoſe you do not expect I ſhould ſpeak to that, yet that which countenances no one *Socinian* errour, and I think either profeſſly, or ὐ παρέργῳ diſcountenances every *Socinian* errour, will be able to compare (in that matter of countenancing them) with any other Writer in the world. For though it were granted, that it doth not ſo much diſcountenance them as other Books that are written particularly againſt them, yet not countenancing them at all, it doth as much not countenance them, as any other thing can be imagined to do. But

Now 'tis a little wearifome to me to ſee this 10. Sect. again breaking aſunder into queſtions, which you might ſo very well have ſpared. For ſure Sir, 1. I no where had ſaid in theſe Papers, *That the Direct. had commanded all to ſit at the Sacrament*; I had only ſpoken of the *Proteſtants in Poland forbidding ſitting, becauſe it complied with the Arians.* 2. I had alſo no need to ſay, That *all familiarity inferr'd an equality*; 'tis enough to me, that humility and diſtance, kneeling, *&c.* is more like to be an argument of inequality, and an expreſſion of it. 3. *That Socinians think themſelves equal with Chriſt*, &c.] I have no need to affirm, having only urged a matter of fact, which ſtands good without it, becauſe that familiarity in ſitting at the Sacrament will be more agreeable to their notion of Chriſt as a mere creature, than kneeling will be; and that is all was to be proved from it, and not that the *Socinians* equal themſelves with Chriſt. As for my ſaying, That *Chriſt did not bleſs us till after his reſurrection*, (which perhaps you repeat out of the way, to ſet ſome ill mark upon it) 1. I pray remember that they are the plain words of Scripture, *having raiſed his Son Jeſus, he ſent him to bleſs us*, &c. and I hope 'twill be no huge fault to ſay what *Socinus* doth, when if he do ſay it, he ſaith the ſame with Scripture. 2. That you may miſtake the meaning of that phraſe; and think, as ſome do, that for Chriſt then to begin to bleſs, is for him then to begin to have divine power: but ſure you know that is not my meaning; but that Chriſt may be conſidered in reſpect of his natures, or of his offices, *i. e.* in reſpect of the οἰκονομία or διοίκησις, as the Fathers uſe it; and that 'tis only in that latter reſpect that all power is then ſaid to be given unto him, and ſo this of *bleſſing*, and at laſt to be reſigned up to the Father: which will not at all hinder the renouncing of all *Socinian*

nian or *Arian* hereſies in the buſineſs of Chriſts eternal Divinity, or of the Trinity. By this you ſee what an ill parallel you had fetcht out of *Smalcius*, and I muſt ſuppoſe moſt of your others are ſuch.

For your argument offered me for the Liturgy, I am not merry enough to receive, or reward you for it, (and you know, my buſineſs in hand is not to aſſert the Liturgy; that is ἐτέρου σκέλους; but the demonſtrating that I was none of the men for the new deſigned Liturgy) only let me tell you, that the eaſineſs and pleaſantneſs of the Liturgy was not thought to conſiſt in the eaſineſs of the task for the Miniſter, (for I do not perceive that the Directory-way, as 'tis exerciſed, hath any whit leſs of that eaſe in it) but in reſpect of the Auditors, who can go on in their duty with more eaſe and pleaſure: and ſure duty is not naturally ſo acceptable to all men, that there is any neceſſity of making it more tedious, toylſome, (eſpecially if it be added, as you ſay it is) and leſs profitable, than was neceſſary. And therefore you may perceive for all your ſcoffs, that Orators arguments (if the Author of that *View* were guilty of that faculty) even thoſe that you pick out for the very worſt, may have ſomewhat beſide Rhetorick in them. I am ſure this which you mention, is more proper and effectual to infer the concluſion, than the fetching that argument out of that Book, to expoſe and ſhew it openly, was to the queſtion in hand, whether I was in the deſign for the new complying Liturgy. But I have learnt to paſs by all ſuch Sarcaſms and impertinences, I hope, with ſome tolerable patience.

Now then you ſay you haſten to my diſcourſe of *Godly ſorrow*, I beſeech God to give each of us our part of it.

In that, you begin with a challenge to me, to prove that which you know was proved already, if explaining a thing, and laying it before you in ſuch a manner that you do not (I conceive, cannot) deny any part of it, may be called the proving of it. Your ſecond is but a repetition of what was ſaid by me; yet hath ſome art in it, depriving it of the proof that was brought for it, that it might look the more naked, and deſpicable. Your third was diſcreetly order'd to ſcoff at what was ſaid, for a *dictate* and *admirable*, (which was neither, but a plain evident truth, that the impurity of our humane condition may be matter of godly ſorrow to any, though not meerly *quà* an infelicity) and you ask again whether it be godly ſorrow to grieve for an infelicity? I ſay again, ſuch the infelicity may be (particularly that now ſpoken of) that it may be matter of Godly ſorrow, or κατὰ τι διὸ (and be otherwiſe deſcribed in a gracious ſtile of loving the appearance of Chriſt, which may rid us of our impurities) and yet not be this *quà ſic*, meerly as an infelicity; which was all that was needful there to be inferr'd.

In your fourth you mention your opinion, that all pollution of the ſoul of man hath been by ſin only. But ſure Sir, this doth not prove every pollution to be a ſin; but, as your words import, an effect or conſequent of ſin.

Next, you pronounce that I am much miſtaken: and your proof of it is *petitio principii*, a begging, *i. e.* not proving, yet aſſuming the thing before in queſtion (and prov'd on the other ſide by me, both before and now in the laſt Sect.) *viz.* That *no man grieves for a ſin after a godly manner, but he that grieves for it as a ſin againſt God.* When you know, that by that one inſtance of the impurity of our nature mourned for by him that took it not for a ſin, but only a thing that rendred him 1. imperfect; then 2. prone to ſin; and 3. leſs amiable in Gods ſight, *&c.* (with an addition of wiſhing and praying *to be diſſolved, and be with Chriſt as far better*) the contrary was undeniably inferr'd; and no anſwer offered by you to theſe premiſſes. For the undeniable grounds of repentance, I ſuppoſe they are laid in that Catechiſm both by requiring it for all ſin, and by naming inclinations to evil in the front of ſins, without [*ifs*] or [*ands*] or any dubious expreſſions. But yet after all your ſeverity in giving your advice for the deſigning of a Catechiſm, I conceive your inference, in the name of the *Acute wretch*, was far from any acuteneſs: for ſure whatever were reſolved about inclinations being no ſins when unconſented to, 'twould never follow for your Client, *Ergo, the like acts, to which he is naturally inclined, are not evil.* For ſure Sir, the acts may be allow'd ſins (and not be excuſed by our being naturally inclined to them) whatever were conceived of the inclinations. The concluſion from your premiſſes could only be this, *Ergo* this and that act, being natural alſo, are not evil. And if your wretch ſhould conclude ſo, you would ſoon be able to inform him that his acts are not natural, and therefore may be allow'd to be evil though he be naturally inclined to them, becauſe it is very evil not to reſiſt and deny thoſe inclinations.

You then go off in triumph with a [*You know what I could adde.*] Truly Sir, I profeſs I do not: and yet whatever 'tis, if it be like this you have allow'd me, I ſhould *conſider* it perhaps in obedience to you, but never be much wrought on by it. Yet ſhall I excuſe this for the good news it brings with it, being a tranſition to the fourth report, another ſtage toward the end of my very wearifome journey.

In that, you have begun with many little particulars which want of truth; particularly, that I make a ſecond acknowledgment that I was miſ-informed, when I only profeſs that by your diſcourſe I cannot diſcern whether I was in this miſ-informed or no. It ſeems you are willing to receive acknowledgments of miſtakes: you would otherwiſe think it more pertinent to tell me whether in either Aſſembly you inſiſted on that particular or no. For an anſwer to your *quære's*, you ſure perceive (though you complain for want of it) that I gave you that whole ſence of my ſoul in that point, not only by that means to be ſure to tell you my opinion of your then preſent *quære's*, but alſo of all others of that ſubject that 'twere poſſible for you to ask. And by this time I conceive you do diſcern that I am neither very forward to make *quære's* to divert, *&c.* nor to deny anſwer to them, when they are made.

About the firſt propoſition you mention, though you ſtand not to ask [*why acceptation is put for pardon?*] 'Twere no great matter if I ſaid 'twere *de induſtriâ*, on this head, becauſe God firſt *accepts* the penitent *perſon* in Chriſt, and then after (in order of nature, though not of time) he pardons his ſins: though indeed 'tis true again, that the ſins are pardoned in order of nature before the acceptation of the *actions*; I mean, of all the actions of the ſubſequent life. But then there is a double acceptation,

acceptation, of the perſon firſt, and then of the actions; of *Abel* firſt (as the Fathers obſerve) and then of his offerings. Which yet I hope, will not paſs with you for the double juſtification; but this *ex abundanti* alſo.

But to your main queſtion (for I muſt now wholly deal in the old trade of anſwering queſtions: which I have been told is the far eaſieſt way for him that wants other proviſion, and yet would fain not make an end of diſputing) *Why I ſpeak of remiſſion and acceptation, and leave out imputation?* Sure 'tis, partly becauſe acceptation of the perſon, and ſo pardon alſo, includes *imputation* of Chriſts righteouſneſs, as the formal cauſe of our juſtification; God accepting of Chriſts λυτρὸν or payment (which is imputation of his ſufferings by way of ἀντίψυχα for us) and then accepting our perſons, and pardoning our ſins; partly, becauſe one kind of imputation is after our pardon of ſin in order of nature, a diſtinct thing from it, and ſo needed not to be there ſpoken of, as belonging rather to our ſanctification, for the completing or filling up the imperfections of that; I mean now the imputation of Chriſts perfect obedience to that penitent believer whoſe ſins are pardoned by the ſufferings of Chriſt: for to ſuch a one Chriſts perfect obeying the Law may ſo far be imputed as to give a gloſs or tincture to his ſtill imperfect obediences, ſo far as that they ſhall be accepted by God; Which imputation therefore may be antecedent to, and have to do with that acceptation of actions, but yet in order of nature be after the acceptation of perſons, and forgiveneſs of ſins. But the truth is, I then meant to give you plain groſſer propoſitions to prevent miſtakes and diſputes, and not to deſcend to ſuch nicer diſtinctions as theſe.

But truly you were very wary, when you laid ſuch an obſervation on the [*This*] in the ſecond propoſition, which ſure was an innocent particle of reference looking back to the Antecedent [*juſtification*] in the former propoſition, and meaning it in the very ſame latitude that there it had been uſed, for the entire, not partial (or firſt, or one part of) juſtification. To let this paſs, when you had taken notice of it, was not an act of charity, but juſtice in you, yet that which would have been very welcome to me many times. For juſt from as true or ſolid ground as this, have many of your other exceptions ſprang up, and have not ſo candidly been laid down by you.

To your next queſtions, which you profeſs to ask, that miſtakes may be prevented, upon that account, I profeſs to anſwer moſt chearfully; for I ſee how wearisome a thing it is to have been miſtaken.

To your firſt *quære* [*Why the grace of God in juſtifying*, &c. *doth not extend to every man for whom Chriſt hath ſatisfied?*] I anſwer clearly, becauſe Chriſts ſatisfaction is not *abſolutely* for all, or that they may be pardoned whatever they do, how infidel or impenitent ſoever they continue; but *conditionally* for all, and thereupon that grace of juſtification extends to none but thoſe who perform the *Condition*.

For your ſecond 'tis very nice (and might ſure have been ſpared in this buſineſs) That *becauſe God hath been affirmed by me to require regeneration as a condition to juſtification, therefore I muſt tell you what condition God requires unregenerate perſons to perform, that they may attain unto regeneration.* To queſtion thus were infinite, and to this matter of juſtification utterly unneceſſary. But yet I ſhall not fail you in any thing; Ile ſatisfy you in that alſo. God requires in the unregenerate man τὸ ὑπήκοον ἢ ὑπακοῆς, as the Ancients expreſs it, *a readineſs to obey his call*; not to reſiſt, but receive his grace, when he beſtows it on him; and having received it, what degree ſoever it be, to cheriſh, and make uſe of it; and this by his grace, God enables him to do.

As for your demand of me, by way of retribution, that I muſt grant that God doth juſtify the ungodly, *i. e.* the man that is guilty of many ſins, I make no queſtion of that, if he be a penitent, and ſo may he be, and yet be called ἀσεβὴς ſtill, in the ſence that I conceive belongs to that word, *Rom.* 4. 5. that is, ὁ μὴ ἐργάζων; not one that continues impenitent in ſin, but one that neither hath nor doth perform exact, perfect, legal obedience: which is very reconcileable, if not the ſame, with what you confeſs, [*That God never juſtifies an impenitent infidel in ſenſu compoſito*, i. e. never any that is then infidel or remains impenitent.

To your third I anſwer, that there is ſuch a condition, which doth ſo qualify the ſubject, that I can ſay, by it, and only by it I am juſtified, *i. e.* by it only as a *condition*, not including any *cauſality* in it. And if you will know, what that condition is, you have been oft told already, and I now tell you, *Faith in the notion wherein it ſignifies a receiving the whole Chriſt, and contains in it a reſolution of obeying Chriſts Commands, as well as of depending on him for mercy.* And on ſuppoſition, or condition that you grant that, and ſo ſpeak of faith as ἐνεργουμένη δι' ἀγάπης. and τελειμένη δι' ἔργων, I will ſpeak with you in the dialect of the firſt ſort of the men you mention, and ſay that faith is required to receive the object of juſtification, Chriſt, *&c.* but withal adde, that it is required as a condition too, to diſpoſe or qualify the ſubject, and that without this condition, no man living ſhall be juſtified. Which being premiſed, it ſhall not yet follow from thence that by this he ſhall be, as you ſay, conſtituted righteous, if by [*conſtituted by*] you attribute any cauſality to this qualification, or any thing but that of being a condition by which he is juſtified, *i. e.* is not juſtified without it. And ſo this is as *plain* as I can *deviſe* too; and me thinks there ſhould be no *miſtake*. For in the ſence wherein I have now expreſt my ſelf, I do again conſent to your concluſion, *that God doth by his free and effectual grace work in the hearts of his elect to receive Chriſt, (that is, the Whole Chriſt) that they may be juſtified, not by their own obedience, or vow of obedience (as by a cauſe) but by obedience of Chriſt alone freely imputed by God, and reſted on by faith only:* It being one act of that faith by which the juſt do live, to have affiance, or reſt on Chriſt.

In your [*moreover*] it may alſo be true, that there may be ſome difference between *diſpoſing the ſubject to ſalvation and to juſtification:* as the cordial habit of faith, and ſincere vow, may diſpoſe to juſtification; and, in caſe of living to occaſions and opportunities, *the acts of faith and actual performances* will be required; yet ſo that he that is diſpoſed for juſtification, if he ſhould then preſently dye, were diſpoſed to ſalvation alſo. Which notwithſtanding I ſhall alſo add with you, 1. That there *is faith required, to receive the object, Chriſt, Jehova our righteouſneſs; and grace prerequired, to enable thus to believe*; and obedience to, or making uſe of that grace (the ἴσχυν χάριτος, *Heb.* 12. 28.) a

condition required in us, to that end that grace may have its perfect work on us, And 2. that *all the acts and habits of grace, which are in the beſt men concurring together, are not ſufficient to juſtifie a man before God.* And therefore faith concurring ſo, with ſuch a vow, or with faithful actions, cannot juſtifie us. This I write out of your Paper, as faſt as I can drive, (and, by the way, you ſee ſome difference between our tempers; I conſent to as much of yours as poſſibly I can, and labour to take as few exceptions; you on the contrary have another method in reading them that you are not kind to) and conſent to it moſt fully at firſt ſight, and never remember to have doubted of it, ſince I conſidered Divinity. But for your addition, [*Of faiths juſtifying relatively*] you muſt give me leave not to take that into my form of Doctrine (being not very intelligible) but to uſe my own expreſſions, as conceiving them more perſpicuous, and commodious to the notions I have of this matter, *viz.* Thus, that *Chriſt only juſtifies, Faith receives Chriſt, but yet ſtill by no way of cauſality juſtifies*; is *cauſal* indeed in *receiving* Chriſt, but only the *condition* in juſtifying; becauſe, though receiving is an act of ours, and in us, yet juſtification is an act only of Gods upon us, and concerning us. Which in effect you yield alſo, when you ſay, that [*Faith cannot pardon ſins or accept.*] For then it cannot juſtifie. At this time methinks we are excellently well agreed, I wiſh it may long continue.

But then in the next words, we are out again; I am now lookt on as one that *abuſes Scripture for the maintenance of errors*, whereas God knows 'twas no more but citing the words in St. *James, faith conſummate by works*, as a parallel place to faith ἐνεργουμένη δι ἔργων in St. *Paul*, and let the Papiſts ſay what they will, (and abuſe that or any other place) ſure this is no *abuſing Scripture for maintenance of errors.* But then what you mean by your not *dreaming, that I thought Abraham was juſtified by the actual ſacrificing of his Son*, I cannot dream or imagine; certainly I never ſaid any ſuch thing; or if you thought I meant that by works, you are much miſtaken: but only I conceived the reſolution of ſacrificing to have been accepted by God, to his juſtification without actual ſacrificing him.

But then Sir, in that which follows, when 'tis reſolved that we are agreed in the concluſion, 'tis very ſtrange that that will not ſatisfy you without ſome retractation. O how much a more pleaſant thing is victory than peace! Sir, I muſt tell you confidently, all that that Author ever hath ſaid in the *Catechiſm* is perfectly reconcileable with this concluſion; (and he may chance to be as fit to judge of the importance of his own words, as any man elſe) and therefore ſtill *retractation* muſt be ſpared, unleſs you pleaſe to *retract* cauſleſs diſpleaſures. But that it ſeems you will not ſuddainly do: for again you are deep in a queſtioning over again, what hath been ſo often anſwered, and profeſtly acknowledged. I ſhall proceed to do it over again once more. 1. I ſay, that we are not juſtified by any thing in us, *i. e.* either by vow of obedience, or faith, ſave only as by a condition, or *cauſâ ſine quâ non*; and in that ſence, by both of them together we are juſtified. But then you have an objection to thoſe words of mine *The condition muſt be undertaken before the Covenant belongs to me*] and ſay in your third, That *if by Covenant I mean the whole Covenant of grace, I muſt make ſome condition go before our regeneration alſo.* I anſwer, that the word *Covenant* there in that place, ſignifies any one part of the whole *Covenant*, which depends on the performance of any proportionable part of the condition, and ſo needs not belong in that place to *regeneration* alſo, but may be reſtrained only to that of juſtification. Yet for the condition prærequired to regeneration alſo, I have given you my ſence formerly, and need not ſo ſoon repeat it to you.

4. For the third [*you know*] I profeſs not to know how they belong to me, or any intereſts of mine.

5. *That to receive forgiveneſs is an act of faith*, I ſhall again acknowledge, ſo you conclude not from thence that it *juſtifies* by ſo doing. But that I ever ſaid, *That we receive a pardon by an act of charity, &c.* I ſhall not yet be perſwaded, nor can that propoſition have any truth, any otherwiſe than that charity is part of the condition, without which that Pardon ſhall not belong to me, (which were a very ridiculous ground of ſaying, that *we receive our pardon by that act*; becauſe [*receiving by*] notes an efficiency, and of that there is none in a mere condition.) Sir, I am confident I never ſaid theſe words, and therefore I cannot well forget them.

* Hâc edit. 12. As for your citation out of the * *page* 28. of the Cat. *That a man is juſtified by faithful actions, and by them only.* That you muſt underſtand (as 'tis there clearly ſet in the caſe of *Abraham*) in caſe there be a preſent opportunity to exerciſe the faith. For though when ſuch occaſions are not preſent, the faith which conſiſts *in voto*, the full reſolution, the cordial receiving the whole Chriſt, will ſerve the turn, without any actions; yet when the occaſion is preſent, the action muſt be ready, or elſe the faith will not juſtify. And therefore though in this caſe of ſuch opportunities, I plead for more than the bare vow, as neceſſary to juſtification, yet ſtill 'tis true that I plead for no more in any other caſe; and even in this, I can content my ſelf with this vow, if it be ſincere; nor will God acknowledge it ſo, if it act not in time of tryal, when the opportunity is offered. And ſo, *ſure I am well enough off from a firſt and ſecond juſtification.* For all, that I require by way of condition, is the ſincere receiving of Chriſt in heart and reſolution; which if it be ſincere, will fructify in its due ſeaſon; and if it be not ſuch as will do *ſo*, 'tis not fit to be accepted by God to our juſtification.

But for your arguing on the other ſide, That *if we are juſtified by a vow if perſonal obedience*, then we are not *juſtified by Chriſt alone, or by faith only*; that is but the old Sophiſm, ſo oft laid open, by our confeſſing nothing to have to do with our juſtification but Chriſt, as the *cauſe* of our juſtification, or that which conſtitutes us righteous; and for our vow of obedience and faith, that is only as the *condition:* granting ſtill faith to receive the pardon, but not thereby to juſtify.

And ſo once more I will agree with you, that is, with that concluding propoſition of yours, whether you will permit me, or no; and do it now again without any need of the leaſt ſyllable of retractation.

Thus have I attended you a moſt wearieſome journey, being ſcarce permitted to paſs over any line in your Papers without anſwering ſome either miſtake, or queſtion of yours. And truly I have ſerved you freely and faithfully, and that hath ſwell'd it to a bulk beyond what in any reaſon I was bound to pay you. And if you do not pleaſe that there ſhall ariſe to me ſome fruit by all this by your diſcerning and acknowledging the cauſeleſsneſs of your exceptions, yet if you pleaſe, let us put it

to

to others to judge between us; for 'tis poſſible we may judge amiſs of our own performances. And therefore by your good leave (as before I told you) I ſhall be willing the world ſhall judge between us, or as many of them as ſhall be fitted with great patience to ſit out the hearing of ſo mean an Act. If this courſe will not pleaſe you, but you think good to write back again, I ſhall take confidence to expect (what is moſt juſt) that you return *ad punctum*, or *ad carceres* from whence we ſet out: and which ſoever of your publick charges upon that Author ſeems to you to remain unſatisfied by my returns, let it be ſpecified, and your reaſons joined with your expreſſions of diſlike, ſuch as you think will deſtroy the grounds, and be directly and clearly oppoſite to the ſtate of the queſtion on which I build. And having now twice ſubmitted to ſuch punctual anſwering of ſo long a catalogue of queſtions, let me I pray be freed from any more of that task. For I know when all other things are at an end, there will never be any end of them. There is a very unhandſome Engliſh proverb to that purpoſe; Let me beſeech you, not to fall under any ſuſpition of being guilty of it: and as you might juſtly accuſe me, if I applied it to you, ſo I beſeech you to ſee that it be not appliable. Yet let me tell you, *When theſe controverſies now depending are at an end, there is no one queſtion concerning any line in thoſe Books ſo paradigmatized by you, or in any piece of Divinity, wherein I underſtand ought, but you or any man ſhall for the leaſt asking have the full ſence of*

Wedneſday Nov. 4.

Your Servant

H. Hammond.

SIR,

YOU have ſent me many ſheets; and the only concluſion that I can pick out of them, *is an Engliſh Proverb; and that but intimated:* Truly Sir, if I being a fool have ask'd more queſtions than you in your wiſdom are able to anſwer, I am aſhamed of my folly, and you need not glory in your wiſdom; yet ſuch, it ſeems, is your high conceit of your own wiſdom, that you do paſſionately long to publiſh your wiſdom to the world in print. Sir, I ſhall not licenſe any Papers of yours that I have as yet received; and you may ſee cauſe hereafter to thank me for it: nor will I deſire you to licenſe ſo much as an * of mine. But it ſeems you cannot think of any other way of ſatisfaction for that injury which you conceive hath been offered to you by your Friend (for ſo I call every man that deals plainly with me,) and give me leave as a friend to adviſe you to beware leſt the ſatisfaction which you gain by getting into Print, be not as imaginary as the injury which hath been offered to you, by the repeated yet neceſſary admonitions of

Nov. 15. 1646.

Your humble Servant

Francis Cheynell.

If you think fit to object any thing againſt me in Print, I doubt not but by Gods help to give all that are impartial full ſatisfaction, as ſoon as my more weighty employments will permit.

SIR,

YOur Letter of return to my laſt I received not till this morning (though it were dated on the Lords day was ſeven-night:) and with it an advertiſement that Mr. *W.* whom you appointed to convey my former to you, was gone to *London* before it came to me. So that, although I know not how this paper will make ſhift to find out the way, yet can I not but addreſs it toward you, if it be but to take the leave of you a little ſolemnly, and to profeſs that I deſign not any farther trouble to you on this matter, having been aſſured by you of the unprofitableneſs of my former pains; and having little hopes, that any more will prove more fortunate than thoſe eight or nine ſheets, *out of which you tell me you can pick but one concluſion*, viz. *an Engliſh proverb*, and *that but intimated*. Sir, I am very unhappy if I have written ſo much ſo unconcludingly: but cannot be ſo ſevere to my ſelf, and thoſe papers, as to imagine that it was not in your power to have *pickt* out ſome others, (had they been for your turn to take notice of them) as eaſily as that one which you acknowledge was *but intimated*. It ſeems, your notes tend all to finding of faults; and ſo this came into your obſervation. I ſhall not from hence conclude that this was the only thing you had reaſon to diſlike in thoſe papers; Only I muſt ſay that your reaſons of diſliking this particular of the *Engliſh proverb*, as far as it was mentioned by me, are by no means concluding; and to make them appear ſuch, you are fain to affix a ſence on my words very diſtant from that which the contexture of them is capable of. For Sir, that you have yet appeared to be a *fool*, or that I undertake to have any *wiſdom*, or have any need to do ſo (the innocence of the cauſe which I have in hand being ſufficient to ſupply that place)

or

or that you have asked me *more queſtions than I am able to anſwer*, I had no way ſo much as *intimated*; but on the contrary, had for the time paſt *anſwered* all your very many *queſtions*, or ſhewed you (as in ſome few) how unneceſſary it was to the matter in hand, to anſwer them; and yet promiſed you farther, That *when the controverſies now depending betwixt us were at an end, there ſhould be no queſtion concerning any line in thoſe Books, or any piece of Divinity wherein I underſtood ought, but you ſhould for the leaſt asking have my full ſence or anſwer.* All that that mention of the proverb could ſignify, was this, that I deſired you would take care hereafter not to fall under any ſuſpition of being guilty of it; which was but a circumlocution of this plain ſence, that if you returned any thing to thoſe ſheets, I deſired it might be *ad punctum*, without asking any unneceſſary queſtions, becauſe that would be a way unworthy of any Scholar, and would be infinite. And if I ſhould have told you plainly, that if you ſhould do this, you would, by the force of that proverb, be found guilty of *folly*, and poſſibly poſe a man *wiſer* much than my ſelf, this would not have amounted to any of the three things by you concluded from my Letter. Yet is all this as truly ſaid by you as what you next adde, That *I paſſionately long to publiſh my wiſdom to the world in print.* The rudeneſs of this ſcoff ſhall be pardoned by me. I ſhall only ſpeak to the truth of it. I had no ſuch opinion of the worth of any thing, that would be pertinent anſwer to your exceptions, as to have any *paſſion* or *longing* to have it printed; I only told you, *That if you could not yet acknowledge the cauſleſneſs of your exceptions, by your leave I ſhould be willing the world ſhould judge betwixt us:* and in one other place, *When you had bid me venture your arguments to any reader*, affirming that *you feared none*, I thought it ſeaſonable to tell you that I expected according to the purport of your ſpeech, that you would give your *conſent that this whole matter ſhould be referred to others judgment, and to that end Printed.* I ſuppoſe, neither of theſe ſpeeches imply either *paſſion* or *longing* after the preſs; And truly Sir, as long as there are ſuch Readers abroad as you, I think a man in prudence ought before-hand to be aſſured of their kindneſs, ere he have much appetite to be in print. The ſhort is, I was and am moſt willing to ſubmit the diſpute between you and me, and the truth of this queſtion [*Whether you have wronged me or no,*] to any or all reaſonable men: and having offered it ſucceſsleſly to you, I am ſtill ready, if you conſent, to make it more publick; and ſhall not conſider any intereſts of my own ſo much, as to retract my offer. You ſay, *You ſhall not licenſe any papers of mine which you have yet received:* and then, I ſuppoſe, you are confident they will not now be *licenſed* in this place; and it will only be in my power to take care that this be the laſt you ſhall *receive.* Only I ſhall adde (without expreſſing any longing) that if you will *licenſe* your *own*, you ſhall not need to trouble your ſelf in *deſiring me to licenſe mine*, or to give my conſent that they be *licenſed.* As for your advice to the contrary, I know not from what degree of kindneſs it proceeds: and having ſome reaſon to believe that there is nothing in them againſt piety, or charity, perhaps you may be miſtaken, if you think *your not licenſing* them will ever deſerve *thanks* from me; any more than that which you call an act of friendſhip, doth, *viz. your having dealt plainly with me.* To which give me leave to anſwer, that friendſhip is a ſtrange thing, and very diſtant from *Chriſtian charity*, if it be any thing like thoſe publick reproaches which you laid moſt cauſeleſly upon the Author of the Catechiſm in your Sermons. Aſſure your ſelf, if I were now in the temper of mind, in which you were when you did that, (and it ſeems, now continue to be) I would preſently ſend all your papers to the Preſs with my anſwer to them; and tell you, I was in this your *friend.* But I have other imployments for my thoughts, and other motives and principles of not revenging injuries, than thoſe which you offer me by way of *friendly advice to beware*, &c. Which perhaps may intimate ſomething of terror. I ſhall for the preſent ſit down with full patience and ſatisfaction of mind, that I have driven this buſineſs thus far: and till your more weighty imployments permit you to conſider me, as my pains to ſerve and ſatisfy you deſerve from you, I take my leave of you, and reſt

Nov. 23. 1646.

Your very loving Friend

H. Hammond.

I would you had ſignified your pleaſure poſitively, that I ſhould not permit to any mans eyes, what you only ſay, you do not deſire me, *&c. I ſhould then think my ſelf obliged to burn that firſt part of my laſt anſwer: but as yet, wanting your directions, I have not done it.*

A view

A view of ſome
EXCEPTIONS
TO THE
PRACTICAL CATECHISM, &c.

SEeing it again appears to me by a *Book*, that came to this Town on Saturday laſt, (entituled, *A Teſtimony to the truth of Jeſus Chriſt*, &c. pretending to be ſubſcribed by 52 *Miniſters of Chriſt within the Province of London*) that it is Gods good pleaſure to deliver me up to be evil ſpoken of, and accuſed, and to bear a yet deeper part of his bitter cup, than many others of my Brethren have done, I deſire to bleſs and praiſe his name for this his goodneſs and mercy to me, and to embrace all thoſe, who have join'd their hands to be inſtruments in this, as thoſe whom by *Chriſts* command (particularly belonging to me on this occaſion) I am bound *to love, to bleſs, to pray for*, and not to think of any other way of return toward them. This, I thank God, I can moſt chearfully do; and would ſatisfy my ſelf to have done it in private, between *God* and my own ſoul, were there not another occaſion, which makes it a little neceſſary for me to ſay ſomewhat publickly; and that is, the vindication of the *truth of Chriſt Jeſus*, which they who are willing to give *teſtimony* to it, will, I hope, take from me in good part.

Theſe men *page* 4. in the beginning of the ſecond branch of their teſtimony, (which it ſeems by *page* 37. the whole number of the 52 Miniſters have ſubſcribed) make mention of *unſound opinions, eſpecially abominable errours, damnable hereſies, and horrid blaſphemies, which are broached and maintained here in* England *among us, under the notion of* New lights, *and new truths; many of which they have reaſon to judge deſtructive to the very fundamental truths of Chriſtianity*, &c. *All of them utterly repugnant to the ſacred Scriptures, the occaſion of much grief of heart to all the friends of truth and piety at home, the ſcandal and offence of all the Reformed Churches abroad, the unparallel'd reproach of this Church and Nation, totally inconſiſtent with the Covenant, and the covenanted Reformation, and in a word, the very dregs and ſpawn of thoſe old accurſed hereſies which have been already condemned*, &c.

After this preface and expreſſion of their zeal to Gods truth, they conclude the period with a profeſſion, that they *more particularly abominate theſe infamous and pernicious errours of late publiſhed among us, and hereafter recited in this enſuing Catalogue*, viz. *Errours*, &c.

In this Catalogue, three particulars there are recited from the *Practical Catechiſm of H. Hammond*, 2 Edit. *London*, 1646.

From which premiſſes, I ſuppoſe, any Reader will conclude, that thoſe three particulars are by theſe Miniſters thought guilty of all thoſe Charges which they had affixt to *All* the unſound opinions, *&c.* noted by them, *viz.* that they are *utterly repugnant to the ſacred Scriptures*, &c. and in the modeſteſt of their expreſſions, that they are *infamous and pernicious errours*.

Upon this ſuppoſition, I hold it my duty, by ſetting down theſe three particulars punctually, to refer to all impartial Chriſtians to judge whether it be *a Teſtimony to the truth of Jeſus Chriſt* to paſs ſuch cenſures on them.

The firſt is recited by them, *p.* 9. and it is this, That *Chriſt was given to undergo a ſhameful death voluntarily upon the Croſs, to ſatiſfie for the ſin of* Adam, *and for all the ſins of all mankind*.

This is thus plainly ſet down in their catalogue of *infamous and pernicious errours*, but without the leaſt note to direct what part of this propoſition is liable to that charge, any farther than may be collected from the title of the *Errours* under which 'tis placed, viz. *Errours touching univerſal or general redemption*. From whence I preſume to diſcern their meaning to be, that to affirm Chriſt to have *ſatisfied for*, or *redeemed all mankind*, is this *pernicious errour* by them *abominated*. And ſuch I confeſs I ſhould acknowledge it to be, if it had any right to be joyn'd with that other, by theſe men ſet under the ſame head [*that the damned ſhall be ſaved:*] but I hope that errour hath received no patronage from that *Catechiſm*, nor ſure from that aſſertion of *Chriſts redeeming all mankind*. Theſe two propoſitions being very reconcileable; that *Chriſt redeemed all men*, and yet that the whole number of the impenitent, unbelieving, reprobate world ſhall never be *ſaved* by him. If there were any need of it, I ſhould eaſily ſhew the way of reconciling theſe two, by adding that the great Benefits of *Chriſts death*, which I affirm to be *general*, are given upon *condition*, not abſolutely (as *Gods love to the world*, and, the effect of it, *giving his Son*, is not deſigned, that all *abſolutely*, but that all *conditionally*, i. e. *whoſoever believeth in him, ſhould not periſh, but have everlaſting life*) and that they which do not perform that *condition* (as God knows a great multitude do not) ſhall never be *ſaved* by his *death:* To which purpoſe is that of *Proſper*, one far enough from all kindneſs to the *Pelagians*, *Redemptor mundi dedit pro mundo ſanguinem ſuum, & mundus redimi noluit*, &c. *the Redeemer of the world gave his blood for the world, and the world would not be redeemed. ad Gall. cap.* 9. But, to confine my diſcourſe (without conſideration of the *conſequences*) to the aſſertion it ſelf; I deſire it may be obſerved, that this was not crudely ſet down in that *Catechiſm*, but with this immediate addition [*to taſt death for every man, Heb.* 2. 9.] by that plain teſtimony of Scripture confirming the truth of what was aſſerted, as punctually as could be imagined. For ſure [*every man*] ſignifies all mankind, as that notes *ſingulos generis humani*, in the largeſt notion of the word, and *taſting death* for them is ſatisfying for their ſins. If this teſtimony (ſo clear, that it alone hath, to my knowledge, convinc'd one as learned a man

man as doth in this Church of ours maintain the doctrines contrary to the *Remonſtrants)* be not thought ſufficient to ſupport this aſſertion, I ſhall then *ex abundanti* add theſe other plain teſtimonies; Not only that of *Gods giving his only Son*, mentioned by *Chriſt* as an effect or expreſſion of his *love to the world*, (which it would not be, if he did not give him for the *world*, whom he is ſaid to *love)* but (to prevent all diſtinctions concerning the notion of the World, as if it ſignified only the Elect) more particularly theſe two; Firſt that of 2 *Pet.* 2. 1. where *the Lord*, i. e. *Chriſt*, is plainly ſaid to have *bought (i. e.* paid the price, ſatisfied for) *them, who deny him, and bring upon themſelves ſwift deſtruction:* to which agrees that of 1 *Cor.* 8. 11. where the *weak brother*, of whom 'tis ſaid, that by another mans ſcandal he *ſhall periſh*, is deſcribed to be one *for whom Chriſt died.* The other teſtimony which I ſhall add, is that of Saint *Paul*, 2 *Cor.* 5. 14. which I deſire the intelligent Reader to obſerve: Where ſpeaking of the *conſtraining* obliging *love of Chriſt*, he ſaith, *we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead*, that is, ſurely, *All* in the full latitude, not only the *elect* but *All others*; and this concluſion the *Apoſtle* infers by this *medium*, becauſe *one, i. e. Chriſt died for all*, which being a proof of the other, muſt certainly be as true, and as acknowledged (if not more) as that which 'tis brought to prove: and particularly the [*all*] for whom he *died*, be as unlimited as the [*All*] that were prov'd from thence to be *dead*, or elſe the *Apoſtle* could not *judge* (as he ſaith he doth) or conclude the *death* of *all* in *Adam* by that *medium.* From this arguing of the *Apoſtle* I ſhall make no queſtion to infer, that in Saint *Pauls* divinity, *Chriſt died for all who are dead in Adam*; and on that occaſion I ſhall add, by the way, that the contrary doctrine [of *Chriſts* not dying for all] was by the *Antients* affixt on *Pelagius* upon that ground, of his affirming that all (*i. e.* that Infants) were not faln in *Adam*, and ſo needed not to be redeem'd by Chriſt. Thus it appears by S. *Aug. cont.* 2 *Epiſt. Pelag. l.* 2. *c.* 2. *Pelagiani dicunt Deum non eſſe omnium ætatum in hominibus mundatorem, ſalvatorem, liberatorem, &c.* and when the *Maſſilans*, to vindicate themſelves from that charge of S. *Auguſtines*, confeſs that *Chriſt* died *for all mankind*, (as it appears by *Proſpers Epiſtle) Proſper* expreſſes no manner of diſlike of that confeſſion, but forms other charges againſt them. And the truth is, there is ſcarce any antient Writer before *Pelagius*, but hath directly aſſerted *Chriſts* dying for all; The teſtimonies of *Irenæus*, *Clemens*, *Origen*, *Macarius*, *Cyril of Jeruſalem*, *Euſebius*, *Athanaſius*, and many others might readily be produced, if that were needful. And then let it be gheſt alſo, which of the two poſitions, the affirmative or the negative, beſt deſerves the charge of being the *ſpawn of thoſe old accurſed hereſies, which have been already condemned, &c.* The ſame I could add from many the learnedſt *Proteſtants*, which never were thought to be tainted with any ancient or modern hereſie (though others I know have expreſt themſelves otherwiſe) but I need not ſuch auxiliaries. To conclude this point; I ſuppoſe, in affirming or vindicating this poſition, I have born *teſtimony* to the *truth of Chriſt*, from whom, and whoſe Apoſtles I profeſs to have learn'd this truth, and to conceive it (for the ſence of it) as fully teſtified by plain Scriptures, as many Articles of the Creed; and for the expreſſion uſed in the *Practical Catechiſm* of [*all mankind*] I muſt acknowledge to have learn'd it from the Church of *England* (of which I do yet with joy profeſs my ſelf an obedient ſon and member) in thoſe words of her *Catechiſm*, eſtabliſht by *Act of Parliament*, and inſerted in the Book of *Liturgy*, where I was taught, [*to believe in God the Father, who created me and all the world, In God the Son, who redeemed me and all mankind, and in God the holy Ghoſt, who ſanctified me and all the elect people of God*;] where *mankind* as it is of a *narrower* extent on one ſide than all the world of creatures, ſo is it to be underſtood of a *larger*, than *all the elect people of God*; And ſo much for the firſt charge.

The ſecond is ſet down *pag.* 15. and it is this, *That neither* Paul *nor* James *exclude or ſeparate faithful actions or acts of faith from faith, or the condition of juſtification, but abſolutely require them, as the only things by which the man is juſtified.* What is thus ſet down I acknowledge to be *in terminis* in the *Practical Catechiſm*, but cannot eaſily gheſs wherein the errour or perniciouſneſs is conceived to lie, unleſs it ſhould poſſibly be thorow a miſtake of the phraſe [*the only things by which the man is juſtified*] as if by that ſpeech ſhould be underſtood, either that the *faithful actions or acts of faith without faith it ſelf*, were the *only things by which we are juſtified*, or elſe that all the things there ſpoken of *Faith*, and *faithful actions*, or *acts of faith* are the only CAUSE, and ſo ſome CAUSE of our *juſtification*, or by which, as by a CAUSE, we are juſtified; either of theſe I confeſs might paſs for an errour, but both theſe doctrines I have ſufficiently diſclaimed; and indeed in this very propoſition 'tis affirm'd that the *faithful actions or acts of Faith are not excluded or ſeparated from Faith* (which they muſt be, if they juſtify without *Faith*) *or the condition of juſtification* (*i. e.* from that faith which is conſidered as, and affirm'd to be the *condition* of our juſtification) but *by the two Apoſtles abſolutely required*, to what? Why *to faith, or the condition of our juſtification, as the only things* together with it by which as by a *condition*, and only ſo (as 'tis clearly ſet down all over that part of the *Catechiſm*, which handles *Faith* or *Juſtification*) the man is *juſtified.* This I ſuppoſe may give theſe men ſome light of their miſtake, if it were ſuch: but if they underſtand the ſpeech as then and now I do, and yet think it errour, and pernicious, I muſt then only prove that what was ſaid from Saint *James* and Saint *Paul*, was not by me falſly impoſed upon them, and then they muſt either maintain my ſpeech, or fall with me in the ſame condemnation. That Saint *James* doth not *exclude or ſeparate faithful actions, or acts of Faith, from Faith, or the condition of Juſtification, but require them*, (i. e. Faith, and faithful actions, or acts of faith) *as the only things by which, as by a condition, the man is juſtified*, will be clear by the definition of a *condition* in *Logick*, and the plain words of Saint *James*; A *Condition* is a qualification of the ſubject required to make him capable, or a *cauſa ſine quâ non*; and ſo a condition of *juſtification* is no more, than that without which a man cannot be juſtified; and that is the direct affirmation of Saint *James*, *c.* 2. 24. *Ye ſee that by works* (i. e. faithful actions, or acts of faith) *a man is juſtified, and not by faith only:* and again, *Faith if it have not works*, ver. 17. and *Faith without works*, ver. 20. *is dead*, and ſo ſure not ſuch as by which we are juſtified. From whence I form this *ſyllogiſm*; *That, without which, in* Saint James's *opinion, we are not juſtified, and by which join'd with faith we are juſtified, not by faith only, is not by* Saint James *excluded or ſeparated from Faith, or the condition of our juſtification, but required together with Faith, or the only things by which* (as by a condition) *the man is juſtified:* But *without acts of faith or faithful actions, in* Saint James's

opinion,

opinion, we are not juſtified, and by them we are juſtified, and not by faith only; Therefore *faithful actions, or acts of Faith are not by* S. James *excluded or ſeparated from Faith, or the condition of our juſtification, but required together with faith, as the only things by which* (as by a condition) *the man is juſtified.*

The firſt propoſition is clear from the nature of a *Condition*; the ſecond from the words cited out of Saint *James*, and then I hope the concluſion will neither be *errour* nor *pernicious*.

Then for Saint *Paul*, 'tis made evident in the *Pract. Catechiſm* that the *faith* by which according to his doctrine *Abraham* was *juſtified* (and not by *works*) *Rom.* 4. was not only a depending on God for the performance of his promiſe (which yet was a *faithful action*, or *act of Faith*,) but alſo a reſigning himſelf up wholly to him to obey his precepts; or more clearly, was a *Faith*, which, howſoever it was tried by promiſes or commands, did anſwer *God* in *Acts of faith*, or *faithful actions*; and ſo was accepted by God (without abſolute unſinning obedience, much more without obedience to the *Moſaical law*, without *works*) all which is clear in the ſtory of *Abraham*, and I ſuppoſe need not farther be evidenced. And then concerning Saint *Pauls* part in the buſineſs, my ſyllogiſm ſhall be this; *He that affirms* Abraham *to be juſtified by that Faith, which, howſoever 'twas tried, did anſwer God in acts of faith or faithful actions, doth not exclude or ſeparate faithful actions or acts of faith from faith, or the condition of our juſtification, but abſolutely requires them*, &c. But Saint *Paul* affirms *Abraham to be juſtified by that faith, which howſoever 'twas tried, did anſwer God in faithful actions, or acts of faith*; Therefore Saint *Paul doth not exclude or ſeparate faithful actions*, &c. The firſt propoſition I conceive wants little proving, after that which hath been already premiſed in this matter. And for the ſecond I ſhall deſire that *Abrahams faith*, as it hath juſtification attributed to it by Saint *Paul*, may be viewed both in the fourth to the *Romans*, and the eleventh to the *Hebrews*. In the former his *faith* was tried by the promiſe of a numerous ſeed, *&c.* and he anſwered that with one *act of faith*, or *faithful action*, *believed in hope, beyond hope*, ver. 18. was *ſtrong in faith* and *gave glory to God*, ver. 20. was *fully perſwaded, that what God had promiſed, he was able to perform*, ver. 21. all which what are they but *acts of faith*, or *faithful actions?* all, which (when the object of the *faith* is Gods abſolute promiſe) the matter is capable of; and for this it *was counted to him for righteouſneſs*, or he was juſtified, *ver.* 22. and thence ſure I may conclude, that theſe were ſo required, as the *condition* by which he was, and without which he ſhould not be juſtified. In the 11*th* to the *Hebrews* many other *acts* of his *faith* or *faithful actions* are mentioned, ver. 8. *By faith he obeyed to go out of his own countrey, not knowing whither he went*, and ver. 9. *by faith he ſojourn'd in a ſtrange land*, ver. 10. *by faith he expected a City, that hath foundations*, ver. 17. *by faith he offered his Son*, and ver. 19. *counted that God was able to raiſe him up from the dead*, ver. 20. *by faith he bleſſed* Iſaac *concerning things to come*. What are all theſe but acts of faith, or faithful actions in all kinds of tryals? And therefore I ſuppoſe all this being out of Saint *Paul*, as the former out of Saint *James*, 'twill be no *errour*, or *pernicious*, from their very words to have affirm'd this Doctrine, and affixt it on them. I ſuppoſe alſo this may ſerve for the ſecond propoſition.

The third is ſet down *pag.* 18. from *Pract. Catech.* * *pag.* 48, 49. and 'tis this, That [*Thou ſhalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain*] is undoubtedly no more than [*thou ſhalt not forſwear thy ſelf.*] To this Charge I anſwer firſt, that it is a little ſtrange, that a bare explication of a phraſe of Scripture, a part of the third Commandment in *Exod* though it were acknowledged falſe, or forc'd, ſhould yet be ſo far improveable by any, as to come under the title of an *infamous pernicious errour*, a *ſpawn of the old accurſed hereſies*, &c. and be capable of all thoſe other aggravations at firſt mentioned, which being affixt to all the errours in the Catalogue, muſt alſo be affixt to this which is ſet down for one of them.

* Of this Edition.

But then ſecondly, for the truth, (moſt undoubted certain truth) of this explication, or interpretation, thus cenſured, I have formerly at large made it appear, that the words [*to take the name of God*] ſignifie to *ſwear*, and no more, and the *Hebrew* which we render *in vain*, ſignifies [*falſly*] and is ſo rendred in the ninth Commandment, and agreeable to that, *Pſalm* 15. *to lift up the ſoul to vanity*, is to ſwear by the ſoul or life *falſly*, as it there follows, *nor ſworn to deceive his neighbour*; and beſide my own judgment in this matter, back'd with the conſent of as learned as this age hath, or the Antient Church had any, I conceived that I had a moſt authentick warrant from *Chriſt* himſelf, who reads it οὐκ ἐπιορκήσεις, *thou ſhalt not forſwear thy ſelf:* For ſo we read, *Matth.* 5. *Ye have heard that it was ſaid to them of old, thou ſhalt not kill*, and again in the ſame manner, *thou ſhalt not commit adultery*, that is, that of the ten Commandments delivered in *Sinai*, and brought down by Scripture, to them his preſent auditors, one Commandment was, *thou ſhalt not kill*, another, *thou ſhalt not commit adultery*; and ſo again in the very ſame form of words, another, *Thou ſhalt not forſwear thy ſelf*; from which I did aſſure my ſelf (and ſo ſtill do) that οὐκ ἐπιορκήσεις is as directly the interpretation (in Chriſts judgment) of the firſt part of the third Commandment, as οὐ μοιχεύσεις or οὐ φονεύσεις of the ſeventh and ſixth, and ſo that it is *undoubtedly no more* the one than the other. And indeed this was the only occaſion of delivering thoſe words in the *Practical Catechiſm*, to ſhew that Chriſt did not miſreport the words of the Commandments, nor yet refer to any other place but that Commandment in thoſe words of his. And though I have many other things, that I could ſay to that matter, able to free that ſpeech from all imaginable inconveniences (eſpecially when in that place Chriſts prohibition is explain'd to be againſt all kind of ſwearing (by any other as well as by God) in ordinary converſation, or in any caſe but wherein it is neceſſary to confirm by Oath) yet I am very willing to leave the matter here, upon this account at this time given of it, *i. e.* in my opinion, on Chriſts ſcore, and not fear what any ingenuous Reader will charge on me for this interpretation.

I beſeech God to forgive them which have brought this unneceſſary trouble upon the Reader; and for my ſelf I have to them theſe two only requeſts, 1. That they will examine themſelves ſincerely, and as in Gods ſight, what the motive or deſign was, which perſwaded them to ſingle out me alone (who profeſs my ſelf, and am by all that know me acknowledged to hold nothing contrary to the Church of *England*, and will juſtify it to any man that knows what the Church of *England* is) and join me with the Broachers of all the blaſphemies and hereſies of this age: And ſecondly, that they

will lay to heart the conſequences which may naturally flow from hence, if God do not uphold weak Chriſtians, who ſeeing ſo many doctrines of very diſtant natures blended together, with the ſame brand of [*hereſie and blaſphemy, infamous and pernicious*] faſtned on them, and no kind of proofs annext, that any are ſuch, (beſide the judgment of the Cenſors) may poſſibly find ſome of them to be the infallible truths of God, and be tempted (if they have not ſtronger antidotes than this bare *Teſtimony* will afford them) to have the ſame thoughts of the other alſo; Or if not, whether they will not be inclined to have the ſame ſeverity and condemnation for me, or any other Aſſertor of ſuch propoſitions as theſe, as they are taught to have for the Authors of thoſe other *blaſphemous* propoſitions, and ſo be tempted to uncharitableneſs.

Having ſaid thus much, I ſhall hope it may find ſome good ſucceſs among ſome who have ſubſcribed that *Teſtimony*: But if I am miſtaken in all of them, I ſhall then deſire that this improſperous Paper may gain me but thus much, that either the firſt ſubſcriber Mr. *John Downam* (who did Licenſe the Printing of this very Book, from whence all theſe pretended Errours are cited) or elſe Dr. *Gouge*, or Mr. *Gataker*, who are foremoſt of the ſecond rank, or ſome other perſon of learning and Chriſtian temper, will afford me their patience perſonally, and by fair Diſcourſe, or any other Chriſtian way, to debate the truth of our pretenſions; and for this I ſhall wait their leiſure.

From my ſtudy, Chriſt-Ch. in Oxon.
Jan. 24. Munday 1647.

H. Hammond.

OF

OF

CONSCIENCE, SCANDAL, WILL-WORSHIP, SUPERSTITION, AND IDOLATRY.

Προφῆται δύο ἢ τρεῖς λαλείτωσαν
καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι διακρινέτωσαν.

THE PREFACE

IT *is a ſtrong preſumption that that* Religion *is falſe which is apt to be made uſe of for ſecular advantages, that thoſe opinions have ſomewhat of the* ὁ πλάνος *ingredient in them, which are produced as the ground to juſtifie or authorize practices, otherwiſe impious and infamous; There is ſo little* Communion *or compliance* betwixt God and Belial, *that it is very hard even for Satan himſelf, that great impure Artificer, to proſtitute or debauch any truth of God, (which is really ſo) to that mean or vile ſubmiſſion of yielding it ſelf pliable or inſtrumental to any deſign or intereſt of his. He which can be corrupted or employed by an enemy is either not ſo honeſt or not ſo clear, either not ſo faithful or not ſo wary, as might be expected. This one conſideration would prejudge a great part of the Divinity of theſe unhappy times, which in a perfect contrariety to the* wiſdom which cometh from above, *Ja.* 3. *or the* fruits of the Spirit, *Gal.* 5. *is ſo far from* purity, peaceableneſs, gentleneſs, love, joy, long-ſuffering, *&c. that it is engaged to owne another extraction, to confeſs it ſelf his Creature, and progeny, whom in the lineaments and features it ſo viſibly reſembleth. Among the many ſeverals of this kind, I have long conceived that the vulgar Notions of thoſe four names, which theſe enſuing Treatiſes have taken confidence to examine, have had no ſmall part of the guilt of thoſe fatal evils under which this calamitous wretched Kingdom now pants, a proſtrate, ghaſtly and direful ſpectacle. And conſequently that theſe obſtructing of the fountains might poſſibly abate thoſe ſtreams and torrents (which have taken riſe from thence) of uncharitableneſs firſt, and then of bloud. The miſtaking of every phancy or humour, carnal or Satanical perſwaſion for* Conſcience *(the acknowledged rule of action) and the ſetting up upon too weak a ſtock for that high priviledge of a* Good Conſcience, *hath embolden'd moſt of the vices of the World,* * petrified the practical faculty, *and made it inſenſible of any of thoſe ſtripes, or threats, or diſcipline, which the Law of Nature or of Chriſt hath provided for the reſtraint of their Subjects; and from thence it daily happens that not only the moſt Un-Chriſtian but unhumane practices, the moſt unnatural ſavage barbarities of theſe laſt years, (which no Paraſite can flatter, or Precedent extenuate) are now avowed to be dictates and commands of* Conſcience, *and ſo not only reconcileable with piety but advanced and ſet up for the only* meaſure *of it, and no man allowed to paſs for* Conſcientious, *which hath any remainder of Moral or Chriſtian Vertue (in the ancient Notion of the Word) diſcernible in his actions; and ſo not only* Zoſimus *his ſlander of* Conſtantine *is become the real guilt of too many Profeſſors, (thoſe ſins confidently committed by them, for which no other Religion allows any expiation) but, beyond the malice of that falſe tongue, the ſins themſelves reſolved on as a ſpecial*

* ἀπολίδωσις ἡ ψεκτικὴ. *Arrian. in Ep.*

καθαρτικὸν

καθαρτικὸν or purgative, an act of ſupererogating Vertue, ſufficient to ſanctifie any other impurities. To theſe ſo groſs errours both in opinion and practice, the preſent height of animoſity and vehemence of the flame may poſſibly have betrayed men; but what it ſhould be that hath ſo heightened the paſſion, and firſt elevated it to this pitch of Diſtemper, will not be diſcerned any otherwiſe than by conjecture from the Quarrels which have been moſt inſiſted on, againſt the eſtabliſhed Government and Diſcipline of the Church, and the indifferent actions, and Ceremonies, and obſervances either preſcribed, or cuſtomary among us; to which when no direct immediate blame or accuſation could be affixt, it hath been the manner to object obliquely, ſometimes that they have been matter of Scandal, and that thought to have been ſufficiently proved, if any could be produced who have diſliked them (as if their being diſpleaſed were to be ſcandalized, or one mans being angry once without a cauſe, were for ever juſt cauſe for others to be angry at that which were of it ſelf moſt innocent;) Sometimes that the crime of Will-Worſhip were chargeable on them, ſuppoſing firſt, (but not proving) Will-Worſhip to be a crime, and then every the leaſt obſervance uncommanded (though withal as perfectly unprohibited) by Scripture to be the interpretation of that crime; and ſometimes that they have been Superſtitious; by the equivocalneſs of that word, firſt perſwading themſelves and others that every exceſs in Religion comes under that title, and then that the uncommandedneſs of any thing, induces that exceſs, and conſequently involves in that guilt. To which three ſo inauſpicious (I may add Scandalous) miſpriſions broached by Satan, εἰς πτῶσιν, to the fall, and ſo truly to the offending of many in Iſrael, theſe enſuing Treatiſes were deſigned as antidotes or cures; to which end if they may prove in any degree ſucceſsful, the writer of them will never repent that he hath ſubjected them to the various and paſſionate cenſures of the many, hoping thereby that the mature and impartial judgments of the few may be alſo provoked to interpoſe. By whoſe pleaſure and ſerious examination, whether they ſhall ſtand or fall, they are in all humility ſubmitted.

OF

OF CONSCIENCE.

Sect. 1. AMong the many practical errors which are gotten abroad into the world, a very large proportion there is of thoſe which have either ſuck't their poiſon from, or diſguiſed it under that ſpecious venerable name of *Conſcience*. That which the Philoſophers could call their guardian Angel, and juſtify the phraſe by vouching none but Angelical dictates from it: That which ſome good-natured Atheiſts did ſo revere, that they defined the only deity in the world, and in proportion phanſied nothing but God-like of it, is now by ſome Chriſtians (like the true God among the Heathens) worſhip't in ſo many corporeous ſhapes, that there is at length ſcarce any thing ſo vile (Phanſy, humour, paſſion, prepoſſeſſion, the meaneſt worldly intereſt of the ambitious or covetous deſigner, like the Calves, the Cats, the Crocodiles, the Onions, the Leeks of *Egypt*) but hath the favour or luck to be miſtaken for *Conſcience*, and receive all the reſpect, that I ſay not adoration, that belongs to it.

μόνον ἄνευ συνειδήσιν θεόν. Tatian.

Sect. 2. 'Twill be then but an act of juſtice and mercy, juſtice to truth, and mercy to the abuſed world, and withal a ſpecial preparative to a prudent reformation, to reſcue ſo divine a name from ſuch heatheniſh cage, to reſtore it to its natural primitive ſimplicity, and caſt out all the falſe forms which it hath been forced to appear under. To which purpoſe all that I ſhall deſign will be reduced to theſe two enquiries, 1. what is the proper notion of conſcience, 2. what is required to entitle a man to a good conſcience.

Sect. 3. For the former of theſe, what is the proper notion of Conſcience, I ſhall labour to find out not among the Scholaſtical definitions or diviſions of it among humane writers, but only by obſerving the force and uſe of the word in the Scripture, particularly the New Teſtament. And he that ſhall meet it there 32 times, and but take a view of it at every meeting, will ſure come to ſome degree of acquaintance with it, and find upon judgment reaſon to reſolve, what for his eaſe I ſhall now lay before him:

Sect. 4. That the word συνείδησις, *Conſcience*, is no more than Science or knowledge, and therefore being but once uſed by the Greek Tranſlators of the Old Teſtament, *Eccleſ.* 10. 20. it is there ſet to expreſs a word which is otherwiſe by them commonly rendred σύνεσις and ἐπίγνωσις) only with a peculiar relation added to it, as that *knowledge* is in order to *action*. Thus *Tit.* 1. 15. when νοῦς and συνείδησις, mind and conſcience are diſtinguiſhed, 'tis obvious to any to diſcern the ground of that diſtinction, that former being properly the denotation of the faculty merely ſpeculative, or intellectual; this latter, of the practical judgment, or that whether act or faculty of the underſtanding ſoul, which extendeth to practice; the Apoſtle by that phraſe, [*the mind and conſcience are defiled*] meaning diſtinctly this, that this errour in mens judgments, (which is the defiling of their mind) carries Un-chriſtian practice along with it, (which is the *defiling* of the *practical* faculty) this Judaical miſtake in their underſtanding is attended with Judaizing actions in their lives, the former apportioned to the Ἰουδαϊκοὶ μῦθοι, the *falſe Judaical doctrines*, which relate to νοῦς the *mind*, the ſecond to the ἐντολαὶ ἀνθρώπων ἀποστρεφομένων τὴν ἀλήθειαν, the commands of men perverting the truth, *v.* 14. which relate to the συνείδησις, *the Conſcience*.

νοῦς. συνείδησις.

Sect. 5. For the clearing of which (that it is ſuch a practical knowledge in the acception of the Scripture) if there need any light, you may have it from the ſurvey of every place ſeverally, and in ſpecial from this one, 1 *Pet.* 2. 19. *This is thankworthy, if* διὰ συνείδησιν θεοῦ, *for Conſcience of God a man ſuffer grief*, &c. *i. e. if* for this *obediential practical knowledge of God* (this *knowledge* of truth attended with a *reſolution* not to diſobey God, though it coſt a man never ſo dear) *he ſuffer grief*, &c.

Sect. 6. This being premiſed, there is but one thing more to be added to this matter, and it is this; That we take notice of the ſeveral ways of aſpect that *Conſcience* hath upon *practice*; One forward in the direct line, another backward, or by way of reflection; which are ordinarily expreſt by the double office of *Conſcience*, 1. as a *cuſtos* or *monitor*, adviſing and inſtructing and keeping us to our duty; 2. as a *witneſs* teſtifying to our ſelves and to God what we have done; which is in plainer terms no more but this, That there are two ſorts of *Conſcience*; 1. *Conſcience of duty to be performed*, or full perſwaſion that ſuch a thing ought to be done, or not to be done by me, a being reſolved of the neceſſity or unlawfulneſs of any thing, and 2. *Conſcience of having performed*, or not performed it, a knowing or judging my ſelf to have done well or ill. And under theſe two notions, all the ſeverals in the New Teſtament, (and the one ſole place of the apocryphal books of the old) will be contained. If you pleaſe, you may ſee how.

Sect. 8. To the former kind belongs that famous place, *Rom.* 13. 5. *You muſt be ſubject* (to the Supreme powers, *v.* 1. *i. e.* to the men that are in ſupreme authority as in *Polycarpus Ep.* to the *Philipp. Orate pro Regibus & Poteſtatibus & Principibus*, *Powers* are put with *Kings* and *Princes*, p. 23.) *not only for wrath*, *i. e.* fear or danger of puniſhment, the effect of *wrath* (the Magiſtrate *being Gods Miniſter, and avenger for wrath*, or puniſhment *to him that doth evil*, *v.* 4.) but alſo διὰ συνείδησιν, for or *becauſe of Conſcience*, *i. e.* becauſe it is the command of God, and conſequently that which all inferiours (*every ſoul*) may, if they be not wilfully blind, know to be their duty, [*to be thus ſubject*]

Sect. 9. So 1 Cor. 8. 7. *For ſome with Conſcience of the idol*, *i. e.* being reſolved in mind, that it is not lawful to eat or taſt of any μέρος or τομὴ, *part* or *portion* of the idol-feaſt (whether ἐν εἰδωλείῳ, *at the idol-table*, or having bought it at the *Shambles*, as it ſeems, was the faſhion for thoſe τόμαι to be ſold there at ſecond hand, *c.* 10. 25.) accounting it unlawful to eat any meat conſecrated to that uſe, *do* yet *eat*

that

that which is of this nature, *and* by ſo doing, *their weak i. e.* uninſtructed *conſcience is polluted, i. e.* they ſin againſt their Conſcience, do that which they are perſwaded they may not do, which although it be never ſo innocent a harmleſs thing in it ſelf (an *idol being ſimply nothing*) yet to them which do it, when they think it unlawful (*and all have not knowledge*, ſaith he in the beginning of the verſe, *i. e.* are not ſufficiently inſtructed in their duty) it is pollution or ſin, according to the fore-mentioned place *Tit.* 1. 15. *To the pure all things are pure* [*all things*] *i. e.* all things of that nature, of which there he ſpeaks, though in themſelves indifferent, [*are pure*] *i, e.* may lawfully be uſed [*by the pure*] *i. e.* by them which are rightly inſtructed, but to the *polluted and unbelievers* (*i. e.* to them that are miſled by Jewiſh fables, or by the dogmatizing of falſe teachers, and brought to believe things to be prohibited by God, which are not prohibited) to them that are guilty of this kind of *Judaiſm*, and (as it is *interpretativè*) *unbelief*, *there is nothing pure, but their mind and conſcience are polluted*, both their underſtanding is in an errour, taking falſity for truth, and their practical reſolution is ſinful alſo, nay obliged to ſin, which way ſoever they turn themſelves, whether they abſtain ſuperſtitiouſly, when they are not bound by God to abſtain, (which is the ſin of thoſe that are *ſubject to ordinances*, *Col.* 2. 20. of which I have ſpoken at large in another place) or whether they abſtain not, when they are perſwaded that they ought to abſtain, which is *ſin againſt Conſcience*.

Tr. of Will-worſhip.

Sect. 10. From whence by the way you may obſerve the miſerable lot of thoſe which have not γνῶσιν knowledge in the beginning of that verſe, which are miſled to think any thing unlawful which is lawful, and continue in that errour without ſeeking of light, which are thus *impure* (for to ſuch μηδὲν καθαρὸν *nothing is pure*,) they are, as long as they remain ſo, obliged to ſin, which way ſoever they take to, abſtain or not abſtain. For though in things indifferent and uncommanded, ſimply to abſtain were no ſin, yet then to abſtain ὡς ἀπὸ βδελυκτῦ, as from a thing abominable or unlawful, is both by Scripture and the ancient Councels, in caſe of marriage and meats, every where condemned as ſinful: and yet on the other ſide to eat *without*, or againſt *Faith*, *i. e.* being doubtful whether it be lawful or no, or being perſwaded it is unlawful, *is ſin*, (ſaith the Apoſtle) and there is great neceſſity to ſuch of ſeeking, (and in others great charity of helping them to) γνῶσιν inſtruction, or right information in this caſe, which is the only cure for this unfortunate malady.

Sect. 11. So again v. 10. συνείδησις ἀδεινῦς the *conſcience of him that is weak*, or (which is the ſame) *v.* 7. and *v.* 12. the *weak conſcience*] ſignifies that falſe perſwaſion of him that is in an errour, an *erroneous Conſcience*, *weakneſs* noting *ſickneſs* in the Scripture ſtile *John* 5. 14. 1 Cor. 11. 30. and errour being the diſeaſe or *ſickneſs* of the ſoul, and that with a little improvement growing deſtructive and mortiferous; as in caſe he that hath that erroneous *ſick* Conſcience, do act ſomewhat againſt conſcience, and ſo adde *ſin* unto *errour*, for then ἀποθνήσκει ὁ ἀδενῶν, *v.* 11. that ſick man dies, *periſhes* of that *diſeaſe*. So ch. 10. 25, 27, 28, 29. the word *Conſcience* is ſtill in the ſame ſence, for conſcience or conſideration of duty, and ſo 1 *Pet.* 2. 19. forementioned.

So likewiſe 1 *Pet.* 3. 21. where baptiſm is called ἀγαθῆς συνειδήσεως ἐπερώτημα εἰς θεὸν *the anſwer of a good conſcience to God*, the good *conſcience* ſignifies conſcience rightly inſtructed in its duty, as in baptizing thoſe of full age it is ſuppoſed to be; which *Conſcience* is then to *anſwer* and conſent to all Gods propoſals in baptiſm (or the miniſters in Gods ſtead) ſuch as [wilt *thou forſake the Devil*, &c.] and ſo the words will be interpreted in a ſence proportionable to that of *denying ungodly luſts*, *Tit.* 2. 12. which there the *appearing* of Chriſt is ſaid to *teach* us. For as *luſt* propoſes *ungodly* queſtions to us, which we are bound to *deny*; ſo God in baptiſm is ſuppoſed to propoſe good queſtions to us, which we are bound to grant, and ſtipulate the performance of them, and that is the ἐπερώτημα *the anſwer of a good conſcience to God* or to his queſtions propoſed in baptiſm, after the manner of ancient pacts among the Romans made by way of queſtion and anſwer, as part of the *ritus ſolennis* or formalities of them.

Sect. 12. But then for the ſecond acception of the word, as it notes conſcience of what we have performed, or paſſing judgment on my ſelf for what I have done, (and that either for any one individual act, or for the main of our lives, our ſtate; and that again either firſt *acquitting*, or ſecondly *condemning*, or thirdly conſidered in a third notion *common* to both thoſe, paſſing ſentence in general, ſo ſhall you find it in many other places, and indeed in all the reſt which we have not hitherto named.

Sect. 13. For the firſt of theſe three ſpecies as it *acquitteth*, you have it *Acts* 23. 1. *I have lived*, (or behaved my ſelf in all my converſation towards men πεπολίτευμαι in all my politick, or publick relations) with or *in all good conſcience*, in ſuch a manner, as I cannot accuſe my ſelf of any thing done contrary to my Chriſtian profeſſion, or dignity of my Apoſtolical calling. So 2 *Cor.* 1. 12. the *Teſtimony of our Conſcience* is expreſt by what follows, that *in ſimplicity*, &c. *we had our converſation in the world.* So good conſcience is taken 1 *Tim.* 1. 5. and 19. and 3. 9. and 2 *Tim.* 1. 3. *Heb.* 13. 18. 1 *Pet.* 3. 16. but above all you have a ſpecial place belonging to this firſt branch of the ſecond in *Acts* 24. 16. Ἀπρόσκοπον συνείδησιν] we render it a *Conſcience void of offence*, the meaning is, a confidence and aſſurance that he hath done nothing ſubject ſo much as to the cenſure of having *ſcandalized* others; for St. *Paul* being there accuſed by the *Jews* v. 5, 6. for three crimes *ſedition*, *hereſie*, and *profaning of the Temple*, he anſwers to the firſt *v.* 12. to the ſecond *v.* 14. to the third *v.* 16. 18. and his being purified in the Temple after the Jewiſh manner he makes an evidence of his innocence in that particular, a proof of his not having ſcandalized any Jew, which to have done would have been a fault in him, whoſe office it was to become *all things to all men*, *that he might gain or ſave all*, and not to diſcourage or deter any who might be gained by compliance; and the doing ſo, is it which is called being ἀπρόσκοποι Ἰουδαίοις, 1 *Cor.* 10. 32. *giving none offence to the Jews*, the very word uſed in the place of the Acts.

Sect. 14. In the ſecond place, the accuſing or condemning conſcience is often mentioned alſo; *John* 8. 9. *Convicted by their Conſcience*, or reproved ſome for one ſin, ſome for another. So by intimation, *Heb.* 9. 9. where 'tis ſaid of the Legal ſacrifices that they could not *make perfect as pertaining to Conſcience*, where the word τελειῶσαι] rendred to *make perfect*, ſignifies in the ſacred idiom [to *conſecrate*,] to make a prieſt, whoſe office being προσεγγίζειν τῷ θεῷ *to draw near to God*, proportionably τελειῶσαι κατὰ συνείδησιν to perfect or *conſecrate* as *pertaining* to *conſcience* ſignifies to give acceſs with boldneſs to God,

God, by taking off that guilt which formerly lay upon their Conſcience, the ſame that *v.* 14. is called, *to purge the conſcience from dead works*, to waſh off that guilt of ſin paſt, which hinders their approach to God, obſtructs all entrance to their prayers (for *we know that God heareth not ſinners*, *Jo.* 9. 31. and *If.* 1. 15.) whereupon 'tis obſervable, that *Heb.* 13. 18. when he beſpeaks their prayers for him, he adds this reaſon to encourage them to do ſo, *For we truſt we have a good Conſcience*, that good conſcience being neceſſary there to have other mens prayers heard for them, as here to give themſelves *acceſs* to God in *prayer*. So *Heb.* 10. 2. *Conſcience*, or conſcientiouſneſs *of ſins*, and *v.* 22. *Evil Conſcience*, and ſo *Wiſd.* 17. 11. there is mention *of wickedneſs condemned by her own witneſs and preſt by conſcience.*

Sect. 15. And of the laſt ſort, in the latitude common to both, are *Rom.* 2. 15. *Rom.* 9. 1. 2 *Cor.* 4. 2. and 5. 11. and 1 *Tim.* 4. 2. all clear enough without the help of our paraphraſe to add light to them.

Sect. 16. Having thus marſhalled all theſe places of Scripture into ranks, and given ſome hints of general inſight into them, it now remains that we return a while to the nearer ſurvey of the two general heads, and firſt of the former acception of the word, as it imports a monitor, or director of life, by which our actions muſt be regulated, and from the miſtaking of which the chief inconvenience doth ariſe.

Sect. 17. To which end, it will be abſolutely neceſſary to ſettle and reſolve but one queſtion, what is that Rule or κανων of Conſcience, from whence it muſt receive its regulation. For he that draweth a line of direction for another, muſt have a rule to draw it by, and that a ſtreight exact one, or elſe the directions will not be authentick, and they *which walk* ἀκριβῶς *exactly* or conſcientiouſly, muſt τῷ κανονι στοιχεῖν *walk by rule*, *Phil.* 3. 16. and τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν *have their eye or thought alway upon that one thing*, their *rule* of direction, or elſe be they never ſuch φθάσαντες in the beginning of that verſe, ſuch *forward* proficients, their *end may be perdition*, v. 19. This when once we have done, the difficulty will ſoon vaniſh.

Sect. 18. And to this purpoſe I ſhall take that for granted which in *theſe* I never heard any doubt of, (though many of our actions look otherwiſe in *hypotheſi*) that *law* is this only rule; κανων & νομος, rule and law being words of the ſame importance, and nothing fit or proper to regulate our actions, but that which the lawgiver, to whom obedience muſt be payed, hath thought fit to rule them by. To which purpoſe it is ordinarily obſerved that ἁμαρτία, *ſin*, or aberration from that rule by which we ought to walk (for ſo that word naturally ſignifies) is by St. *John* 1 Epiſt. 3. 4. defined ἀνομία which we render *a tranſgreſſion of the law*. In which place of St. *John*, though the truth is, (ἁμαρτία and ἁμαρτίαν ποιεῖν denoting more than the bare Commiſſion of ſin in that Author generally, *viz.* the wilful perpetration of it, and an indulgence in, and habit of ſo doing) the word ἀνομία and ἀνομίαν ποιεῖν muſt proportionably alſo ſignifie not only tranſgreſſing, but wilful habitual contemning the law, being an *exlex*, or without *law* (as the Idolatrous Atheiſt is ſaid to be *without God in the world*) *i. e.* without any account or reſpect of it, (and ſo ποιοῦντες ἀνομίαν *John* 3 1. 3. notes the greateſt degree of ſinfulneſs, we render it *workers of iniquity*, and ſo very frequently in the Septuagint we find ἀνομία, where we render the Hebrew by *miſchief*) yet ſtill the obſervation ſtands good, that law is the rule, in aberration from which all ſin conſiſts, and ſo ἁμαρτία is ἀνομία in both ſences, the leaſt degree of ſin a deviation from the law, and a malicious contentious ſinning, a malicious, contemptuous deviation, or tranſgreſſion; and ſo St. *Paul* hath alſo reſolved it, that where there is no law, there is no tranſgreſſion, no παράβασις, *Rom.* 4. 15. no going awry, when there is no rule propos'd to go by.

Sect. 19. This being ſo clear in it ſelf, and yet through the miſtakes, yea and impieties of the *world* become ſo neceſſary to be thus farther cleared; Two things there are which will hence inevitably follow, the firſt Negative, the ſecond Poſitive; the firſt or the negative, that whatſoever undertakes to direct, or guide our actions, to tell us our duty, that this we muſt, that we may not do, and hath not ſome law, (in force, and ſtill obligatory to us) to authorize thoſe directions by, is not *Conſcience*, whatſoever it is.

Sect. 20. 1. Humour it may be, to think our ſelves bound to do whatſoever we have a ſtrong inclination to do, it being a matter of ſome difficulty to diſtinguiſh between my natural and my ſpiritual inclinations, the motion of my ſenſitive appetite, and my diviner principle, my lower, and my upper ſoul, and the former commonly crying louder, and moving more lively, and impatiently, and earneſtly than the other.

Sect. 21. 2. Phancy it may be, which is a kind of irrational animal Conſcience, hath the ſame relation to ſenſitive repreſentations (*thoſe laws in the members*) which Conſcience hath to intellectual (*thoſe laws of the mind*) and then, as *Ariſtotle* ſaith, *that in* thoſe *creatures which have not reaſon, phancy ſupplies the place of reaſon*; ſo they which have not, or will not have conſcience to direct them, phancy moſt commonly gets into its place. Or,

Sect. 22. Thirdly, Paſſion it may be; Our fears will adviſe us one thing, our animoſities another, our zeal a third, and though that be perhaps zeal of God, yet that zeal is a paſſion ſtill, one of thoſe which *Ariſtotle* hath defined in his Rhetoricks, being not κατ' ἐπίγνωσιν, according to knowledge or *Conſcience*, *Rom.* 10. 2. for the Hebrew word, as I told you, is rendred by thoſe two words promiſcuouſly, ἐπίγνωσις and συνείδησις, *knowledge* and *Conſcience*. Or, דַּעַת

Sect. 23. Fourthly, diabolical ſuggeſtion or infuſion it may be, an enthuſiaſm of that black ſpirit; as it is, (or of ſome thing as bad in effect) infallibly, whenſoever *Rebellion*, *Sedition*, *Murther*, *Rapine*, *Hatred*, *Envy*, *Uncharitableneſs*, *Lying*, *Swearing*, *Sacriledge*, &c. come to us under the diſguiſe of Religion and Conſcience: and therefore *the Spirits* muſt be ſearcht *whether they be of God*, or of the Devil; and no ſurer way to do it, than by theſe and the like ſymptoms, theſe fruits and productions of that infernal Spirit, which ſo perfectly repreſent and own their parent, that none but blind or mad men or dæmoniacks can believe them in earneſt to come from God. Or,

Sect. 24. Fifthly, Falſe-doctrine it may be, and that again ſet off either, by the authority of the teacher, or by the dignity of ſome eminent followers and practiſers of it, and then the Apoſtle calls it [*having mens perſons in admiration*] or by the earlineſs of its repreſentation, being imbibed and taken in

 firſt,

firſt, ſwallowed and digeſted before the truth was offered to us, and then 'tis prejudice or prepoſſeſſion, and this again always aſſiſted by the force of that old axiom, [*Intus exiſtens*, &c.] and by that which is natural to all habits, to be hardly moveable, and yet further improv'd ſometimes by pride and obſtinacy, always by ſelf-love, which makes us think our own opinions (*i. e.* thoſe which we are already poſſeſt of) the trueſt; which in this caſe is in effect to think our luck the beſt luck, and the ſame which was obſerved in one worſt ſort of Heathens, who, whatſoever they ſaw firſt in the morning, worſhip't that all the day after; a chooſing of perſwaſions as country men chuſe Valentines, that which they chance to meet with firſt after their coming abroad.

Sect. 25. Beſides theſe, many other things it may be, and ſo, 1. 'tis odds enough that it will not be conſcience, which pretends to be ſo, and 2. it is certainly not conſcience, unleſs it produce ſome law for its rule to direct us by. And this was the *Negative* or *firſt* thing.

Sect. 26. The ſecond or the Poſitive thing which follows from the premiſſes, is this, that Conſcience of duty in any particular action is to be ruled by that law which is proper to that action; as for example: The *Chriſtian law* is the rule of Conſcience for Chriſtian actions; the *law of reaſon*, or moral law, for moral; the *law national*, municipal, or local, for civil; the *natural law of all creatures*, for natural actions; and the *law of ſcandal*, (a branch of the Chriſtian law) for matters of ſcandal; and the *law of liberty*, for indifferent free actions. And as it is very irregular, and unreaſonable to meaſure any action by a rule that belongs not to it, to try the exactneſs of the circle by the ſquare, which ſhould be done by the compaſs, and in like manner to judge the Chriſtianneſs of an action, by the law of natural reaſon, which can only be judged by its conformity with the law of Chriſt, ſuperiour to that of nature; So will there be no juſt pretence of Conſcience againſt any thing, but where ſome one or more of theſe laws are producible againſt it; but on the other ſide, even in the loweſt ſort of actions, if they be regulated by the law proper to them, and nothing done contrary to any ſuperiour law, even by this God ſhall be glorified, 1 *Cor.* 10. 31. a kind of glory reſulting to God from that readineſs of ſubmiſſion and ſubordination of every thing to its proper rule, and law, to which the great Creator hath ſubjected it, and of all laws to that ſupreme tranſcendent one, the law of Chriſt. And though ſome touches there are in the Scripture of each of theſe laws, ſome *fibræ* or ſtrings of them diſcernible there, ſo far, that there is nothing almoſt under any of the heads foremention'd, but by the Scripture ſome general account may be given of it, and again, though that of Scripture be the ſupreme law of all, and nothing authorizable by any inferiour law, which is contradicted or prohibited by that, yet is not that of Scripture ſuch a particular Code or Pandect of all laws, as that every thing which is commanded by any other law, ſhould be found commanded there, or be bound to prove it ſelf juſtifiable from thence, any further than that it is not there prohibited, or thereby juſtly concluded to be unlawful.

Sect. 27. From whence by the way, I conceive direction may be had, and reſolution of that difficult practical probleme, what a man ſhould do in caſe he be legally commanded by his lawful ſuperiour to do what he may lawfully do, which yet he is perſwaded he may not do, or doubteth whether he may or no. For in this caſe if he be not able to produce ſome plain prohibition from ſome ſuperiour law, as from that of Scripture, he cannot be truly ſaid to be perſwaded in conſcience, (which implies knowledge) of the unlawfulneſs of that thing, nor conſequently hath he any plea for diſobedience, to that lawful command of his Superiour. All that may be ſaid, is, that he may from ſome obſcure place miſunderſtood have cauſe or occaſion to doubt whether he may do it or no; and then, although doubting ſimply taken (*i. e.* where no command interpoſes,) may keep me from doing what I doubt, yet it ought not to be of that weight, as to keep me from my lawful Superiours lawful command, becauſe that very command is a ſufficient ground to ſuperſede my doubting, when I have no plain prohibition of Scripture to the contrary, (which in this caſe I am ſuppoſed not to have, for if I had, Then, firſt, it were not a lawful command, and ſecondly, I ſhould not doubt, but be aſſured) it being my duty, and part of my Chriſtian meekneſs, in doubtful matters to take my reſolution from thoſe whom God hath placed over me, and it being the ſin of dogmatizing to affirm any thing unlawful for me or others to do, which ſome law of God, *&c.* ſtill in force, doth not prohibit; which ſin being added to that other of diſobedience to my lawful Superiours, will ſure never be able to make that commence vertue, which was before ſo far from any pretenſions to that title.

Sect. 28. Having proceeded thus far in the ſearch of the ground of Conſcience, 'twere now time to reduce this operation to practice, and ſhew you, 1. What directions Conſcience is able to afford from every of thoſe laws for the ruling of all actions of that kind, and ſecondly, what an harmony and conſpiration there is betwixt all theſe laws, one mutually aiding and aſſiſting the other, and not violating or deſtroying. But this were the largeſt undertaking that could be pitcht on in the whole circle of learning, *Ævodius*'s *Pandectæ rerum ab omni ævo judicatarum*, and all the Schoolmens and Caſuiſts volumes, *de legibus*, *de jure & juſtitiâ*, and on the decalogue, would be but imperfect parts of this; I ſhall give you but one taſt or δεῖγμα of it, by which the reader will be perſwaded to ſpare me, or rather himſelf that trouble.

Sect. 29. The prime of theſe, the Chriſtian law, is the rule of all actions that come within that ſphere, ſets down the nature of all Chriſtian duties of *piety*, and *love* of our brethren in general, and more particularly of *Faith*, *Hope*, *Charity*, *Repentance*, *ſelf-denial*, *taking up the Croſs*, &c. of *humility*, *meekneſs*, *mercifulneſs*, *peaceableneſs*, *obedience to* ſuperiours, *patience*, *contentedneſs*, and the like; and the relation of a Chriſtian being a grand tranſcendent relation, there is no action imaginable, but may either in reſpect of the *matter*, or *motive*, or *principle*, or *circumſtances*, offend againſt one of theſe, (and then, *malum ex quolibet defectu*, the leaſt of theſe defects blemiſheth it) and ſo conſcience directed by that rule or law, will direct me either to do it, or not to do it in that manner, and then 'tis not any compliance with, or agreeableneſs to any or all other laws, which will make this action Chriſtian, which hath any ſuch notable defect or blemiſh in it; Not to purſue this any farther, having thus named it, and ſhewed you the vaſtneſs of the ſea it leads to, it will ſuffice to our preſent deſign to tell you, that from what is ſaid, theſe 3. corollaries, to omit many others, will be deducible.

1. That

1. That it is not poſſible for Conſcience (be it never ſo ſtrongly perſwaded) to make any action lawful, which is not regulated by thoſe rules, or laws which are proper to it, and reconcileable with the grand rule, the Chriſtian law. Conſcience can never transform *profaneneſs* into *piety*, *ſacriledge* into *juſtice* or *holineſs*, *rebellion* into *obedience*, *faction* into *humility*, *perjury*, or taking of unlawful oaths into *religion*, *rapine* into *contentedneſs*, *inhumanity* into *mercifulneſs*, *adultery*, *fornication*, *divorces*, (ſave in caſe of adultery) or any *uncleanneſs* into *purity*, *labouring to ſhake a Kingdom*, (to remove the croſs from my own ſhoulders to another mans) into *taking up of the Croſs*; but contrarywiſe, if it be truly and univocally Conſcience of duty, it will tell me that every one of theſe foul titles belongs to every ſuch action (the ſcripture being ſo clear in theſe particulars, that there is no place or excuſe for ignorance or miſtake) and by ſetting before me the *terrors of the Lord*, *perſwade* me not to venture on any one ſuch action upon any terms; or if I have ventured, it will ſmite and wound me for it, and drive me to timely Repentance; or if it do not, 'tis either a cauterized *inſenſate conſcience*, a *reprobate mind*, or elſe ſome of theſe *Images*, which even now I mentioned, miſtaken for Conſcience; or if it be a *full perſwaſion* of mind, that what I thus am about, I am obliged to do, (if that be a poſſible thing in ſuch matters and under ſo much light) 'tis then in the calmeſt ſtile an erroneous Conſcience, which is ſo far from excuſing me (unleſs in caſe of ignorance truly invincible, which here is not imaginable) that it brings upon me the moſt unparallel'd infelicity in the world, an obligation to ſin which way ſoever I turn my ſelf, on one ſide appearing and lying at my door the guilt of committing that ſin which I have ſo miſtaken, and on the other the guilt of omitting that (though ſin) which my Conſcience repreſented to me as duty; and nothing but repentance and reformation of judgment firſt, and then of practice, will be able to retrive the one or the other. *Sect.* 30.

The ſecond Corollary will be this; That 'tis the moſt unreaſonable inſolence in the world, for them that can ſwallow ſuch Camel-ſins as theſe without any regrets, nay with full approbation, and direction (perhaps) of Conſcience (if that may be called *Conſcience* which is ſo divided from, and contrary to *knowledge*) yet to ſcruple and interpoſe doubts moſt tremblingly, and moſt conſcientiouſly in matters of indifferency not ſo much as pretended to be againſt the word of God, (and ſo within the law of Chriſtian liberty, that they may be done if we will) and yet over and above their natural indifferency commanded by that authority, in ſubjection to which the Chriſtian vertue of obedience conſiſts; and all this either Firſt upon no ground of Conſcience at all, but only that 'tis contrary to their *Phancy*, their *Humour*, their *Prepoſſeſſions*; or Secondly becauſe it is a reſtraint upon their Chriſtian liberty, which yet Chriſt never forbad to be reſtrained *quoad exercitium*, *as far as belongs to the exerciſe of it*, but hath permitted ſometime the care of not *offending the weak brother*, *i. e.* Charity, and ſometime Obedience, to lawful ſuperiours, to reſtrain it, (for if in things indifferent they may not reſtrain, there can no obedience be payed to them;) or Thirdly becauſe they are offenſive (though not to them, yet) to others, who are perſwaded they are unlawful, Whereas firſt, that perſwaſion of thoſe others is erroneous, and not ſufficient to juſtify diſobedience in themſelves, much leſs in other men, in caſe of lawful humane command. And ſecondly, that their cenſuring of ſuch indifferent actions, *i. e.* being *angry without a cauſe*, may be greater matter of ſcandal, and ſo more offenſive to others, and more probable to work upon them to bring them by that example to be ſo angry alſo, than the doing that indifferent action, miſtaken by others, and condemned for unlawful, would be to bring them to tranſcribe that reprobated ſamplar, *i. e.* to do what they thus condemn; all men being far more apt and inclinable to break out into paſſions, than into acts againſt Conſcience, and ſo more likely to be ſcandalized or offended, or inſnared, by following the former, than the latter example, to ſin (for company or after another man) by cenſuring whom he cenſures, which is being angry without a cauſe, then by doing what they are adviſed and reſolved they ought not to do, which is ſinning againſt Conſcience. Or fourthly becauſe they are againſt their Conſcience to do, whilſt yet they produce no law of God or man againſt them, and ſo in effect confeſs there is nothing in them againſt conſcience; unleſs, as before was noted, they wilfully æquivocate in the word *Conſcience*; which will and skill of theirs, as it will not make any thing unlawful, which before was indifferent, ſo will it not conclude ought, ſave only this, that they which are ſo artificious to impoſe on others, and form ſcruples where there were none, would not be thought the likelieſt men to ſwallow groſs ſins under the diſguiſe of vertues, or if they do ſo, will have leaſt right to that only antidote of invincible ignorance to digeſt them. *Sect.* 31.

The third Corollary will be this, that ſcrupulouſneſs of conſcience in ſome lighter leſs important matters (if it may be ſuppoſed excuſable, as a weakneſs of an uninſtructed mind, joined with that good ſymptom of tenderneſs or quick ſenſe, yet) can never hope to be accepted by God by way of commutation or expiation for groſſer ſins, ſo that he that falls foully in any confeſſed ſin, ſhould fare the better at the great day of account, or be in leſs danger of being caſt out of Gods favour for the preſent, becauſe he is over ſcrupulous in other things. For ſure this were a ſtrange way of ſupererogation to pay one arrear to God by running into another with him, to diſcharge a debt by owing more. And yet this is an errour which may ſeem worth the pains of preventing, it being ſo notoriouſly ſeen, that ſome men, which profeſs to have care of their ways, and muſt in charity be believed to have ſo, go on confidently in grievous ſins, which they cannot but know will damn without repentance, (the ſentence of not inheriting the Kingdom of God, *Gal.* 5. being ſo diſtinct, and punctual, and abſolute, and indiſpenſable againſt them) and yet have no antidote to rely on for the averting that danger, but only this of their exactneſs and ſcrupulouſneſs in things indifferent; which if they ſhall ſay they do not confide in, they are then obliged in conſcience, and charity to their brethren (who may follow them to this precipice) either to give over hoping, or to ſet to purifying, without which there is no true ground of hope. This hint puts me in mind, that there is another part of my deſign ſtill behind, belonging to the ſecond notion of Conſcience, to examine. *Sect.* 32.

What 'tis that is required to entitle a man to a good Conſcience; which will briefly be ſtated by premiſing what before was mentioned, that the Good Conſcience belongs either to *particular* ſingle performances, *Sect.* 33.

performances, or to the *whole ſtate of life* and actions. To the firſt there is no more required, but that that particular action be both for matter and circumſtance regulated by the rule, or rules which are proper to it, and have nothing contrary to any ſuperiour tranſcendent rule. As that my *meat* be with *ſobriety* and *thankſgiving*, my *alms* with *chearfulneſs*, *liberality*, *diſcretion*, done in *gratitude* and *obedience* to God, and *mercifulneſs* to my brother, without reflexion on my own *gain* or *praiſe* in this world. But for the *Good Conſcience*, which belongs to the whole ſtate of life and actions which is called *a good Conſcience in all things*, *Heb.* 13. 18. or a *good Conſcience* conſiſting in having *a good converſation in all things*, (for ſo the * punctation in the Greek will direct rather to render it, [*we have a good conſcience, willing to live well*, (or have an honeſt converſation) *in all things*]) there the difficulty will be greater. And yet two Texts there are which tend much to the clearing and diſinvolving of that one, 1 *Pet.* 3. 16. where ἀγαθὴ συνείδησις, *Good Conſcience* in the beginning of the verſe, is explained in the cloſe by ἀγαθὴ ἐν χριστῷ ἀναστροφὴ, *a good Converſation in Chriſt*, or a good Chriſtian converſation, or ſuch as now through Chriſt, by the purport of the ſecond Covenant may and ſhall be accepted for good. Where the word [*converſation*] denoting firſt the actions and behaviour both toward God and man, and ſecondly, the whole courſe and frame of thoſe actions, (wherein it ſeems a good Conſcience conſiſts,) cannot better be explained than either by the Apoſtles ἀκριβῶς περιπατεῖν, an *accurate exact walking*, *Eph.* 5. 15. or the phraſe to *Titus*, *c.* 2. 12. *living ſoberly and righteouſly and godly in this preſent world*; the firſt reſpecting our duty to our ſelves, or actions, as private men, the ſecond, our duty to our brethren, in our more publick capacities, the third, our duty to God as creatures, men, and Chriſtians; or Saint *Luke*'s character of *Zachary* and *Elizabeth*, *Luke* 1. 6. *Walking in all the Commandments and Ordinances of the Lord blameleſs*; *Walking Blameleſs*, *In all: Univerſal ſincere obedience*, (not entire or perfect without ever ſinning, but) conſidered with the rules of ἐπιείκεια, or *moderation of ſtrict law*, (which is now part of the νόμος πίστεως, the *Goſpel-law*, by which a Chriſtian is to be tryed, as *equity* is a part of the *municipal law* of this land; Such is mercy for frailties, and infirmities, and groſſer lapſes recovered and retracted by repentance) now under the Goſpel, ſo as to be acceptable to God in Chriſt; which was intimated (as in the ἐν χριστῷ, *in Chriſt*, 1 *Pet.* 3. ſo) in the former part of that verſe, and their character δίκαιοι ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ, *righteous before God*. Which phraſe [*Before God*] hath a double intimation worth obſerving in this place, firſt of the perſeverance or perpetuity of that righteouſneſs (as oppoſed to the temporary of the hypocrite) for the phraſe, ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ [*before him*] refers to the ſhew-bread of old, *Exod.* 25. 30. *which was to be ſet before God alway*; and therefore is ſometime called לחם פנים the *bread of faces*, or לפני *bread before his face*, literally ἐνώπιον, *before him*, and ſometimes, לחם תמיד *perpetual bread*, and ſecondly, of the acceptation or reception in the ſight of God, for that again was the end of ſetting the *bread always before God*, that God looking on it might accept them; and ſo *righteouſneſs before God*, is ſuch righteouſneſs as God will pleaſe in the Goſpel to accept of, as when *viſiting the fatherleſs*, &c. *Jac.* 1. 27. is called, *religion pure and undefiled before God the Father*; it noteth ſuch a degree of unblemiſh't purity, not as excluded all ſin, but as God in Chriſt would (or hath promiſed to) accept of. And the ſame phraſe therefore is in another place of the ſame Chapter, *Luke* 1. 75. rendred by our Church in the Goſpel for Midſummer day by theſe words, *ſuch as may be acceptable for him*.

* καλὴν συνείδησιν ἔχοιμεν, ἐν πᾶσι καλῶς θέλοντες ἀναστρέφεσθαι.

Sect. 34. Which being all taken into the deſcription of a good conſcience, that *it is ſuch a continued good converſation as God now under the Goſpel promiſeth to accept of*; the only difficulty behind will be, what that is which God promiſeth to accept of; To which end, it will be very inſtrumental to take in that other place which I promiſed, and that is that forementioned, *Heb.* 13. 18. where the *Good Conſcience* is evidenced (or the ground of confidence that he hath a good conſcience, demonſtrated) by this [ἐν πᾶσι καλῶς θέλοντες ἀναστρέφεσθαι, *willing*, or reſolving, or endeavouring *to live honeſtly*, or to have honeſt converſation *in all things*. From whence the only thing which I deſire to collect is this, That the *ſincere reſolution or endeavour to live honeſtly in all things* (which I remember, one of our ancienteſt Church-writers Saint *Cyril* of *Jeruſalem* calls, θέλημα δικαιοπραγεῖν, and oppoſes it to ἔργα, works) *is the Scripture-nomination of a good Conſcience*, or the μέγας παῤῥησίας θησαυρὸς, *that great treaſure of confidence* to all which have it; that ground of mature perſwaſion for any, that he hath, or ſhall by God be allowed, and acknowledged to have a *good Conſcience*.

Sect. 35. And if it be farther demanded, what is neceſſarily required, (and how much will be ſufficient) to denominate a man Such, what is the *minimum quod ſic* of this ſincere reſolution, or endeavour, although that, I confeſs, will be hard, if not impoſſible, to define in ſuch a manner, as ſhall come home to every particular, (the proportions of more or leſs *knowledge* or *ſtrength*, the inequality of the talents of *illuminating* and *aſſiſting* grace ſtill interpoſing and making a variation) yet will it not be matter of much difficulty to give ſome general advertiſements, and πρόληψις, which will be acknowledged as ſoon as mentioned, and being put together, and by each man ſingly applyed to his particular caſe, by way of ſelf-examination, will be able to tell him in ſome meaſure, whether he hath a good Conſcience or no. And the firſt of theſe will be. That,

Sect. 36. Acts and habits of ſin in the former (heathen or unregenerate) part of the life, of what nature (and clothed with what aggravations) ſoever, if they are now retracted and renounced by repentance (as that ſignifies not only a *ſorrow*, but a thorow *change*) are reconcileable with a good conſcience. The truth of which is clear, firſt, becauſe the Goſpel allows place for *repentance*, and promiſes *reſt to the heavy laden*, ſo he *come unto Chriſt*, and *mercy* to him that *confeſſeth and forſaketh*. Secondly, becauſe the ſincerity of reſolution and indeavour *now*, (which is all that is required to a preſent good Conſcience) is reconcileable with *paſt ſins*, even of the largeſt ſize. Thirdly, becauſe Saint *Paul* himſelf, which was once a *Saul*, can yet ſay confidently, that *he hath a good Conſcience*. And Fourthly, becauſe (which I ſhall a little enlarge on) the ſin againſt the Holy Ghoſt, which alone is by the Goſpel made uncapable of remiſſion, is as I conceive, no act, no nor courſe of any ſpecial ſin, but a ſtate of final impenitence, a continued perſevering reſiſtance of all thoſe ſaving methods which are conſequent to the deſcent, and are parts of the office of the Holy Ghoſt.

μεταμέλεια. μετάνοια.

To

To which purpoſe I ſhall give you one hint which may perſwade the preferring of this opinion before the contrary, and it is by obſerving the occaſion of Chriſts delivering thoſe words concerning the irremiſſibleneſs of ſpeaking againſt the holy Ghoſt. Thoſe words are delivered by Chriſt both in St. *Matthew* and St. *Mark* upon occaſion of that ſpeech of the Jews, that Chriſt *Caſt out Devils, by the Prince of Devils*, which was clearly a blaſpheming or ſpeaking contumeliouſly againſt Chriſt himſelf, or the *ſon of man*, and there is no paſſage in the text which can conclude that that ſpeech of theirs was by Chriſt called the *blaſphemy againſt the holy Ghoſt*, but rather the contrary that it was a *blaſphemy only againſt the ſon of man*; for 'tis apparent that Chriſt *Mat.* 12. 15. for the ſpace of ſix verſes ſets himſelf to convince them of the falſity of that ſpeech (which probably he would not have done, if they, to whom he ſpake, had been in an irrecoverable irreverſible eſtate of blaſphemy.) For that he ſhould take ſuch pains only to leave them unexcuſable, firſt there was no great need, in this caſe they were ſo already: ſecondly 'tis a miſtake to think that Chriſt doth ſo at any time, they are bowels of mercy and not deſigns of miſchieving, or accumulating their ſin, and judgments, which incline him to call and knock, and labour to convince ſinners, and having done that, doth both invite them to repentance by ſhewing them the poſſibility of pardon yet, and give them an admonition able to ſhake them out of all impenitence, by telling them the danger which attended, if the only laſt method of working on them which was yet behind, did not proſper with or work upon them. This is the importance of that 31. and 32. verſe concerning *the ſpeaking a word, i. e.* ſtanding out *againſt the ſon of man* on one ſide, and *the holy Ghoſt* on the other; the ſum of which is this, there ſhall be by the coming of the holy Ghoſt a poſſibility of pardon and means of reformation for thoſe that reſiſt and hold out and even crucify Chriſt (as by the coming of Chriſt, there was for thoſe that ſhould believe on him, though they had formerly lived diſobedient unto God the Father, reſiſted thoſe methods of mercy uſed on them under the Old Teſtament) for *them that ſpeak a word, i. e.* by an Hebraiſm do an action (of affront, of injury, of contumely) *againſt Chriſt*, yea that reſiſt and believe not on him, but conceive and affirm him to *caſt out Devils by the power of Beelzebub* (which was as contumelious a thing as could be ſaid of him) but when Chriſt ſhall be taken from the earth, and the holy Ghoſt ſhall be ſent down to convince the world of that great ſin of crucifying Chriſt, and to ſettle in the Church of God ſuch an orderly uſe of all Goſpel-means that may tend to the bringing ſinners to repentance (the uſe both of the *word* and *ſacrament* and *cenſures* and all other things neceſſary to that great end of working on the moſt contumacious) that if this prevail not, there is little hope left of ever working on ſuch perverſeneſs, then 'tis to be reſolved, that thoſe that thus ſtand out againſt all thoſe ſaving methods of Gods laſt œconomy, ſhall be left uncapable of any good, of any whether means of yet-farther-working on them, or of pardon either in the Church or in Heaven, there being no more perſons in the God-head now behind (unleſs we will change the Chriſtians Trinity into *Pythagoras's* τετρακτυν) nor conſequently means in the providence of God, for the reducing of, or obtaining mercy for ſuch. By this 'twill appear that this blaſphemy againſt the holy Ghoſt is not any one act, no nor habit of ſin (particularly not that ſpeaking againſt Chriſt there, which you will alſo gheſs by Saint *Luke*, who mentions not that ſpeech of theirs concerning his caſting out Devils by the Prince of Devils, and yet ſets down this ſpeech of Chriſt, of the irremiſſibility of this blaſphemy againſt the holy Ghoſt, *Luke* 12. 10. which argues that this hath no near relation to that) but a final holding out againſt, and reſiſting the whole office of the holy Ghoſt, and all thoſe gracious methods conſequent to it. *Sect.* 37.

To which I ſhall only adde in reference to my preſent purpoſe (that there may be no place of doubting even to him which will not receive my interpretation of this place) that even by thoſe which conceive it to be ſome ſpecial kind of ſin, yet the unpardonableneſs of it is acknowledged to ariſe from thence, that 'tis impoſſible for any ſuch to repent, yet not for any that repents, to find pardon and mercy, which is ſufficient for the confirmation of my preſent propoſition. *Sect.* 38.

'Tis true indeed, that he that is ſold a ſlave of ſin, the unregenerate carnal man, is, whilſt he is ſo, in a moſt hopeleſs, comfortleſs eſtate, and if he have any natural conſcience left him it muſt needs be a kind of fiend and fury within him, *No peace to* ſuch *wicked, ſaith my God*, and 'tis as true that the recovery of ſuch a man out of the grave of rottenneſs, that Lazar-ſtate in ſin, is a miracle of the firſt magnitude, a work of greateſt difficulty (Chriſt *groans* at the raiſing of him that was four *days* dead *and putrified in the grave*) and coſts the ſinner much dearer to be raiſed out of it. *Saul is ſtruck down* in his march towards *Damaſcus*, *blind* and *trembling* before his converſion; but yet ſtill when this converſion is wrought, he may have a *good Conſcience*, what ever his fore-going ſins were.

And although the Apoſtles Cenſure *Heb.* 6. 6. and 10. 26. light yet heavyer upon thoſe who after *the knowledge of the truth and guſt of the life to come, and participation of the holy ſpirit relapſe* to their former *ſins*, it being there affirmed that there is no *poſſibility to renew* them, or (as the Greeks read it) *for them to renew* or recover *to repentance*, and conſequently *the ſacrifice for* ſin [ὐκ ἔτι ἀπολείπεται] no longer belonging to or *remaining for them*, yet doth not this hinder the truth of the preſent propoſition; for firſt thoſe places to the Hebrews belong not to the ſins of the unregenerate life, which only now we ſpeak of, but of the relapſe after the knowledge of the truth, ſecondly, even in thoſe places ſpeaking of thoſe ſins, the doctrine is not, that there ſhall be any difficulty of obtaining pardon for them upon repentance, (for the Subject of the Apoſtles propoſitions is the παραπεσόντες and ἁμαρτάνοντες men conſidered excluſively to repentance, as abiding in ſin unreformed impenitent, and to ſuch we deſign not to allow mercy) but that this is ſo great a grieving and quenching of the ſpirit of God, that it becometh very difficult, and in ordinary courſe *impoſſible* for them that are guilty of it to repent, πάλιν ἀναλανίζειν εἰς μετάνοιαν, *again to recover to repentance*: It being juſt and ordinary with God upon ſuch ſins of thoſe to whom he hath given grace, to withdraw that grace again according to his method and œconomy of providence expreſt in the parable of the talents, [from *him that hath not* made uſe of the grace or talent given, *ſhall be taken away even that which he hath*,] and *Wiſd.* 1. 5. *the holy ſpirit of diſcipline will not abide where unrighteouſneſs cometh in*, and ſo being thus deprived of that grace, 'tis conſequently impoſſible that thoſe ſhould ἀναλανίζειν, in a neutral ſence, *renew* and *recover*, or in an active reciprocal *renew or recover themſelves, to repentance*, though yet *Sect.* 39. ἀναλανίζειν.

for

for God to give a new ſtock of grace it is not impoſſible, but only a thing which he hath not by revealed promiſe obliged himſelf to do; and therefore whether he will do it, or no, is merely in his own hand and diſpoſitive power, and that which no man hath ground to hope and title to challenge from him. All which notwithſtanding our preſent propoſition ſtands firm, that where there is repentance, or true thorow-change, thoſe former retracted acts or habits are reconcileable with good Conſcience.

Sect. 40. The ſecond this, that *Sins of weakneſs of all kinds*, whether firſt, of ignorance, or ſecondly, of natural infirmity, the one for want of light, the other for want of grace, or thirdly, of ſuddain ſurreption, ſuch as both by the law of [*Si quis præcipiti calore*] in the Code of *Juſtinian*, and by the municipal laws of moſt nations, are matter of extenuation to ſome crimes, to diſcharge them from capital puniſhment, at leaſt to make them capable of pardon, or fourthly, of daily continual incurſion, either for want of ſpace to deliberate at all, or becauſe 'tis morally impoſſible to be upon the guard to be deliberate always, (*opere in longo fas eſt obrepere ſomnum*) or fifthly, which through levity of the matter paſſes by undiſcerned, and the like, are reconcileable with a good Conſcience, becauſe again, be a man never ſo ſincerely reſolute and induſtrious in endeavour to abſtain from all ſin, yet as long as he carries *fleſh* about him, (which is ſuch a principle of weakneſs, that ordinarily in the New Teſtament, the word *fleſh* is ſet to ſignify *weakneſs*) ſuch weakneſſes he will be ſubject to, ſuch frailties will be ſure to drop from him. This, I remember, *Pariſienſis* illuſtrates handſomely, firſt, by the ſimilitude of an armed man provided with ſtrength and proweſs, and wreſtling with another *in lubrico*, on a ſlippery ground, who though neither weapons nor ſtrength nor courage fail him, yet may he very probably fall, the ſlipperneſs of the footing will betray him to that; or ſecondly, by an horſeman mounted on an unmanaged or tender-mouth'd horſe, who cannot with all his skill and caution ſecure himſelf from all miſadventures, the beaſt may upon a check come over with him, or getting the bit upon the tooth run into the enemies quarters; or thirdly, by a City that is provided for a ſiege with works and men, and victuals, and ammunition, and yet by a treacherous party within may be betrayed into the enemies hands; There is a principle of weakneſs within like that ſlippery pavement, that tender-mouthed beaſt, that inſidious party, which will make us ſtill liable to ſuch miſcarriages, and nothing in this contrary either to courage or diligence, to reſolution, or indeavour. And for ſuch as theſe frailties, ignorances, infirmities, *&c.* So they be laboured againſt, and the means of preventing or overcoming them ſincerely uſed (which if it be done, you ſhall find them daily wayn in you, and if they do not ſo in ſome meaſure, you have reaſon to ſuſpect, and to double your diligence) there is ſure mercy in Chriſt to be had, obtainable, by daily confeſſion, and ſorrow, and prayer for forgiveneſs of treſpaſſes) without any compleat conqueſt atchieved over them in this life. It being St. *Pauls* affirmation, very exactly and critically ſet down *Rom.* 5. 6. that Chriſt ὄντων ἡμῶν ἔτι ὄν, ὄντας ἀσεβῶν ἀπέθανε, *we being weak*, died for the ungodly, to note the univerſal benefit of his death for ſuch *weak ones* and ſuch ſins as theſe to which mere *weakneſs* betrays them.

συγγνώμων ἐν τῷ ἁμαρτῶν ἀνθρωπίνως λήγοντα. *Thucyd.* l. 3. p. 198. and σύγγνωμον δ' ἔδοξε τὸ ἀκούσιον, ἅτε ἑκόντες μὲν οὐκ ἐλάσσαν. *Ibid.*

Hooper. The very doctrine which from that text at the beginning of our reformation our Reverend Biſhop Martyr did aſſert in his excellent preface to his explication of the commandments.

Sect. 41. To which purpoſe I ſhall only add one proof more, taken from the τὸ λογικὸν or rational importance of Saint *Pauls* exhortation, *Rom.* 15. 1. *We that are ſtrong*, ſaith he, *muſt bear the weakneſſes*, ἀσθενήματα, *of them which are not ſtrong*, ἀδυνάτων; and not pleaſe *our ſelves*, for v. 3. *Chriſt did not ſo, but* &c. which reaſon ſure muſt come home to both parts, the affirmative as well as the negative (or elſe the Logick will not be good) and ſo the affirmative be, *that Chriſt bare the infirmities of the weak*; and ſo again *v.* 7. [προσελάβετο ἡμᾶς] applied to the ſame matter *he took us up when we were thus fallen.* I might add more, but I hope rather that I have ſaid too much in ſo plain a point, and abundantly evinced the reconcileableneſs of ſuch frailties with a good Conſcience.

Sect. 42. A third thing is, that *The luſting of the fleſh againſt the ſpirit* is reconcileable with a good Conſcience, ſo it be in him that *walketh in the ſpirit*, obeys the deſires and dictates of that, and *fulfilleth not the luſts of the fleſh*, *Gal.* 5. 16, 17. There is no ſpiritually good thing that a man ever doth in his life, but the fleſh hath ſome mutinyings, luſtings, and objections, againſt it, there being ſuch a contrariety, betwixt the commands of Chriſt and the deſires of the fleſh, that no man, which hath thoſe two within him, *d th the* things that he would. (For ſo 'tis, ἵνα μὴ ποιῆτε, *that you do not*, not that you cannot do) [*The things that he would*] (*i. e.* the things, which either he reſolves to do, or takes delight in) thoſe he doeth not, *i. e.* either purely without ſome mixture, or ſtill without ſome oppoſition of the contrary, or (as again the place may be rendred,) this oppoſition of theſe two one againſt another tendeth to this, that we may not do, or to hinder us from doing every thing that we would, as indeed we ſhould do, were there not that oppoſition within our own breaſts. This is the meaning of that 17. verſe, which notwithſtanding it follows *v.* 18. that *if we be led by the ſpirit*, if that be victorious over the contrary pretender (as it may, though t'other luſt againſt it) if the production be not *works of the fleſh*, *adultery*, &c. v. 19. but the *fruit of the ſpirit*, *love*, *peace*, &c. v. 22. *againſt ſuch there is no law, no condemnation*, no accuſation of Conſcience here, or hereafter.

Sect. 43. For it muſt be obſerved, that there is great difference betwixt *this luſting of the fleſh againſt the* ſpirit in them that are *led by the ſpirit*, *Gal.* 5. and the *warring of the law in the Members againſt the law in the mind*, which *bring th into captivity to the law of ſin*, *i. e.* to it ſelf, *Rom.* 7. For thoſe in whom that latter is to be found are there ſaid to be *Carnal*, ſold under ſin (as a ſlave was wont *ſub haſtâ* to be ſold) and ſo ἄγεσθαι ὑπὸ σαρκὸς to be led by the fleſh and fulfil the luſts of the fleſh, which is of all things moſt unreconcileable with that mans ſtate, againſt whom *there is no condemnation in Chriſt*, *Rom.* 8. 1. and ſo with a *good Conſcience.*

Sect. 44. And if the reſiſtance of the *mind*, or the *law moral*, of the *ſpirit*, or the *law Chriſtian*, be ſufficient to excuſe that action or habitual courſe which is committed and lived in, in oppoſition to both of theſe, or while both of theſe check and contradict, then ſure are ſins againſt Conſcience become (if not the moſt excuſable ſins, yet) the more excuſable for this, that they are againſt Conſcience; that woulding or contending of the *mind*, or the *law of the mind* being no other but the dictate of the inſtructed Conſcience, (in them which know the law, *Rom.* 7. 1.) which he that obeys not but follows the

the law or command of ſin againſt it, hath not ſure a good Conſcience, in our ſecond ſence as that ſignifies a Conſcience of well-doing or doing nothing againſt rule of Conſcience, for that this man *in terminis* is ſuppoſed to do.

Having now proceeded thus far in the affirmative part in ſhewing what ſins are reconcileable with a good Conſcience, I ſhould now proceed to the negative part and ſhew what are not reconcileable therewith. But before I advance to that, there is one claſſis or head of ſins, about which there is ſome queſtion and difficulty of reſolving, to which of the extreams it ſhould be reduced, *i. e.* whether it be reconcileable, or unreconcileable with a good Conſcience. And that is the ſingle Commiſſion of ſome act of known ſin, which hath not the Apology of weakneſs to excuſe it, and yet is not indulged or perſiſted, or continued in, (for of thoſe that are ſo, you ſhall hear anon in the 8. propoſition) but without delay retracted by humiliation and reformation; For the ſtating and ſatisfying of which 'twill be neceſſary firſt, to obſerve that, *Sect.* 45.

Any ſuch act of willful ſin, *Firſt*, hath in it ſelf a being, and ſo is capable of a notion abſtracted from the retraction of it. Yea ſecondly, is a work of ſome time, and though it be never ſo ſuddainly retracted by repentance, yet ſome ſpace there is before that retractation; and if we ſpeak of that time or ſpace, there is no doubt, but that act, firſt, is contrary to good conſcience, and contracts a guilt, and conſequent to that, the diſpleaſure of God and obligation to puniſhment, which nothing but repentance can do away; yea and ſecondly, is a natural means of weakening that habit of good, of ſauciating and wounding the ſoul, and for that time putting it in a bloudy direful condition, and ſhould God before repentance ſtrike, for ought we know there would be no remiſſion, and ſo, fearful would be the end of that ſoul. *Sect.* 46.

But then ſecondly, if before God thus viſit in juſtice, repentance interpoſe, (as in this preſent caſe we ſuppoſe it doth) if this plank be caught hold on inſtantly upon the ſhipwrack, if he that hath committed this act of carnality, *&c.* lye not down (after the manner of the Grecian horſes in St. *Ambroſe*'s expreſſion, *qui cùm ceciderint, quandam tenent quietis & patientiæ diſciplinam, are taught, when they fall in the race, not to ſtrive or endeavour to get up again*, lye ſtill on the ground with great *ſtilneſs* and *patience*) *walk not after the fleſh*, *Rom.* 8. 1. Then preſently is he ſet right again in Gods favour, upon (performance of the ſolemnities, as it were, payment of the fees of the court) humiliation, contrition, confeſſion, and lowly ſupplications to God for pardon in Chriſt, and ſo then to him thus repaired there is *no condemnation*; beſide the forementioned effects that attended that ſin at the time, there is no future arrear behind in the other world. *Sect.* 47.

As for the other effect of ſin in this life, the waſting of the Conſcience, or provoking of God to withdraw his grace, though any ſuch act of wilful ſin may juſtly be thought to do that alſo in ſome degree, firſt, to ſtop God from going on in his current of liberality, and ſecondly, to caſt us back from that plenitude and abundance, which before in the riches of Gods bounty in Chriſt was afforded, and ſo much weaken our ſtock of grace, leave us much more infirm than we were before the commiſſion; yet we find not any threat in Scripture that God will, upon this provocation of one ſingle act not perſiſted in, preſently withdraw all grace, but we have reaſon to hope what the article of our Church ſuppoſes, that in this caſe he leaves ſufficient grace to enable that *child* of his that thus *falls*, *by* that his *grace to return again*. *Sect.* 48.

And if that ſad preſage, *Heb.* 6. 6. ſeem to any to withſtand this, the anſwer will be prompt and eaſy, by obſerving that the word παραπεσόντας, there [*the fallers away*] ſignifies more than ſome one ſingle act of ſin preſently retracted again, even a general apoſtaſy in their practice, (if not in their faith) a return to their former unregenerate ſins, (as the phraſe ἐμπλακέντες ἡττῶνται, [*they being entangled are overcome*] notes 2 *Pet.* 2. 20. a place perfectly parallel to this, and) as in this place the ancients have generally interpreted. And then though ſuch indulgence in ſin, ſuch *returning to the vomit* or *mire again* in that other place, do provoke God to withdraw his grace neceſſary to enable them to repent, yea and caſt them back into a *worſe* eſtate than they were in, not only before ſuch ſinning, but even before their converſion, 2 *Pet.* 2. 20. Yet that God will ſo puniſh with total deſertion any one act or commiſſion preſently retracted again, 'tis not affirmed here nor any where elſe, that I have obſerved, but rather on the contrary, that he will viſit them with chaſtiſements, which are a *grace* and a means to recal them, without any utter *forſaking or taking of his loving kindneſs from them*, Pſal. 89. 33, 35. *Sect.* 49.

That this matter may be throughly cleared, I ſhall ſuppoſe this objection made againſt what hath hitherto been ſaid of it, that it may ſeem by this doctrine, [that the regenerate man may be under Gods diſpleaſure] that he that remains ſanctified may be unjuſtified, for ſo he will be, if all his ſins be not forgiven him, which they are not, if this act of ſin not yet repented of, be not forgiven. In anſwer to this, I ſhall reinforce my affirmation, that of neceſſity it muſt be granted, if we believe the Scripture, that any ſuch act of ſin unretracted by repentance, doth certainly ſtand upon the ſinners ſcore unremitted; for that God (as ſome affirm) doth at the firſt act of my being juſtified forgive all my ſins not only paſt, preſent, but alſo future too, cannot be ſaid, but upon a ſuppoſition that that man will never commit any ſuch ſin againſt which the Goſpel threatens periſhing, *i. e.* any deliberate preſumptuous ſin, (which ſuppoſition if it were true, would infer an impoſſibility of the regenerate mans thus ſinning, not an aſſurance of his pardon without (or abſtracted from the conſideration of) his repentance, (which is the only point in hand) for if he do, then upon confeſſion and forſaking there is promiſe of mercy, and not otherwiſe, and in brief without repentance there is no remiſſion: and therefore 'tis obſervable, that they which thus affirm, find themſelves enforced to fly to Gods omnipotence and immenſity, to whom all things are preſent, by help of which they can conceive and reſolve that at the time of that ſins being upon him unrepented of, God yet ſeeing his future repentance as preſent, may ſeal his pardon, and then may by the ſame reaſon do ſo alſo before the commiſſion; the weakneſs of which arguing, I ſhall no farther demonſtrate than by this rejoinder, that by the ſame reaſon it might be ſaid, that a man is juſtified before he is born, which yet the objectors do not affirm, but that at the time of his firſt converſion, be it at ſuch a Sermon or the like, he was juſtified, and then all his ſins paſt, preſent, and to come forgiven him, which is as *Sect.* 50.

contrary

contrary to the notion of all things being preſent with God, as to ſay that this act of commiſſion is not forgiven till it be repented of, for ſure the time before that mans birth, and the time after it, are as truly preſent to God before all eternity, as the time of this commiſſion and that repentance.

Sect. 51. The only way for us to underſtand our ſelves or any thing that belongs to Gods actions concerning us, is that which the Scripture ſuppoſes and commands us to walk in, not the way of Gods ſecret counſels, (which if we knew, were no longer ſecret) not the way of Gods immenſity, (which if it were intelligible by us, were not immenſity) but the way of his revealed will, which is, that whenſoever the ſinner *repenteth* him of his ſin, and *amends* his life, he ſhall have his ſin *blotted out* and *put out of Gods remembrance*, *i. e.* forgiven unto him and not till then: and to ſuppoſe he may have remiſſion before ſuch repentance, is to ſuppoſe God perjur'd who ſwears he ſhall not, and to lay falſity to the Charge of the whole Goſpel, which reſolves, *except ye repent, ye ſhall all periſh.*

Sect. 52. To all this I might farther add that Gods juſtifying the faithful man, is the approving his fidelity upon trial of it, and ſo acquitting him (upon a δοκιμὴ or probation) from ſuſpicion of hypocriſy, pronouncing him faithful, or Evangelically righteous, and upon that, owning him as a friend, entering into League with him, as might appear by Gods *juſtifying Abraham and calling him friend* (in the ſence wherein they are Chriſts *friends*, *which do whatſoever he commands them*, ſo approve themſelves unto him) if it were now ſeaſonable to examine that buſineſs. This being ſuppoſed, it would be moſt evident, that ſuch an act of known deliberate ſin committed in time of trial, is quite contrary to *juſtification*, even as contrary as *Abrahams* refuſing to believe Gods promiſe firſt, or after to ſacrifice *Iſaac*, you may ſuppoſe would have been. Of which the leaſt that can be ſaid, will be this; that ſuch a failing is a ſhrewd blemiſh to ſincerity, which will make it neceſſary for him that is guilty of it, to repair his credit with God by expreſſing a great ſenſe of his miſcarriage, and by many future performances of conſtancy, and reſolution, if ever he hope to be approved, or *juſtified* by him.

Sect. 53. But now having thus far confirmed this, and ſo rather ſtrengthened, than weakned the objection, the next thing I ſhall deſire may be obſerved is this, that every non-remiſſion of a ſin for ſome time, every diſpleaſure of Gods, every not-imputing to righteouſneſs, is not an utter interciſion of juſtification, is not a calling all the former forgotten ſins to remembrance, for to ſuch only an Apoſtaſy, or continued falling away from God betrays the ſoul. For, the whole current of my life may approve my fidelity to God, though ſome one action be very contrary to it; Nay ſecondly a Father may be diſpleaſed with his Son for ſome one fault, and yet not diſinherit him, nay upon farther provocation he may caſt him out of his family, and yet afterward receive him into it again.

Sect. 54. So that there are three degrees obſervable in this matter, firſt diſpleaſure, ſecondly wrath, thirdly fury. Firſt withdrawing of the Fathers favour, ſuſpenſion of pardon, ſo 'tis in caſe of any ſuch ſingle act of ſin preſently repented of, conſidered before its retractation. Second, caſting out of the family, total interciſion of mercy for that preſent, ſo 'tis in caſe of ſuch ſin perſiſted in indulgently. Third, utter final irreverſible abdication, ſo 'tis in caſe of final obduration.

Sect. 55. This may be illuſtrated, firſt by a vulgar, then by an eccleſiaſtical reſemblance. Among friends firſt there may be a matter of quarrel, diſlike, diſpleaſure, and one friend juſtly frown upon the other, yea and keep ſome diſtance from him, and be really angry with him, for ſome act of injury done by him, contrary to the laws of friendſhip, which till he hath ſome way repaired, the friend may juſtly not pardon him, and ſo abſtain for that preſent from the former degree of familiarity with him: but then ſecondly the injurious friend may continue as injurious ſtill, and go on and perſiſt in that courſe of falſeneſs or unfriendlineſs, and then the injur'd friend wholly forſakes his company, breaks off thoſe bands of friendſhip with him, yet ſo as that upon the others relenting and amending, he may yet again return to him, and ſo that total ſeparation prove no final one: thirdly there is, upon obduration or no manner of relenting, a final irreverſible breach.

Sect. 56. The eccleſiaſtical reſemblance is, that of the three degrees of excommunication among the Jews, the firſt or loweſt, was *niddui* ſeparatiou, not total turning out of either ſacred or civil ſociety, but remotion to a diſtance, that the offender ſhould not come within four Cubits of any other, and ſo be denied the peace of the Church, and the familiar kind of Communion, which others enjoy. Above this there was *cherem* which was a total excluſion or diſtermination with anathemas or execrations joined with it, but yet was not final; then thirdly there was *Schammatha* giving up to deſtruction or deſolation, delivering up to Gods coming in judgment, and that was irreverſible.

Sect. 57. Now for the full ſatisfying of the argument, (having already ſhewed you the ſtate of this offender in reſpect of juſtification) it will only be neceſſary to add one thing more, that the ſtate of the ſame man as it reſpects ſanctification, is parallel and fully proportionable to the ſtate as it reſpects juſtification, and ſo the objection will quite fall to the ground.

Sect. 58. To the clearing of which you muſt know that ſanctification may be conceived in a double notion, firſt as a gift of Gods, ſecondly as a duty of mans: to prevent miſtake, this I mean; God gives the grace of Converſion and ſanctification, and he that is effectually wrought on by that grace, is converted and ſanctified, this is it which I mean, by the firſt notion of ſanctification, as it is a gift of Gods: But the man thus converted and ſanctified, *i. e.* thus wrought on and effectually changed by the ſpirit of God, is bound by the Goſpel-law, to operate according to this principle, to uſe this talent, and this is called, *to have grace*, *Heb.* 12. 28. *i. e.* to make uſe of it to the purpoſe there ſpecified of *ſerving God* εὐαρέστως (*i. e.* either *well pleaſedly*, chearfully, willingly, or *well pleaſingly*, ſo as God may and will accept) *in righteouſneſs and godly fear*, according to the notion of *Having* in the parable of the talents, where 'tis ſaid that *to him that hath ſhall be given*, *i. e.* to him which makes uſe of the talent intruſted to him, operates accordingly, doth what that enables him to do, offends not againſt it by idleneſs, or by commiſſion of contrary ſins, which he that doth, is the *non habens*, *he that hath not* there, from *which ſhall be taken away*, &c. And this having of grace is it which I mean by the ſecond notion of ſanctification, as it is a duty of mans, which I conceive is meant by the Apoſtle,

ſtle, when he ſaith, this *is the will of God, even your Sanctification*, and *he which hath this hope purifies himſelf*, and *let us cleanſe our ſelves from all filthineſſes perfecting holineſs*, all which places ſuppoſe the thing ſpoken of, to be the *duty* of man, which by the help of Chriſt *ſtrengthning* him, he is *able* to perform, and therefore upon the ſuppoſition of *Gods working in him both to will and to do*, to will, by ſanctifying, to do, by aſſiſting grace, he is incited and exhorted by the Apoſtle, *to work out his own ſalvation*.

This being thus cleared, 'twill be eaſily granted in the ſecond place, that every ſuch act of deliberate commiſſion as we now ſpeak of, is contrary to ſanctification in this latter notion, contrary to the *duty* of the ſanctified man, from which breach of duty it was, that we bound him before under that guilt, which nothing but repentance could rid him of, and if you mark it, that is the only thing which contracts a guilt, the doing ſomewhat contrary to *duty*, and ſo the want of this ſecond notion of Sanctification it is, the want of ſanctified operations, which interpoſes any rubs in the buſineſs of our juſtification, and not ſo properly that wherein God only was concerned, his not giving *grace*; guilt being ſtill a reſult from ſin, and ſin being a *breach of the law*, a contrariety to duty and not to guilt; and though he that hath not received the gift of ſanctification be not juſtified, yet the cauſe of his non-juſtification then, is not, in proper ſpeaking, Gods not having given him grace to ſanctify, (for that is but a negative thing, and cannot produce non-juſtification, which is in effect a poſitive thing by interpretation, ſignifying condemnation, two negatives making an affirmative, non-juſtifying being non-remitting of ſin, and that the actual imputing of it to condemnation) but the ſins of his former and preſent impenitent unſanctified life. *Sect.* 59.

This alſo being thus cleared, I ſhall only add a third thing, and then conclude this matter, that in the ſame proportion that any ſuch act of ſin doth unjuſtify, it doth unſanctify alſo, *i.e.* ſhake and waſt, though not utterly deſtroy, that ſanctified ſtate that before the man was in, by the gift and grace of God. *Sect.* 60.

For as there were three degrees of provocation in the matter of juſtification, ſo are there alſo in this of ſanctification, the firſt, *grieving the Spirit of God*, *Eph.* 4. 30. reſiſting it, traſhing of God in his courſe of grace and bounty towards us, putting our ſelves under *niddui*, as it were, in reſpect of Gods grace, as well as his favour, and ſo weakning our ſtock of ſanctity, and this the deliberate act of ſin may be thought to do. The ſecond, is *quenching of the Spirit*, 1 *Theſ.* 5. 19. putting it quite out, *rebelling and vexing his Holy Spirit*, *Iſ.* 63. 10. a total extinction of grace, the *Cherem* that brings the preſent curſe, or *anathema* along with it; and this is not done by one ſin not perſiſted in, but only by a habit or indulgent courſe of ſin; and the third, is the *deſpighting, or doing deſpight to the ſpirit of grace*, *Heb.* 10. 29. that which is proportioned to *Scammatha*, that makes the final irreverſible ſeparation between us and Gods ſanctifying grace; the firſt did not wholly deprive the ſinner of all grace, no nor of ſufficient to enable to repent; the ſecond did ſo for the preſent; the third did ſo finally alſo. *Sect.* 61.

If you will now demand what are the effects and conſequents of that diſpleaſure of God, which this ſingle act of ſin brings upon the offender; I anſwer, that I have in ſome meaſure anſwered that already, ſhewed you at the beginning many lugubrious effects of it; and if that be not ſufficient to ſatisfy you, or to ſhew the non-remiſſion of ſuch ſin till it be retracted by repentance, I ſhall then proceed one degree farther yet, to tell you, *Sect.* 62.

That the method of Gods dealing in this caſe (of ſuch ſingle acts of commiſſion) ſeemeth by the Scripture to be after this manner. Upon any ſuch commiſſion, Satan is wont to accuſe that man before God, [ſuch or ſuch a regenerate child of thine is fallen into ſuch a ſin, and ſo into my hands as the lictor] an example you have of it *Zach.* 3. 1. where Satan ſtands at the right hand of *Joſuah* to be his adverſary ἀντικεῖσθαι αὐτῷ, to plead againſt him, and it ſeems *Joſuah*, though a pious man, was guilty of a crime (for ſo his filthy garments, the mark of a guilty perſon, denote) *viz.* that he ſuffered his ſons to live with ſtrange wives againſt the Law, *Deut.* 14. 15. *Ezech.* 44. 22. and for this it was that Satan accuſes him: After accuſing, he proceeds then to deſire, or require ſolemnly, to *have him to winnow*, by inflicting puniſhments upon him, and God yields many times to this demand of Satan, delivers the offender up to him in ſome limited manner; but ſometimes yields not, as *Zach.* 3. 4. *Sect.* 63.

To which delivering though temptations (or afflictions which ordinarily are ſignified by temptations in Scripture) are conſtantly conſequent, yet not utter deſertion or withdrawing of grace, but allowing of ſtrength ſufficient to Victory, δύναμιν τῦ ὑπενεγκεῖν, *ability to bear*, 1 *Cor.* 10. 13. ἔκβασιν, *paſſage out* of thoſe difficulties in that ſame place, ἀρκοῦσαν χάριν, *ſufficient grace*, 2 *Cor.* 12. 9. and aſſiſtance of his *faith*, that *it fail not* totally, (which is the importance of Chriſts having prayed for *Peter*, *Luke* 22. 32. his interceſſion being a powerful interceſſion (as may appear by his [*Father, I knew that thou heareſt me always*, *Joh.* 11. 42.] and ſo in effect, the obtaining from his Father, and actual conferring on his Diſciple the grace which he prays for.) And therefore it is obſervable, that as thoſe which are thus accuſed and demanded by Satan are generally ſuch as, were it not for this preſent particular commiſſion, would paſs both with God and him, for faithful Diſciples and good Chriſtians, and therefore do ſtill retain that title (as appears by the word ἀδελφῶν, when Satan is called the *accuſer* of them, *Rev.* 12. 10. κατήγορ & ἀδελφῶν, the *accuſer of the brethren*, or the faithful, it ſeems they are faithful ſtill, though they have been guilty of ſome act, for which he thus accuſeth them, and ſo he is called, ἀντίδικ & διάβ, 1 *Pet.* 5. 8. the *plaintiff* or enemy, ὑμῶν, *of you*, *i.e.* the *elect*, to whom he writes, *c.* 1. 1.) ſo the end of yielding to Satans requeſt in delivering them up to him is alſo gracious and fatherly, ἵνα παιδευθῶσι, *that they may be diſciplined*, or taught *not to blaſpheme*, 1 *Tim.* 1. 20. ἵνα ἐντραπῇ, that *he may be aſhamed*, 2 *Theſ.* 3. 14. ἵνα πνεῦμα σωθῇ, that *the ſpirit may be ſaved*, 1 *Cor.* 5. 5. Whereupon it is, that the Fathers ſo clearly reſolve it far better, and more eligible to be delivered up to Satan, than to be delivered up to ones ſelf, or ones own affections or deſires; the firſt of them being the ordinary puniſhment of ſome act, or acts of ſin on purpoſe to recal to repentance; the ſecond being the great plague of ſpiritual deſertion, inflicted on indulgent continuers in ſin; the firſt of them a mark of their not-yet-total abdication, their continuance in *Sect.* 64.

ſonſhip whom God thus *chaſtens* here, that he *may not condemn them with the world*; the ſecond, of their being cut off from that prerogative, whom God thus forſakes.

Sect. 65. To which purpoſe, of Gods dealing mercifully with his ſervants in caſe of ſingle treſpaſſes preſently retracted by repentance, (ſo far as not to inflict any grand ſpiritual puniſhment upon them ſuch as abſolute deſertion, or utter diſinherizon) I conceive an Image repreſented to us in Chriſts command to his diſciples, how oft they ſhould forgive the treſpaſſing brother, *Luke* 17. 4. *If he treſpaſs againſt thee ſeven times a day, and ſeven times a day turn again to thee, ſaying, I repent, thou ſhalt forgive*; where *treſpaſſing ſeven times* is a phraſe, for [how oft ſoever he treſpaſs] the word [*forgive*] notes the obligation to puniſhment without forgiveneſs, and the interpoſing the word [*Repent*] proportioned to every *treſpaſs*, ſhews the neceſſity of that condition to waſh off that guilt; and the word [*Turn*] prefixt to that, argues the *Repentance* unavailable, if it contain not *turning* in it; upon which forgiveneſs being there commanded, if we ſhall now add that other place *Mat.* 6. 36. where Gods mercy to us is made the meaſure of our mercy to our brethren, the argument will come home to prove that God doth ſo deal with us, and conſequently that every ſuch act of ſin contracts a guilt, which is never pardoned but upon repentance, that upon the ſpeedy performance of that duty the patient is preſerved from any heavy ſpiritual puniſhment, which would otherwiſe attend that ſin: as it will appear in the caſe of *Joſhua* which even now I mentioned *Zach.* 3. the *filthy attire* ſignified a fault, and the guilt or pollution ariſing from it, the *Angels* commanding to *take away* thoſe *foul* cloths, *v.* 4. notes (ſaith the *Chaldee* Paraphraſe) the caſting out of his houſe the *ſtrange women*, *i. e.* the reforming of the ſin, and the commanding to do it, notes the neceſſity of that performance; then follows in the ſame verſe, the *pardoning* of the ſin, and the token of that, the *change of raiment*, and then the *cidaris munda*, the *clean mitre* is put upon his head, intimating that which he had before to have been polluted by his ſin.

Sect. 66. What we have hitherto ſaid on this particular, will ſhew the danger of every act of deliberate ſin, and yet withal the difference betwixt ſuch ſingle acts preſently retracted by repentance, and the like perſiſted, or continued in. To which purpoſe 'twill be worth the while to behold what we find recorded of *David*. He, we know, had been guilty of ſeveral acts of ſin, mark't and cenſured in the word of God; and ſome of them ſuch, as for them he was in a manner delivered up to *Satan* to be contumelioufly uſed (as he ſeems to conceive from *Shimei*'s curſing of him, 2 *Sam.* 16. 10. For *Shimei* being an inſtrument of *Satans* in curſing, and Satan thereto permitted by God upon ſome crime, for which he had accuſed him to God, he there calls it, *Gods ſaying to Shimei, Curſe David*:) And yet becauſe he continued not with indulgence in any of them, (his heart preſently ſmiting him, as in the caſe of numbring the People, and recalling him to inſtant reformation) ſave only in that concerning *Uriah* the *Hittite*; (wherein it appears that he continued near the ſpace of a year, from before the conception till after the birth of the child, as is clear by the time of *Nathans* coming to him, 2 *Sam.* 12. 1. 14. 16.) 'tis therefore left upon record by God, That *David did that which was right, in the ſight of the Lord, and turned not aſide from any thing that he commanded him all the days of his life, ſave only in the matter of Uriah the Hittite*, 1 *Kings* 15. 5.

Sect. 67. From whence although I ſhall not conclude, that God ſaw no other ſin in *David* but that in the matter of *Uriah*, (becauſe I know he ſaw and puniſht that of numbring the People, and for that other though not acted, yet deſigned under oath againſt *Nabal*, 1 *Sam.* 25. 22. *Abigail* diſcerns that it was a cauſleſs ſhedding of bloud, and an act of Revenge, *v.* 31. and ſo no ſmall ſin in Gods ſight) yet 'tis clear, that the ſin in the matter of *Uriah*, that only ſin continued in for any long time, made another manner of ſeparation between God and *David*, contracted another kind of guilt, (and was a far greater waſter to Conſcience) than any of thoſe other more ſpeedily retracted ſins did, was the only remarkable ὑποστολὴ drawing back, or turning aſide from obedience to God, the only grand defection, ſhaking off Gods yoke, and ſo the only chaſm in his regenerate ſtate.

Sect. 68. Theſe four Propoſitions being premiſed, whereof three were affirmative, and this laſt of a middle nature, The reſt will be negative; As

Sect. 69. Fifthly, That Hypocriſy is not reconcileable with a good Conſcience. I mean not that Hypocriſy which conſiſts in the concealing from the eyes of men the ſins or frailties he is guilty of: for ſuppoſing thoſe frailties to be what they are, *i. e.* acknowledging in them a guilt proportionate to their nature, I cannot ſee why the bare deſire to conceal them from the eyes of men (ſeparated from the ſins or frailties themſelves, and from any treacherous deſign in ſuch concealing) ſhould be thought to ſuperadd any farther degree of guilt; when on the other ſide the publickneſs of a ſin is an aggravation of it, makes it more ſcandalous and ſo more criminous alſo. Nor again do I mean that hypocriſie, which is the taking in any thought of the praiſe of men (and the like) in our beſt actions; for as long as we have fleſh about us, ſome degrees of this will go near ſometimes to inſinuate themſelves, and then though they prove blemiſhes to thoſe beſt actions, and by anticipating the payment and taking it here beforehand, rob us of that heavenly *reward* hereafter, which would otherwiſe be *rendred* to us *according to thoſe works*, yet ſtill being but ſpots of ſons, reconcileable with a regenerate eſtate, (as the ſtraw and combuſtible ſuperſtruction, is (in Saint *Paul*) compatible with the true ſubſtantial foundation,) they will be reconcileable with good Conſcience alſo, which is always commenſurate to a regenerate eſtate.

Sect. 70. But the hypocriſie which I mean, is, firſt, that which is oppoſite to (and incompatible with) ſincerity; firſt, the deceiving of men, with a pretence of piety putting off the moſt Unchriſtian ſins, having no more of Chriſtianity than will ſerve to miſchief others, *i. e.* only the pretence of it to diſguiſe the poiſon of a bitter heart. Secondly, the deceiving of God, or thirdly, his own ſoul, not dealing uprightly with either; and nothing more contrary than this to a good Conſcience.

Sect. 71. Secondly, the maimed mutilate obedience, the compounding betwixt God and Satan, the *Samaritans* fearing the Lord and ſerving their own Gods, joining others with God, and paying to them a reſpect equal or ſuperiour to that which they pay to God, ſerving Mammon and God, or Mammon more than God; or

Sect. 72. Thirdly, the former profeſſion, the σχῆμα or outſide garb of Godlineſs, not joining the inward,

but

but making a meer pageant of piety, denying the power thereof; or

Fourthly, the hypocriſie of the wiſher and woulder, that could wiſh he were better than he is, could be well pleaſed to *dye the death of the righteous*, to have all the gainful part, the revenue and crown of a good Conſcience, but will not be at the charge of a conſcientious life; or *Sect.* 73.

Fifthly, the hypocriſy of the partial obedient that is a προσωπολήπτης of duty, chooſes out the eaſy, ſmooth, pliable doctrines of Chriſtianity, the cheap or coſtleſs performances; the ἀδάπανον ἐνσέβειαν, will *ſerve the Lord his God of that which coſts him nothing*, will do ſome things that have nothing contrary to paſſions in general, or particularly to his paſſions, like *Herod* that could *hear* John Baptiſt *gladly*, be preſent at as many Sermons as he could wiſh, (and many the like painleſs performances) but when the weightier matters of the Law expect to be taken up alſo, cannot ſubmit to ſuch burthens; or *Sect.* 74.

Sixthly, the hypocriſy of the temporary, which abſtains only as long as the puniſhment is over his head, and awes him to it, or as long as he meets with no temptations to the contrary; both which what place they have in the Death-bed repentance even when it is not only a ſorrow for ſin, but a reſolution of amendment alſo, I leave it to be conſidered; or *Sect.* 75.

Seventhly, the hypocriſy of thoſe which commit evil that good may come of it, who venture on the moſt Unchriſtian ſins for Gods glory, accept the perſon of the Almighty, do injuſtice for his ſake, or rather ſuppoſe him impotent, and fetch in the Devil or their own vile luſts to relieve and aſſiſt God, of whom the Apoſtle pronounceth their *damnation is juſt*, *Rom.* 3. 8. Or *Sect.* 76.

Laſtly, the hypocriſy of him which keeps any one cloſe undepoſited ſin upon his Soul. Theſe are each of them contrary to ſome part of the ground of good Conſcience, to the foundation of Chriſtian confidence, ſome to the *ſincerity*, ſome to the *reſolution*, and ſome to the obedience, ἐν πᾶσι, in all, and ſome to the perſeverance which is abſolutely neceſſary to the good Conſcience. *Sect.* 77.

A ſixth Propoſition is, that a ſupine wilful courſe of negligence and ſloth, whether in duties of mans particular calling, or more eſpecially in the duties of the general calling as we are Chriſtians, that ſin of ἀκηδία, is not reconcileable with a good Conſcience, (omiſſions being deſtructive, ſuch they may be as well as commiſſions) whether it be omiſſion of the performance of moral or Chriſtian precepts (Chriſts improvements of the Law in the Sermon on the Mount, being not only as Counſels but Precepts obligatory to Chriſtians) or whether it be onely the wilful ſupine ſlothful neglecting the means of knowledge, ſuch as are agreeable to my courſe of life; Or the neglecting to make uſe of thoſe means which are neceſſary to enable me to get out of any ſin: (One act of which nature was by Chriſt noted and cenſured in his Diſciples, Their *not faſting and praying to caſt out that Devil that would not* otherwiſe *be caſt out*;) Or the not avoiding ſuch occaſions which are apt to betray me to it; Such acts as theſe, are (as Chriſt ſaith to thoſe Diſciples) acts of *faithleſneſs* and *perverſeneſs*, Mat. 17. 17. and conſequently the continued courſe of them contrary to the ſincerity of endeavour, and ſo unreconcileable with a good Conſcience. *Sect.* 78.

The ſeventh Propoſition is, that all habitual cuſtomary obdurate ſinning is unreconcileable utterly with a good Conſcience. I add the word [*Obdurate*] which ſignifies the hardnining of the heart againſt the knowledge of the truth, againſt exhortations, againſt threats of Gods Word, againſt checks of natural Conſcience, or illuminations of Grace, againſt reſolutions and vows to the contrary, for this will make any habit certainly unreconcileable with a good Conſcience; Whereas 'tis poſſible that ſome Cuſtomary ſinning may be through ignorance of the duty, and that ignorance if it be not contracted by ſome wilfulneſs of mine may be matter of excuſe to me; and ſo reconcileable with good conſcience by force of the ſecond Propoſition. But the obdurate holding out againſt Gods Spirit, either knocking for admittance but not opened to, or checking and reſtraining from ſin after converſion, and not hearkned to, reſiſting all Gods methods of working on us and ſtill reſolutely walking after the fleſh, this is by no means reconcileable with a good Conſcience, nay nor any habit of ſin ſimply taken (for that is excluſive of the habit of piety neceſſary to the good Conſcience) unleſs it have that authentick plea of faultleſs ignorance to excuſe it. *Sect.* 79.

The eighth Propoſition is, that any deliberate preſumptuous act or commiſſion of any ſin againſt which damnation, or not inheriting the Kingdom of heaven, is pronounced in the New Teſtament, being not immediately retracted by repentance, humiliation, and all the effects of godly ſorrow, 2 *Cor.* 7. 11. is wholly unreconcileable with good Conſcience. Such are *Gal.* 5. 19. *Adultery*, *fornication*, *uncleanneſs*, *laſciviouſneſs*, (four diſtinct degrees of incontinence) *Idolatry*, *witchcraft*, (two degrees of impiety) *hatred*, *variance*, *emulation*, *wrath*, *ſtrife*, *ſedition*, *hereſies*, *envyings*, *murthers*, (nine degrees of the *pride of life*, or that other branch of carnality flowing from θυμὸς, or the iraſcible faculty) *drunkenneſs*, *revelling*, (the *ſpecies* of intemperance) and ſuch like: and the ſame with ſome variation and addition, 1 *Cor.* 6. 9, 10. and *Eph.* 5. 5. Every one of theſe at the very commiſſion have the nature of *peccata ſanciantia*, wounding the ſinner to the heart, letting out a great deal of good blood and vital ſpirits, and weakning the habit of Chriſtian vertue; of *peccata clamantia*, crying ſins, the voice of conſcience ſo wronged by them, calling to heaven for judgment againſt ſuch oppreſſors, or perhaps Satan carrying an accuſation thither againſt ſuch offenders; and if upon this they be not ſtraight retracted by an earneſt contrition, humiliation, and repentance, they then proceed farther to be (any one act of them) *peccata vaſtantia conſcientiam*, ſins waſting and deſpoiling the conſcience, betraying to ſome ſadder puniſhment, even deſertion, and withdrawing of Grace, and delivering up to our own hearts luſts, a conſequent of which are all vile affections, *Rom.* 1. and that κατάρα, curſing, *Heb.* 6. 8. *Sect.* 80.

Juſt as it was the manner of the *Jews* Judicatures, He that was puniſhed by their נדוי ſeparation or ἀφορισμὸς (not permitted to come near any man within four cubits) if he did not thereupon ſhew and approve his repentance within the ſpace of two months, on that contumacy was then ſmitten with their חרם anathema or execration, and ſometimes caſt into priſon. So is Gods dealing with the ſinner remaining impenitent for ſuch a ſpace, ſubſtraction of Gods Grace and Spirit, the curſe of the Goſpel is his portion. *Sect.* 81. *Vid.* Coch *exc. Gem. Sanh. p.* 148. *& Buxtorf. inſtit. Epiſtol. p.* 57.

For the clearing of which truth yet farther, 'twill be obſervable that the danger that ariſes from *Sect.* 82.

one ſin of the firſt magnitude, againſt which the ſentence is pronounced, that they who are guilty of ſuch, ſhall never inherit eternal life, is or may be to him that after the knowledge of the truth relapſes into it as great as that which is incurred by many leſſer ſins, or by a relapſing into a generality of impure life, and therefore the remaining in that one ſin, will be as unreconcileable with a regenerate eſtate, as the remaining in many other; and proportionably one act of it as noxious and waſting to conſcience, as apt to provoke God to withdraw his Spirit, as many acts of thoſe leſſer ſins, and though neither any ſingle act either of leſſer or greater ſin in a ſincere lover of Chriſt, preſently retracted, (as it will be if he continue ſo) doth ſo grieve, as to quench Gods Spirit utterly, ſo provoke God, as to make him wholly withdraw his Grace and totally deſert him; yet if that one ſin be continued in, favoured and indulged to, either by multiplying more acts of it, or by not expreſſing repentance for it by all thoſe means which the Apoſtle requires of his inceſtuous *Corinthian*, or which are named as effects of godly ſorrow, 2 *Cor.* 7. 11. this direful puniſhment of deſertion is then to be expected as the reward of any one ſuch ſin, and from thence will follow an impoſſibility for that man ſo deſerted ever to return to repentance again, Gods ſpecial aid, which is now withdrawn, being abſolutely neceſſary to that.

Sect. 83. Where yet of thoſe, that thus remain in any ſuch ſin, there is ſome difference; For ſome that ſo remain in ſin, do ſo remain that they deſire not to get out of it, hate to be reformed; others though enſnared ſo in ſin that they cannot get out, yet are very earneſt and ſollicitous to find out ſome means to break through and eſcape out of thoſe ſnares, and then this latter ſtate of ſoul though it be not ſufficient to give claim or right to mercy, (the victory over the world, the actual forſaking of all ſuch ſins being neceſſary to that, and not only our wiſhes that we were victorious) yet is it a nearer and more hopeful capacity of the grace of repentance, more likely to be bleſſed by the returning of Gods Spirit enabling to repent, than that former ſtate of contemptuous continuers in the ſame ſin appears to be.

Sect. 84. For though in both theſe ſtates there is no repenting without Gods new gift of Grace, and no abſolute promiſe that God will be ſo gracious to ſuch ſinners, yet there is a place, 1 *John* 5. 16. which makes a difference between *ſin unto death, and ſin not unto death* (both of them ſtates of impenitence and perſiſting in ſin, but differing as the two latter degrees of *excommunication* did among the *Jews*, *Cherem* and *Schammatha* both noting a total ſeparation, but the latter a final alſo, and by the compoſition of the word intimating death or deſolation, giving up the ſinner to divine vengeance, as hopeleſs or contumacious, in reference to which the phraſe is here uſed, a ſin unto death, whereas the other, of impenitence, not arrived to that deſperate contumacy, is a ſtate of curſe under *Cherem* or *anathema*, but not unto death yet,) and allows this priviledge to the prayers of faithful men for others, that they *ſhall obtain life for thoſe that have ſinned not unto death*, where that [the not *being to death*] of a ſin, is to be taken not from the matter of the ſin, but from the diſpoſition of the ſinner, and ſo from this deſiring to get out, though he remain in it, or ſomewhat anſwerable to that, might, if any doubt were made of it, be proved as by other arguments ſo by putting together the peculiar uſe of the word ἁμαρτάνειν in that Author, for abiding and continuing in ſin, and the no extenuation that ſuch abiding is capable of (ſo far as to make one ſuch abiding ſo much leſs than another ſuch abiding, as that one ſhould be called εἰς θάνατον, t'other not) ſave only this of wiſhing and heaving and labouring to get out, (which ſuppoſes ſome remainder of exciting, though not of Sanctifying or aſſiſting Grace) while the other goes on without any care or love or deſire of Reformation.

Sect. 85. And though ſtill there be no promiſe that ſuch a relapſt unreformed ſinner's prayers ſhall be heard for himſelf upon that bare deſire to get out, which his praying for Grace will ſuppoſe (there being no ſuch promiſe of Grace to the relapſt perſon upon his prayer, as there is to any elſe) yet 'tis clear from that place of Saint *John* that this priviledge belongs to the prayers of other faithful penitents for ſuch a more moderate degree of unfaithful impenitents, upon their requeſt *God will give life to ſuch, i. e.* ſuch a degree of Grace as ſhall be ſufficient to enable them to recover back to repentance, of which being given them upon the others prayers, if they make uſe, (as infallibly they will if they were and continue to be really ſollicitous to get out of that ſtate) they ſhall undoubtedly *live* eternally.

Sect. 86. The practice of which doctrine of Saint *Johns* thus explained you ſhall ſee every where in the ſtories of, or canons for the penitents, where they that for any ſin of Eccleſiaſtical cognizance were excommunicated, did return to the peace of the Church, (an image of the peace of God) by ſeveral degrees, of which the firſt was, to ſtay and oft lie without the Church doors, and in the porch at hours of prayer, and deſire thoſe that retained the honour of being accounted faithful, and ſo had liberty to go into the Church, to pray to God for them. Which as the ſecure ſupine negligent impenitent was not likely to do, ſo was he not to expect the benefit of it, nor the Chriſtian brother obliged to pray for him; though yet by St. *Johns* [οὐ περὶ ἐκείνης λέγω, I ſay not of that or concerning that ſtate of ſin, that he ſhall pray] I am not convinced that it were unlawful ſo to do.

By all this thus ſet and bounded with its due limitations, the truth of my eighth Propoſition will appear, of the unreconcileableneſs of ſuch preſumptuous acts of ſuch branded ſins unretracted, with a regenerate eſtate or good Conſcience, as being indeed quite contrary to every part and branch of the premiſed ground of a good Conſcience.

Sect. 89. To which all that I ſhall add is only this, that he that tenders but the comforts of this life, *i. e.* of a good Conſcience, will be ſure never to commit deliberately and preſumptuouſly, or having by ſurreption fallen, never to lie down or continue one minute unhumbled unreformed in any ſuch ſin, on which that direful fate is by Chriſt or his Apoſtles inſcribed [ſhall not inherit the Kingdom of heaven] where yet as I ſhall not affirm that none ſhall ſubject us to that danger but thoſe which are there ſpecified, (for there is added and ſuch like, and other ſins there may be committed with the like deliberation and preſumption, and ſo as contrary to Conſcience) ſo ſhall I not ſay that all that commit any one act of any of theſe without that deliberation and preſumption, or that are preſently by their own heart ſmitten and brought to repentance for them, ſhall incur that danger;

for

for the words πράσσοντες and ποιοῦντες, the doers and committers of them ſignify the deliberate committing and indulgent yielding to them, contrary to which the excuſe of ſurreption at the time and the inſtant ſubſequent retractation of them (by contrition, confeſſion, forſaking, and reinforcement of greater care and vigilance for the future) will be ſure means to deliver from that danger.

Whereto yet this caution muſt be annext which may paſs for *Sect.* 90.

A ninth Propoſition, That the frequency or repetition of any ſuch acts after ſuch contrition and reſolution is an argument of the unſinderity of that contrition, of the deceivableneſs of that pretended greater care, and ſo a ſymptome of an ill *Conſcience*, as the ſpreading of the skall or leproſy after the Prieſts inſpection is ſufficient to pronounce the patient unclean, *Lev.* 13. and as that diſeaſe in the relapſe may be mortal which at firſt was not.

Other more particular niceties I confeſs there are, the diſtinguiſhing of which might be uſeful for *Sect.* 91. ſome mens ſtates, and help to diſabuſe them both out of an erroneous and a ſecure, yea and an over-trembling Conſcience. But becauſe that which would be thus proper to one, being laid down in common, or caſt into the lottery, might have the ill hap to be drawn by him to whom it is not proper, (as that Phyſick which would purge out a diſtemper from one, will breed a weakneſs in another) and becauſe no wiſe man ever thought fit to take Laws out of generalities, I ſhall reſolve rather to obey ſuch reaſons, and to be directed by ſuch examples, not to deſcend to particulars, than to be in danger firſt of tempting the Readers patience, then of interrupting his peace.

Pray for us, for we truſt we have a good Conſcience, in all things willing to live honeſtly, Heb. 13. 18.

OF

OF SCANDAL.

Sect. 1. HE that would know the true proper full importance of the word *Scandal or Offence*, or to be *Offended or Scandaliz'd* (as they are taken for the ſame) need not ſeek into many Authors for it. The new Teſtament, and the Apocryphal Books, and the Greek tranſlation of the old Teſtament, are the prime Authors that have uſed theſe words, and all other later Chriſtian Writers may juſtly be thought to have had them from that Fountain; ancient prophane Writers not affording them. From hence 'twill be ſure juſt to infer, that in as many ſenſes as the Scripture Canonical and Apocryphal hath uſed the words, in ſo many they may be juſtly uſed, and in no more. Now the uſes of the word *Scandal* among them are either natural (as generally in the old Teſtament,) or *borrowed*, *i. e.* metaphorical, (as chiefly in the new.) It naturally ſignifies three things. 1. A Trap, a Gin, or Snare to catch any thing: So in the Greek tranſlation of *Pſalm* 69. 22. the word is us'd, (being joyn'd with two other words which ſignify *ſnare* and *gin*,) and in our new tranſlation is rendred a *trap*: and therefore in the place of *Rom.* 11. 9.) where the ſame words are cited out of the Septuagints tranſlation, and not out of the Hebrew text of the Pſalm, I ſhould conceive it ſhould be rendred by analogy, not *ſtumbling blocks* but *gin*, or ſome other word belonging to this firſt ſignification. In this ſence it is uſed 1 *Mac.* 5. 4. where it is all one with *ſnare*, and it is farther interpreted by *(laying wait by the way) to catch them treacherouſly.* So again *Wiſd.* 14. 11. the word is uſed, and explained by another word, ſignifying a *trap*, or *ſnare*, the very ſame that was uſed in the Pſalms, and to the *Romans*.

σκάνδαλον.

Sect. 3.

παγὶς καὶ θήρα.

Sect 4. 2. It ſignifies any *Obſtacle* or *hindrance* laid in a mans way, by which the paſſenger is detain'd or ſtopt, peculiarly a *ſharp Stake*, ſuch as in time of War men were wont to put in the fields where their enemy ſhould follow, to wound their feet or legs in their paſſage: againſt which being ſo ordinary in War, they anciently uſed greaves of braſs to defend their feet or legs, 1 *Sam.* 17. 6. to which you may refer that Epithete ſo frequent in *Homer*, ἰυκνημίδες, and χαλκοκνημίδες Ἀχαιοὶ, to ſignify thoſe greaves brazen or otherwiſe, that the *Grecians* uſed; deſcribed by that Poet, Ια. Φ. by κνημὶς νεοτεύκτω κασσιτέροιο made of tin, and covering the whole leg to the knee, of ſo firm a ſubſtance that it made a loud noiſe at the ſtroke of the weapon on it, σμερδαλέον κονάβησε, ſaith he. Thus is the word σκάνδαλον uſed, *Judith* 5. 1. where we render it *impediments*, a word ſomewhat too general to ſignifie thoſe ſharp ſtakes or other inſtruments to wound or gall the paſſengers, which are known to every body: for which I believe we have ſome proper Engliſh word, I think it is a *gall-trap*.

Sect. 5. 3. The word ſignifies a *ſtone* or *block* in the way, at which men are apt (if they be not careful, or if they go in the dark) to ſtumble and fall: and thereupon in the old Teſtament it is taken for a *fall*: and ſo ſometimes for *ſin*, the *fall of the ſoul*, as *Judith* 12. 2. (where theſe words [*leſt it be an offence*] would more clearly be rendred out of the Greek, *leſt it become an offence*, i. e. *a ſin* or pollution, as you may ſee in the ſame matter which is there treated of, *Dan.* 1. 8. *Tob.* 1. 11.) and 1 *Sam.* 25. 31. and ſometimes for *ruine or deſtruction*, the fall of the whole perſon, which we are brought to by ſin, as *Judith* 5. 20. our Engliſh renders it *ruine*, and *Pſal.* 49. 13. where though we read *folly*, the *Septuagint* read *Scandal*, by that rendring an Hebrew word which ſignifies both *folly* and *ruine*. I confeſs this laſt acception of the word for *ruine*, is ſomewhat rare (yet authoriz'd by our Engliſh in the place of *Judith*,) and therefore if any diſlike it, I ſhall not ſtand much upon it: becauſe in both thoſe places laſt mentioned it may well enough ſignify *ſin*, as that is a *ſnare* or *ſtumbling block*, an occaſion of ruine, or falling, or deſtruction, in which ſence I conceive 'tis uſed, *Judg.* 8. 27. where 'tis rendred a *ſnare*, *i. e.* a *ſin enſnaring or occaſioning ruine*.

כמל

Sect. 6. Beſides theſe three ſignifications, in which, the word in Greek retain'd in our language, is read in the old Teſtament, I am confident there is no other, ſave once *Pſalm* 50. 20. for *ſlander or calumny or defamati n*, (for ſo the Hebrew there ſignifies) a ſence which is vulgar amongſt us in Engliſh; by a Scandal meaning a ſlander: but that ſence being but once met with in the whole Bible, or twice at moſt, (*Eccl.* 27. 23. where yet I conceive the tranſlation might be mended) will not deſerve to be taken into conſideration.

דפי

Sect. 7. Now for the uſe of the word in the new Teſtament, 'tis firſt obſervable, that the beſt nomenclature for hard words in that is the obſerving the uſe of them in the Greek of the old, for the Writers of the New Teſtament, being *Jews* not *Greeks*, wrote in an idiom proper and peculiar to them only, and thoſe other *Jews* that wrote alſo in *Greek*, ſomewhat differing from that of the Attick, or natural Greek Writers. And therefore we may well reſolve, that the uſes of the word, which we have there found and already obſerved, will be very inſtrumental to the underſtanding of the ſame word, and others derived from it in the New Teſtament. And ſo much the rather becauſe, as I ſaid, no prophane Greek Writer before the Scripture, is known to have uſed it; only *Ariſtophanes* once a word near it. This being premiſed, 'twill be worth our pains (at leaſt by ſo doing we ſhall put the whole matter beyond exception) to ſurvey briefly all the places in the new Teſtament, where the word is uſed.

σκανδαλη-θρισμὸς.

Sect. 8. To that end I ſhall begin with the firſt in my Concordance, which is *Matth.* 13. 41. *the Angels ſhall gather out all Scandals*: 'tis in a ſence borrowed from the ſecond mentioned ſignification of a *ſharp ſtake*, which he who hath once met with and been gall'd by it, is wont to gather up and caſt into the fire,

fire, as there it follows the Angels for our ſakes ſhould do, *verſe* 42. (to which Saint *Paul* alſo ſeems to allude, 2 *Cor.* 11. 29. in putting *Scandalizing* and *burning* together) and denotes ſimply whatſoever may *wound*, or *gall* us in our Chriſtian courſe, and by that means *foreſlow* our pace, cauſe us to *ſlacken*, or give over, or lye down in the ſervice of Chriſt, ſo *Mat.* 17. 27. Chriſt pays tribute, that he may not *offend the Jews*, *i. e.* that they might not think him a Contemner of the Temple, to which the tribute was due, and ſo forſake and not believe in him; that he might not diſcourage them from following him. So *Matth.* 15. 12. the Phariſees hearing a doctrine that gall'd them particularly, were *offended* and forſook him, that doctrine drave them away from following him. So again (*Matth.* 18. 7.) *it muſt needs be that offences come*, which ſeems to refer to *falſe doctrines and hereſies*, if you compare that verſe with 1 *Cor.* 11. 19. *there muſt be Hereſies* (and *Rom.* 16. 17. where *offences* are ſaid to be *contrary to the Apoſtles Doctrine*, and that they muſt be *avoided*, as the *Heretick* muſt *Tit.* 3. 10.) the venting of which of all things moſt *hinders* others in their Chriſtian *courſe*, but whether it be meant peculiarly of [a] Hereſies or exemplary ſins it matters not. To which ſoever you apply it, another place, *Luke* 17. 1. will belong unto it alſo, being the place directly parallel to it. So *Matth.* 18. 6. *He that ſhall offend one of theſe little ones*, *i. e.* he that ſhall occaſion their falling off into any ſin; or, which the place eſpecially imports, by contemning them, diſcourage them from the ſtudy of piety. For ſo on the contrary ſide to *receive them*, ver. 5. is by Saint *Mark* 9. 41. expreſt to conſiſt in doing them kindneſs *to encourage them* in the ways of godlineſs. So Chriſt crucified is ſaid a Scandal to the *Jews*, *i. e.* they that were otherwiſe not ill opinion'd of him, and ſo *followed* him with the multitudes, when they ſaw him crucified, were quite diſcourag'd, and fell away from him, (as they that are ſo *gall'd* by thoſe *ſtakes* are fain to give over the purſuit, to return) and ſo reſolved, ſeeing him dye, that he was not the *Meſſias* whom they expected, a glorious temporal deliverer. To which belongs that notable place, *Mat.* 11. 6. and *Luke* 7. 23 *Bleſſed is he that ſhall not be offended in me*, *i. e.* ſhall not be *gall'd* and diſcourag'd, and ſo fall off by ſeeing the ſufferings that befal me, and await my diſciples or followers. So again *Mat.* 13. 57. *Mark* 6. 3. It is ſaid, that the conſideration of his known and mean birth occaſioned their being *offended in him*, *i. e.* their deſerting and not *believing of him*, when the miracles which he had done inclin'd them ſomewhat to a valuing of him. So *John* 6. 61. When Chriſt talks of *eating the fleſh of the ſon of man*, *they were offended*, (that is) that ſpeech carnally underſtood (either that Chriſt was to dye, (which the eating his fleſh preſuppoſed, and they did not like to hear of; dreaming of a temporal glorious *Meſſias*) or that they were to turn *Cannibals* and *eat mans fleſh*,) *diſcourag'd* them from *following* him, at leaſt for taking him for the *Meſſias*. So *Gal.* 5. 11. perſecution is called the *Scandal of the Croſs*, or that upon which ſo many are diſcourag'd from profeſſing the crucified Saviour, according to that in the parable of the ſower, *Mat.* 13. 21. *Mark* 4. 17. upon the coming of perſecution *preſently he is offended*, *i. e. gall'd*, *and falls off*, and *Matth.* 24. 10. on the ſame occaſion and in the ſame ſence. So *Matth.* 26. 31. *Mark* 14. 27. *this night* (to wit of my attachment) *ye ſhall all be offended becauſe of me*, *i. e. fall back*, *forſake me*: and ſo in Saint *Peters* anſwer, *verſe* 39. *Although all men ſhould be offended*, *yet will I never be offended*: upon which, that which Chriſt rejoins (*before the cock crow*; i. e. before morning, or day break, all one with *this night*, verſe 31. *thou ſhalt deny me thrice*) is an interpretation of the word *offended*, and ſhews, that to be *offended*, is to deny Chriſt. And ſo *Joh.* 16. 1. *Theſe things have I ſpoken unto you*, *that ye ſhould not be offended*; where Chriſt foretels the perſecutions that ſhould befal them, that they might be forewarn'd too, and not fall off, when they befal them.

[a] So in *Polycarpus Epiſt.* to the *Philipp. p.* 20. where ἀπεχόμενοι τῶν σκανδάλων is joyned with καὶ τῶν ψευδαδέλφων, καὶ τῶν ἐν ὑποκρίσει φερόντων τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου, ἕτινες ἀποπλανῶσι, &c.

Theſe are the chief, if not all the places to which the ſecond old Teſtament acception of the word *Scandal* in a Metaphorical borrowed ſence belongs, and of all of them, and each, you may obſerve, *Sect.* 9.

1. That *Scandal* ſignifies either ſome *ſin*, the *occaſion of farther ſin* in others; or elſe ſomewhat elſe, which though it be not ſin, yet occaſions ſin in others, though very indirectly ſometimes, as the Croſs of Chriſt: and whether in one or other, the rule will be, that he that is *offended* or *ſcandalized*, doth directly commit ſome ſin, and that, for moſt of the places, the ſin of infidelity, or forſaking or denying Chriſt. *Sect.* 10.

2. That the being *Scandaliz'd*, falling *off from Chriſt*, (or the effect which follows that occaſion) hath no reflection or influence (in any of the places) on that which was the occaſion; ſo as to make it ſinful or avoidable, if it were not ſo before, (as will appear to any that will ſurvey the places) and conſequently that anothers being Scandaliz'd is not ſufficient to lay a charge on him, whoſe action (otherwiſe not chargeable or criminous) was the occaſion of his being ſcandaliz'd. Let the Croſs of Chriſt, with which ſo many were in this ſence, ſcandaliz'd, ſuffice for a proof of this. *Sect.* 11.

Other places there are which muſt be interpreted by bringing the metaphor from the firſt of the three ſences, as it ſignifies a *ſnare* or *gin* to catch one in. So *Mat.* 16. 23. *Thou art an offence unto me*, *i. e.* by expreſſing thy deteſtation againſt my ſufferings, thou laboureſt to bring me into an horrour and fear of ſuffering, and ſo in effect tempteſt me to ſin; where you muſt mark, that though *Peter* were an offence to Chriſt, that is, *tempted* him, laboured to *enſnare* him, yet Chriſt was not *Scandaliz'd*, offended, enſnared, or overcome by the temptation. In the ſame ſence is that *Revel.* 2. 14. of *Balaam* who taught *Balaac* βαλεῖν σκάνδαλον, we render it *to caſt a ſtumbling block*; but ſure it is moſt clearly, *to lay a ſnare* before the Children of *Iſrael*, to entice them by their Daughters to Idolatry, and by Idolatry to *intrap* and deſtroy them. *Sect.* 12.

In this ſence *Scandal* is ſo perfectly all one with Temptation, that as a learned man hath obſerved, the Ethiopick interpreter of the new Teſtament, inſtead of Scandal puts a word that ſignifies *Temptation*, and the ſame that in the Lords prayer is put for *Temptation*: in this ſence is that of the *eye* and the *foot offending* us, *Matth.* 5. 29. 18. 8. *Mark* 9. 47. *i. e.* when a mans eye, or any other member of his body proves a *ſnare* to him, an in-let to Temptations, a means of bringing him to any ſin. *Sect.* 13. Lud. de Dieu. מנסות *from* נסה

And of thoſe places you may obſerve again, 1. That no man is ſaid to be offended, but he that commits the ſin to which he is tempted, and therefore Chriſt is not ſaid to be offended, that is, really to be wrought upon by that *Scandal*; but as Satan tempted him, *Matth.* 4. yet he yielded not, but overcame the tempter: So here he uſes that other Satan: for to have been *offended* in *Sect.* 14.

this

this ſence had been all one with being overcome by a *temptation*.

Sect. 15. Secondly, That the Agent, or he that is ſaid to lay the ſnare or to offend, ſinneth alſo (as in all the places it will *de facto* appear that they did) though no body be taken in it, as he that tempteth to evil commits a ſin, though his temptation prove not effectual. The ſetting of a ſnare being a poſitive act, a note of a treacherous deſign, though it do not ſucceed. And therefore in 1 *Maccab.* 8. 35, 36. the *laying of ſnares* for to intrap the *Iſraelites*, or bring them from obſerving the Law, is call'd there by the devils name, *an evil Adverſary*, or as the Greek hath it, a *devil to Iſrael*.

Διάβολον τῷ Ἰσραήλ.

Sect. 16. A third and laſt ſort of places there are that refer to the third mention'd acception of the word, as it ſignifies a *ſtumbling block*, ſo when the word *ſtone* is joined with it, or the Greek word, that ſignifies *ſtumbling*, ſo *Rom.* 9. 33. Chriſt is called a *ſtumbling block, and rock of offence*, *i. e.* an occaſion of fall, or ſin in many, and conſequently of encreaſing their condemnation, as he ſaith, *if he had not come*, &c. *they had not had ſin*, i. e. had not been ſo great ſinners, had not been guilty of the great ſin of unbelief, and crucifying of *Chriſt*: and therefore *Simeon* propheſies of *Chriſt*, that he would be for the *fall of many in Iſrael*, many ſins his coming ſhould be the occaſion of, ſo *Rom* 14. 13. *That no man lay a ſtumbling block, or ſcandal* (which we render an *occaſion of falling*) in his *brothers way*, that is, do or practiſe any thing, that may bring another that comes after him, upon his noſe, or to commit any ſin. So 1 *Pet.* 2. 8. *Chriſt is called a ſtone of ſtumbling, and rock of offence*, at which to ſtumble is to be *diſobedient to Chriſt*. So *Rom.* 14. 21. *ſtumbleth or is offended, or is made weak*, i. e. by following thee, doth fall, commits ſome ſin, doth ſome act unlawful *for him* (though ſimply it were not *for thee*; it being againſt his Conſcience, though not againſt thine) and ſo by *falling* bruiſes and *weakens* himſelf, makes himſelf leſs able for Gods ſervice, than he was: for ſo every ſin againſt Conſcience being a *grieving the ſpirit*, is conſequently the ſpiritual weakening of the man, or if you will (as in Saint *James* ἀσθενῶν ſignifies *c.* 5. 14.) the wound or diſeaſe of the ſoul. So again, 1 *Cor.* 8. 9. *ſtumbling block to the weak*, and *verſe* 13. where the caſe is clearly the ſame that we laſt mentioned: that if any man by doing any indifferent thing (which he in Conſcience is inform'd to be perfectly lawful for him to do) ſhall occaſion another mans ſin by doing that after him which he is not reſolv'd to be lawful, that man offends againſt that charity due to his brother, and therefore muſt think fit to deny himſelf the uſe of that liberty which Chriſt hath given him. To this may belong that other place, 1 *John* 2. 10. where that phraſe *(there is no Scandal in him)* ſeems to ſignify, falls not into thoſe ſins that ignorant men or uncharitable (who are ſaid in the Antitheſis, *verſe* 11. *to walk in the dark*) are ſubject unto. One place more there is belonging to this purpoſe, where though the word *Scandal* be not uſed in the Text, yet προσκοπὴ, *offence*, is uſed, and that I confeſs to be all one, and it is 2 *Cor.* 6. 3. *giving no offence in any thing*; where yet offence is interpreted by *Beza*, *quidpiam ad quod poſſint impingere*, *any thing that others may ſtumble at*, or be alien'd from the Goſpel by; as if we fail in any Chriſtian duty (mentioned *ver.* 4, 5, 6.) they that ſee us, would be apt to do: and ſo that which follows imports alſo (*that the Miniſtry be not blamed*) that is, that our Actions be not juſtly reprehended or found fault with, *but in all things approving our ſelves*, &c.

πέτρα σκανδάλου, προσκομμα.

Sect. 17. And of this third ſort of places 'tis obſervable again, firſt, that he that is *offended*, ſins himſelf, ſtumbles, and falls, and bruiſes himſelf, and ſecondly, that he that is the occaſion of his fall doth not always ſin (for Chriſt, and Grace, and *that which ſhould have been for their wealth, proves to many an occaſion of falling*) but yet ſometimes he doth: as if he purpoſely in a matter *indifferent*, when he might have choſen, doth any thing which another whoſe Conſcience is *doubtful*, doth after him, and ſo *ſins*; nay, if he do not abſtain from that indifferent action, when he ſees that conſequent *likely* to follow; nay if he be not careful to obſerve, whether the conſequent be *likely* to follow, and if ſo, to *abſtain*. This third ſort of *Scandal* you ſee is applyed peculiarly to one kind of actions, thoſe by the doing of which another coming after, and doing the ſame, falls into ſin, as when either the *example* was *ſinful*, or being *indifferent* in it ſelf is againſt the other mans *conſcience*, and ſo being imitated by him, is in him a ſin *againſt conſcience* and not *indifferent*. And then

Sect. 18. Another ſort of actions there are which may though not ſo directly, yet not improperly be refer'd to this head, as, when I do any thing in it ſelf not *unlawful*, yet very apt to be miſtaken by other men, *for ſomewhat elſe which is unlawful*; and ſee it ſtrongly probable, that thoſe which will be apt ſo to miſtake, will be as apt alſo by occaſion of this action of mine, to commit that other ſin which they conceive me to have committed, or to confirm and harden themſelves in that ſin through that miſtaken example of mine, which they might otherwiſe probably have reformed, if they had not received encouragement by this action of mine; And if queſtion be made, what is to be thought of this, I anſwer, that although I am not ſure that that place of Scripture in our Engliſh Bibles which commands [to *abſtain from all appearance of evil*,] doth come home to this purpoſe, (becauſe ἀπὸ παντὸς εἴδους which we render [*from all appearance*] may bear another ſence, and ſignify no more than *from every kind or ſort of evil*, for ſo both the Greek εἶδος, and Latine *ſpecies* import; and withall, *appearance of evil* is ſo uncertain, and inconſtant a thing, that to abſtain from it *univerſim* cannot be the matter of any *poſſible* command. And again, though I dare not from that other precept of ὅσα εὐφημα *whatſoever is of good report*, *Phil.* 4. 8. conclude it unlawful to do any thing which hath the ill luck to be of *ill report*, *i. e.* to be miſtaken for a ſin (becauſe firſt there is no prohibition in that place interdicting the doing of every thing which is of *ill report*, ſecondly no analogy of other Chriſtian rules to infer ſuch prohibition, it being rather the fate of all Chriſtian vertues to be evil ſpoken of, and the *receiving the praiſe of men*, being branded by Chriſt as unreconcileable with *believing*, thirdly becauſe ſome actions of Chriſt were of *ill report*, particularly that of *eating and drinking with Publicans and ſinners*, (which rendred him ſuſpected for a *glutton*) and that of *caſting out of Devils*, (which was defamed for ſorcery or compact with *Belzebub*,) fourthly becauſe that which is of *ill report* with one, may be of *good report* with a thouſand others, and there the judgment of that one will not be conſiderable againſt thoſe thouſand to defame an innocent laudable action) yet ſtill I conceive that the great obligation to φιλανθρωπία and φιλοψυχία, *loving of all men*, and *deſiring the good of their ſouls*, which lies upon all Chriſtians (by force of Chriſts *example*, and *legacy*, and *precept* of charity) will

1 Theſſ. 5. 22.

will extend ſo far, as to have the force of precept that every man *abſtain* from ſuch *purely indifferent actions* (being ſo in *themſelves*, and then by the Magiſtrate *uncommanded*) which he foreſees will be thus miſtaken for unlawful by thoſe who are likely to be moved by his example to commit thoſe ſins which they conceive him to have committed; this being an inſeparable attendant of my *charity* to my brothers *ſoul*, to uſe all lawful means which my conſcience tells me will be his ghoſtly health, or preſervation.

Mean while ſome difference may be obſerved in things indifferent, ſome being *commendable*, though not *commanded*; of *uſe*, though not of *neceſſity*; and ſuch as *extra cauſam ſcandali*, I ſhould on pious conſiderations be moved to chooſe, or practice: and in this caſe, if it be *demanded* whether that ſole fear of *ſcandal* ought to reſtrain me from that which all other motives rather incline me to, and to make me abſtain; or whether I ſhould rather claim the priviledge of my Chriſtian liberty, and that make me not to abſtain. I anſwer, that a *middle* courſe may yet be better than either extreme crudely taken: that is, that I ought to do my beſt to free this laudable indifferent action of mine from the evil colour that it is capable of, by *rectifying* his judgment whom I diſcern to be *miſtaken* in it, and by declaring, (either expreſly, or by ſome ſignificative character of my intentions faſtened to my action) the clearneſs and innocency of my purpoſes to any other that may be ſo miſtaken; and by ſo doing if I cannot free my ſelf from his *uncharitable cenſure*, yet I ſhall be ſure to keep him from any danger of *following* me to that ſin; for ſure my very diſclaiming of that ſin which he ſuſpects me guilty of, will diveſt that ſin of all authority which it may receive from my committing it, and not *invite*, but rather deter and *fortify* others from falling into that ſin, which they ſee diſavowed and diſliked by me. For if my *authority* be of any force with them, it will perſwade them to abſtain from that which I diſclaim, and profeſs my ſelf to hate (who certainly know my own mind beſt) rather than to do, what they only conceive I do, but I profeſs I do not. And therefore the caſe being thus ſet of the commendable uſeful indifferent, not of the meer frivolous unconſiderable, when the uſe and gain of my action to me is *certain*, and the danger of being miſtaken by others at moſt *but poſſible*, and that alſo preventable by theſe other means, neither piety nor prudence will adviſe to abſtain from that healthful food, which if it be by accident unhealthful to others, hath yet an antidote adminiſtred with it. Which will be yet farther heightned alſo, if this laudable indifferent fall out to be ſuch as the *example* of *holy* men in *Scripture*, or the *practice* of the *Church* in *purer* times have given countenance to, eſpecially if the perpetual *current* of *antiquity* have commended it to us: for certainly theſe will be of great authority with all *prudent pious* men, and the more *early* and Catholick that practice, the greater that authority. *Sect.* 19.

'Tis true, very ſtrict rules in many particulars the Judaical law of the old Teſtament did preſcribe, forbidding many indifferent things, on this only ground, becauſe the uſing them might ſeem a *complyance* with the Heathen cuſtoms of Idolaters. Such was that prohibition, *Exod.* 34. 26. *thou ſhalt not ſeethe a kid in the mothers milk*, in the ſacrifice of the in-gathering; given no doubt in oppoſition to the *Gentile* practice of thoſe which at the time of gathering in their fruits, ſolemnly uſed this cuſtom of *ſeething a kid in the dams milk*, and then in a *Magical* way, ſprinkled their trees and fields, and gardens with it to make them fructify the next year, as *Abrabenel*, and others out of Jewiſh Writers have obſerved. Such was alſo the prohibition, *Lev.* 19. 27. againſt *rounding the corners of their heads*, in reference to the περιτέμνεσθαι κύκλῳ, or, στρέφειν τὰς κεφάλας the *round cut* uſed by the *Arabians* ſaith *Herodotus*, and thereupon forbidden the *Jews*, and *a woe* pronounced *Jerem.* 9. 26. ἐπὶ πάντα στεφανούμενον, &c. *on every one that was ſo cut round*, *Si adjuverit tonſorem*, ſaith *Maimonides*, *if he directed, or willingly permitted the Barber to put him into that heatheniſh guiſe*: And many others in the Old Teſtament of the like nature, and the following Rabbins have added many more directions, if not precepts of the ſame nature. That one book of *Maimonides* concerning Idolatry will furniſh the Reader with ſtore of examples: but ſome ſuch as do not ſo well become the gravity of that Author; as that, *If the* Jew *hath a thorn in his foot, when he is near an Idol, he muſt not ſtoop to take it out. If a tree have been worſhipt, or an Idol ſet in it, it is not lawful to ſit in the ſhade of the trunk or body of that tree, though of the boughs or leaves it be lawful; if there be any other way, it is not lawful to paſs under it; if none, then he muſt run by it.* *Dionyſius Voſſius* in his notes on that Author hath added ſome parallel paſſages out of other Jewiſh Writers, as that of *R. Menaſſe*, *who being ſhewed an Idol, did in contempt caſt ſtones at it, which action of his, becauſe the Image was the image of Mercury* (who was wont to be worſhipt by the Heathens after that manner, by throwing ſtones at it, or ſcattering ſtones before him, to which cuſtom or ceremony the [a] *Mercurial Statues* refer, ſaith *Phornutus* θεὶ θεῶν) *was therefore* noted, accuſed, brought before the Judge, and by him *pronounced to be unlawful*, becauſe it was the proper *worſhip* of that Idol, though uſed in deſpight, not civility by that man. So again *if* there *be but one way to an Idolatrous City, it is unlawful to go that way*, *Aboda Zara ca.* 1. *ſect.* 4. and ſo, ſaith he, the *Hebrews* in *Rabot* mention a Tradition, that the *reaſon* why *Mordechai* would not *bow to Haman*, *was*, *becauſe there was woven in his garment the image of a falſe God.* *Sect.* 20.

Thal. c. 8.

De Idol. c. 12.

c. 3.

c. 7.

[a] Κἂν παρεμβολὴν λίθων συγχώματα *Sibyl. Orac.* p. 156. Lapidum congeries in compitis in honorem cùm aliorum Deorum, tum præcipue Mercurii. Inde Græcis Ἑρμαικὸς ut notat *Nicandri* Schol. Λίθοι σωρευόμενοι εἰς τιμὴν τοῦ ἑρμοῦ · *Corn. ſeveras* in *Ætna*. ——*qualis acervus Exſilit imparibus jactis ex tempore ſaxis.*

Some inſtances alſo might perhaps be brought out of the *practice* of the ancient *Chriſtian Church* (mentioned by *Tertullian de Cor. mil.*) to this purpoſe of abſtaining from things *indifferent*, for *fear* of any appearing *complyance* with the Heathens. Of which yet it muſt be obſerved, firſt that this was in things of no manner of ſpiritual uſe or profit, neither commendable, nor advantageous, in things of ancient Chriſtian preſcription, or practice of purer times: ſecondly, that it was in matters of ſuch a quality, as that complyance would have ſeemed a diſſembling or renouncing of the Chriſtian faith, (and not of imitating of former *purer* Chriſtians) and ſo contrary to that great Chriſtian duty of *confeſſing Chriſt before men*, which they could not be ſaid to do, who when that *confeſſion* was *perſecuted*, did thus comply with or not *profeſs* open diſlike of the actions of thoſe perſecutors. And ſo thoſe inſtances will not be ſo proper to the matter of *Scandal*, as to that other head of *Chriſtian duty*, the *neceſſity of confeſſing of Chriſt before men*, (thoſe eſpecially who are the greateſt oppugners of him, to which matter alſo thoſe other Judaical inſtances do belong) unleſs that non-confeſſing of Chriſt, may by the example ſcandalize alſo. Thirdly, That the ſame men thought it *Sect.* 21.

not amiſs, or unlawful at other times to comply with other as great enemies of Chriſtianity as the *Gentiles*, namely with the *Jews* in obſervation of ſome of their outdated ceremonies, nay thought themſelves obliged ſo to do, when in prudence they conceived it more likely to *gain* thoſe *enemies* by that means, than to *confirm* them in their diſlikes of Chriſtianity, or drive others to thoſe diſlikes. Fourthly, That even with the Heathen themſelves they could in other things think fit to comply alſo, when prudence dictated that complyance as more inſtrumental to Chriſtian policy; and from theſe premiſſes, Fifthly, that this whole matter is to be referred to the Chriſtians pious diſcretion or prudence, it being free to him either to abſtain or not to abſtain from any indifferent action (remaining ſuch) according as that piety, and that prudence ſhall repreſent it to be moſt charitable and beneficial to other mens ſouls; and he that ſhall not thus *regulate* his actions by what he is *convinced* will be thus moſt conducing to that grand Chriſtian end, the *ſaving* or not deſtroying, or *not ſuffering ſin upon his brother*, ſhall not by me be excuſed from the guilt and blame of having *ſcandaliz'd* his brother in this laſt new Teſtament ſence, at leaſt in ſome other which is not far diſtant from it; though after all this it muſt be obſerved, that he which thus is betrayed to, or confirmed in any ſin by conceiving me to have committed it, when I have not, (this eaſie proſtitute ſeducible ſinner who will thus ſin upon any, upon no occaſion) is not Saint *Pauls* weak, *i. e.* doubtful-conſcienc'd Chriſtian of whom he takes ſuch care that he ſhould not be ſcandaliz'd.

Sect. 22. For ſuch is he only, that for want of knowledge of his juſt Chriſtian liberty, thinks it unlawful to do thoſe things, which being indifferent in themſelves, are only unlawful to him, which believes them ſo, or is not ſatisfied that they are lawful; This weakneſs in faith, (a kind of diſeaſe of the mind, and ſo in the new Teſtament phraſe ἀδύνατα) being only want of knowledge or of Orthodox inſtruction, as will appear by comparing *Rom.* 14. with 1 *Cor.* 8. where the ἀδυνῶν τῇ πίστει in one, is all one with the οὐκ ἐν πᾶσιν ἡ γνῶσις in the other, *weakneſs in faith*, with *want of knowledge*.

Sect. 23. The only matter of queſtion or difficulty behind in this particular will be, why thoſe who are in ſuch Judaical errours are ſometimes appointed by Saint *Paul* to be ſo tenderly handled, not to be vilified, or ſet at *nought*, *Rom.* 14. 3. but care taken that they be not *ſcandaliz'd* in the end of that chapter, 1 *Cor.* 8. and yet in the Epiſtle to the *Galathians*, they are by the Apoſtle *reviled* [*O fooliſh*, *&c.*] *c.* 3. 1. and *chid* and *reproached* out of their Judaical performances, and no care taken of not *ſcandalizing* them. The anſwering of this will require us to conſider the different eſtate of thoſe *Galathians* from thoſe *Romans*. The *Galathians* had been formerly *Gentiles*, and (though as it ſeems not improbable from *Gal.* 4. 9. formerly converted from thence, as *Proſelytes* to *Judaiſm*, yet) by Saint *Paul* thoroughly converted from thence and baptized into *Chriſtianity*, as that is oppoſite both to *Judaiſm* and *Gentiliſm* alſo, *i. e.* fully inſtructed by him in the nature of *Chriſtian doctrine*, and *liberty*, and had given up their *hearts* as well as *names* unto it, only after they had been *begotten* by *Saint Paul in the Goſpel*, had *begun in the Spirit*, Gal. 3. 3. had come to an abſolute abrenunciation of all their former Jewiſh perſwaſions, and to ſome good progreſs in Chriſtianity, ſome *falſe Judaizing teachers* began to corrupt and poyſon them, *Gal.* 3. 1. and 5. 7. and to bring them back again to that *yoke*, that they had been taught to caſt off; and theſe *tares* the Apoſtle could hope by reprehenſions and ſharpneſs to root out without endangering the *wheat*, and therefore ſets ſeverely and heartily to it, thinks not fit either in *civility* or *charity* to uſe any complyances, or condeſcendings, or ſofter medicines, (knowing their errours to be contrary to the Doctrine, to which they had been baptized, and conſequently that they might in reaſon give place unto it, and there was * no fear that the rooting out of them would root out Chriſtianity with them, as it might probably do, if they had been ſown or planted together) but employs all his vehemence and bowels of kindneſs towards them, in conjuring out that evil ſpirit had ſo lately got poſſeſſion of them, and doubts not but Chriſtianity that was earlier planted in them, (and that by him who had begotten them in the Goſpel, and ſo had a paternal authority with them) than theſe vain legal dreams, that ſome falſe teachers had lately inſtilled into them, might be able to ſurvive them alſo. And in this caſe being to deal with adverſaries and falſe teachers, not with *weakelings* but *corrupters*, had the Apoſtle uſed any *compliance*, had he *circumciſed Titus*, *Gal.* 2. 3. (as at another time he did *Timothy*) had he *then given place* but *for an hour*, ver. 5. ſuſpended the *uſe* of his liberty then, when *liberty* was decryed, this had been *ſcandalous* in the Apoſtle, this had probably been the confirming of the erroneous, the encouraging of the adverſary, the miſleading the doubtful, ſhaking the faithful, and diſturbing what he had before ſetled among them.

* no cauſe of fear.

Sect. 24. Whereas on the other ſide the *Romans* at their firſt converſion to Chriſtianity had not all of them been taught to put off the opinion of the neceſſity of legal *abſtinences* τῷ τῷ νόμῳ κατηχοῦμενοι συνηθείᾳ καὶ τῇ πίστει, ſaith Saint *Chryſoſtome in proœm. ad ep. ad Rom.* but *continued their obligation to the Law after receiving of the faith*, being ſome of them (as may appear by the matter of Saint *Pauls* diſcourſe to them, in the former part eſpecially of that Epiſtle) *natural Jews*, diſperſed thither; who could not be eaſily brought to aſſent to ſuch doctrine, but would probably have refuſed to embrace Chriſtianity, if it had been offered to them on ſuch hard conditions, ſome others of them (who were Gentiles by birth) being perhaps *Proſelytes* to *Moſes* and *Chriſt* together, partakers of the infelicity of thoſe who are mentioned, *Acts* 15. 5. that by the doctrine of the *Phariſee-Chriſtians* (or *believers of the ſect of the Phariſees*) had at their entrance on the faith, a neceſſity of *receiving Judaiſm* alſo preſt upon them. This Saint *Paul* teſtifies clearly of Saint *Peter*, *Gal.* 2. 14. that he *conſtrained the Gentiles to Judaize*, to receive the *Moſaical* as well as Chriſtian law, and himſelf durſt *not converſe or eat with the Gentiles* whilſt any Jewiſh Chriſtians were by, *ver.* 12. by which whether doctrine or complyance of Saint *Peter*, it was no ſtrange thing if it came to paſs, that thoſe which were by him converted to the faith, (as *Euſebius* and other Eccleſiaſtick Hiſtorians agree that the *Romans* were, *vid. Eccl. hiſt. lib.* 2. *ca.* 14. and 15.) although they were Chriſtians in the *poſitive* part, acknowledging ſo much as was anſwerable to the now-articles of the *Creed*, &c. yet being not ſo in the *negative*, concerning the evacuating of the Judaical law (but rather perſwaded of the contrary) could no more eat *ſwines fleſh*, than a meer *Jew* could do, and therefore 'tis Saint *Chryſoſtome*'s opinion that theſe being

being ſo wedded to thoſe Judaical obſervances, rather than they would eat forbidden fleſh, would in *univerſum* eat no fleſh at all ὥστε μὴ γίνεσθαι εὐφυᾶεῖλοι, ἢ χοιρείων ἀπεχόμενοι μόνων, πάντων ἐξῆς ἀπεί-χοντο ἢ κρεῶν, and ſo came to eat nothing but *Herbs*, *Rom.* 14. 2.

Sect. 25. Of theſe therefore that were thus *weak in faith*, ver. 1. that is either *infirm*, feeble, uninſtructed Chriſtians, babes not men; or elſe (as the Fathers enlarge the ſence, and as *weakneſs* ἀδύνατα moſtly imports in the new Teſtament) *ſick* and diſeaſed in mind, brought up in this Judaical errour, the Apoſtle *Rom.* 14. gives theſe directions: Firſt, That the ſtronger healthfuller, *i. e.* more knowing and more Orthodox Chriſtians ſhould προσλαμβάνεσθαι (the vulgar read *aſſumere*) take them to them, firſt friendly to afford them communion, and not ſeparate from them for this errour, ſecondly, labour to cure their malady, get them out of their errour, and not leave them in the pride and folly of their own hearts, to judge and cenſure thoſe who have done nothing amiſs, but rather deſire their good (which Saint *Chryſoſtome* underſtands by προσλαμβάνεσθαι μὴ εἰς διακρίσεις διαλογισμῶν, and ſo Saint *Jerome* alſo, intending it thus, *Nolite ſecundum veſtras cogitationes, quæ lex non judicat, judicare, alius enim credit*, &c.) and from that verſe obſerves, that though the Apoſtle exhorts the *ſtrong*, yet he covertly *reprehends, and on their backs as it were whips, the weak* or erroneous Judaizers, firſt in ſaying they are *ſick*, ſecondly, in bidding προσλαμβάνεσθε αὐτὸν, which is an evidence, ſaith he, ἐσχάτης ἀῤῥωστίας *that they are in very ill caſe*, and thirdly in mentioning διακρίσεις which notes (ſaith he) that they *judge and cenſure* thoſe that leaſt deſerve it, and that are willing to communicate with them, and labour the curing of them; and indeed that theſe weak ones did ſo judge the ſtrong is plain, *verſe* 3. where the exhortation is diſtinct, *let not him that eateth not, judge him that eateth.*) Secondly, That the knowing again ſhould not *vilify* or ſet at *naught* the weaker [μὴ ἐξουθενείτω *ver.* 3.] not call him *Racha*, empty ſenceleſs fellow, not reproach or ſcoff at his ſcrupulous conſcience, but in charity ſuppoſe it to proceed from *want of knowledge* only, and conſequently to have the excuſe and benefit of that Goſpel antidote, *weakneſs* or ignorance to plead for it. Thirdly, That the ſtronger Chriſtians (which although they have liberty, yet are not obliged alway to make uſe of it) abſtain from thoſe lawful enjoyments which thoſe weak ones, which count them unlawful, may yet by their example be embolden'd againſt Conſcience to venture on.

Sect. 26. But then on the other ſide, the *weak* or *ſick* erroneous *Chriſtian*, that cannot with a good Conſcience uſe that liberty himſelf, is commanded, 1. Μὴ κρίνειν that he do not judge or cenſure the ſtrong, upon two reaſons: 1. becauſe ὁ θεὸς αὐτὸν προσελάβετο, *ver.* 3. God hath by calling him to the faith, aſſumed or received the ſtrong (as that ſtrong had been exhorted to do the weak, *ver.* 1.) εἰς φιλίαν to friendſhip or communion firſt, (as προσλαμβάνεσθε is uſed *Philem.* 12.) then to help and cure him of his former defect or diſeaſe, and bring him to perfect health and growth in Chriſtianity: and ſecondly, becauſe he is Gods ſervant and domeſtick, and *ſtands and falls to his own Maſter*, v. 4. Secondly, That he be ſure never to do any thing againſt Conſcience, or which he is not fully perſwaded in mind, that it is lawful for him.

Sect. 27. Having thus ſeen the ſtate of thoſe *Romans*, it will be ſuperfluous to add much about the *Corinthians* in the almoſt parallel place, 1 *Cor.* 8. This only difference will be worth noting between them, that (as there were two ſorts of *Proſelytes* among the *Jews*, one of *Juſtice*, or of thoſe that undertook the obſervation of the whole Judaical Law; the other of the *Gates*, thoſe that received only the precepts of the ſons of *Noah*, of which the abſtaining from things offered to Idols was one, and as when the difference was betwixt the *brethren*, *Acts* 15. whether the *Gentile-converts* ſhould be *circumciſed*, verſe 1. *i. e.* be admitted *Proſelytes* of *Juſtice*, or only receive the ſeven *precepts of Noah*, *abſtain from things offered to Idols*, &c. verſe 19. it was determin'd in the Council of the Apoſtles, that it ſhould ſuffice, if they were *Proſelytes of the gates*, and therefore they tell them that if they thus be entred, *abſtain from things offered to Idols*, &c. they *ſhall do well*, *ſo*) the *Romans* being either *Jews*, or under the firſt head of *Jewiſh proſelytes*, in Saint *Chryſoſtoms* opinion, and ſo thinking themſelves bound to all legal Moſaical abſtinences, the *Corinthians* were only under the ſecond, and ſo by their principles, which they had received of thoſe, who converted, baptiſed, and *begot them in the faith*, (and that according to the reſult of that Apoſtolick conſultation, *Acts* 15.) did continue to think it unlawful to eat any thing offered to Idols, or that came from an Idol feaſt (which yet by the way Saint *Paul* reſolves was but an errour in them, 1 *Cor.* 8. 4. and by that judgment of his you ſee the unobligingneſs of that interdict, *Acts* 15.) and therefore (in like manner, as before) thoſe, that were better inſtructed than they, ought to have that charity to them, as not to do any thing in their preſence which might by the example draw them to venture on that which was againſt their conſcience, eſpecially conſidering, that they had not knowledge or underſtanding enough to judge how *nothing* an *Idol* was, *v.* 7.

Sect. 28. Having thus compared the *Romans* and *Corinthians* with the *Galathians*, and given ſome account of the reaſon of their different uſage, it will not be amiſs to add what Saint *Chryſoſtome* obſerves to be the cauſe of the like difference in Saint *Pauls* behaviour to the *Coloſſians* from that fore-mentioned to the *Romans*. It is a ſpecial paſſage in his proœm to the Epiſtles. Where having mentioned the order wherein the Epiſtles were written, different from the order of ſetting them in our books, concludes that this was no unprofitable diſquiſition, for thereby many paſſages in the books would be interpreted: As, that *Rom.* 14. he *condeſcends* to the *weak brethren*, but not ſo *Col.* 2. which, ſaith he, was for no other reaſon, but becauſe, that to the Romans was written before the other, and therefore as Phyſicians and Maſters deal not ſo ſharply with Scholars or Patients at firſt as afterwards, ſo the Apoſtle in the beginning συγκαταβαίνει Ἰουδαΐζουσι, μὴ ἢ ταῦτα ἐκ ἔτι, adding that he was not ſo familiar with the Romans as yet, having never been amongſt them at the time of writing that Epiſtle to them, as appeareth *Rom.* 1. 13.

Sect. 29. By all this 'tis clear indeed, that thoſe which are thus *weak* (either in the notion of *babes* or *ſick men*) ſo that they are not able to diſcern lawful from unlawful (as *the Idol to be nothing* 1 *Cor.* 8. 7.) merely for want of ſufficient inſtruction, or ſomewhat proportionable to that, principles of underſtanding, or the like; but eſpecially if they received thoſe errors or miſtakes together with their *Chriſtianity* from the *Apoſtle* or from the *Church* which gave them *baptiſm*, they muſt then, firſt in

meekneſs be inſtructed, and cured of their ill habit of ſoul: ſecondly not be *vilified* or reproacht: yea thirdly be ſo *charitably* conſidered, that till they have received ſatisfaction of conſcience and reformation of errour, we are not to do any thing in their preſence, that may by the example bring them to do what their conſcience is not perſwaded to be lawful, or if we do, we are ſaid to *ſcandalize a weak brother*, *i. e.* an erroneous Chriſtian. But then withal 'tis as clear, Firſt, That thoſe who have firſt received the true doctrine, and are for ſome good time rooted in it, that are otherwiſe *taught* by the *Church* that gave them *baptiſm*, are not within the compaſs of this the Apoſtles care, but, (as the Galathians) to be reprehended, chid, and ſhamed out of their childiſh errours, theſe diſeaſes of ſoul that their own *itching ears* have brought upon them: Secondly, That they that have knowledge in other things, nay are able to diſtinguiſh as critically as any, even to divide a perſon from himſelf, and obey one when they aſſault the other, (and by their ſubtlety in other matters demonſtrate their blindneſs in this one to be the effect of *malice*, of *paſſion*, of *luſts*, of *carnality*, and not of any blameleſs *infirmity* or impotence,) are again excluded from the Apoſtles care: and ſo thirdly, that they that are come to theſe errours by the infuſions of *falſe teachers*, which not the providence of God but their own choice hath helpt them to, preferring every new *poyſon* before the ancient daily *food* of ſouls, have no right to that care or providence of the Apoſtle, any farther than every kind of ſinner hath right to every thing in every fellow-Chriſtians power which may prevent or cure his malady, *i. e.* by the general *large* rule of *charity*, and not the *cloſer* particular law of *Scandal*. Nay fourthly, that the caſe may be ſuch, and the adverſaries of *Chriſtian liberty*, the oppoſers of the uſe of lawful ceremonies ſo contrary to *weak blameleſs* miſtakers, that it may be *duty* not to allow them the leaſt *temporary complyance*, but then to expreſs moſt zeal in retaining our lawful *indifferent* obſervances, to vindicate our liberty from enſlavers, when the truth of Chriſt would be diſclaimed by a cowardly condeſcending, the adverſaries of our faith confirmed and heightened, and the true weakling ſeduced, (a copy of which we read in St. *Peters* ὑποκρισει, *Gal.* 2. 12. and *Barnabas* and the *Jewiſh* converts being carried away with it *v.* 13. falling by his example into the ſame fault of diſſimulation, puſillanimity, non-profeſſion of the truth) which is a moſt proper kind of *ſcandal*, as frequent, and incident, as any, and ſo being as dangerous, as fit alſo to be prevented. To which I might add a fifth propoſition alſo, That the Apoſtles ſpeech of ſcandal *Rom.* 14. and 1 *Cor.* 8. hath been thought by holy men among the *ancients* to have much of *civility* in it, at the moſt to be but an act of Apoſtolical care for thoſe weak ones, (proportionable to thoſe which in other places he preſcribes for every other kind of ſinner) both which are far enough from being able to infer any claim or challenge of thoſe weak for themſelves, any farther than what the firſt part of it amounts to, that of inſtruction; or at leaſt the ſecond, that of not being vilifyed, as the ſick hath right to the Phyſician, to cure him and not to reproach him, civilly to get him out of his malady, *i. e.* to rectify not to ſcoff at his miſtake. For that he ſhould challenge any right to the third part of that care, that he ſhould reſtrain me from the uſe of my lawful liberty, becauſe elſe he will ſin againſt his own conſcience, do after me what he reſolves unlawful to do, ſuppoſes a wilful *ſin* of his to be to him a foundation of *dominion* over me, and ſo that every man that will thus *damn* himſelf, doth for that, *merit* and *acquire command* over me, which if it be ſuppoſed, is ſure as wild an extravagant *irregular* way to *power*, as that of its being *founded in gratia*, or any that theſe worſt days experience hath taught us.

Sect. 30. Having thus far expatiated on this laſt kind of ſcandal, and taken in that which is proper to it, and alſo that which is more diſtant from it, I ſhall now reſolve it neceſſary to add yet one thing more, inſtrumental to the underſtanding of this kind of *Scandal* in the ſtricter notion of it, by way of farther caution and reſtraint, and 'tis this, that

Sect. 31. This being *offended*, ſtumbling and falling in this third and laſt ſence, is not to be extended to all kinds of ſins, which a man may commit upon occaſion of another mans *indifferent* action; but only to that *one kind*, that conſiſts in doing that after him, either *doubting* or *againſt Conſcience*, which he did with an *inſtructed* Conſcience; or at moſt to this other kind alſo, of doing ſome unlawful thing which anothers lawful action was yet by *miſtake* conceived to give *authority* to; and which that man probably would not have done, had not that *miſtaken example* thus emboldened him. For if all ſins that by any accident might be occaſioned by my indifferent Action, ſhould come under the nature of being *offended* or *ſcandaliz'd*, conſequently I muſt be interdicted all indifferent actions at all times, becauſe at all times each of them may *occaſion* (by *ſome accident*) ſome *ſin* in another: and 'twill be impoſſible for me to foreſee or comprehend all ſuch accidents that may occaſion ſuch ſins. An action of mine may by accident produce a contrary effect; my *faſting* from fleſh, may move another (that *diſlikes* me) by way of *oppoſition* to me, to eat fleſh, though in *Conſcience* he be perſwaded he ought not; as in *philoſophy* there is a thing call'd *Antiperiſtaſis* (by which exceſſive cold produces heat) and *equivocal generations*, as when living creatures are begotten of duſt and ſlime: and for ſuch *accidental*, perhaps contrary productions, no *law* makes proviſion, no *care* is effectual: only for thoſe effects, that *per ſe*, *of their own accord* are likely to follow (as tranſcribing a Copy is a proper conſequent only to the writing of it) theſe the law of the *Apoſtle* belongs to, and to them our *care* and ſpiritual *prudence* muſt be joined, ſo that we do nothing, though to us never ſo lawful, which we have reaſon to fear, that another who thinks it unlawful, may yet, without ſatisfying his Conſcience, be likely to do after us, or on occaſion of which he may probably do ſomething elſe, which otherwiſe he would not venture to do.

Sect. 32. Having thus far dealt in the retail and gone over all the kinds of ſcandal ſingle, we may now aſcend to the conſideration of all in groſs, and then alſo theſe Corollaries will be found true, that from all the kinds of *Scandal* it is clear, 1. *That no man is offended or ſcandaliz'd, but he that falls into ſome ſin*, and therefore to ſay I am ſcandalized, in the Scripture ſence is to confeſs I have done that which I ought not to have done: and then my only remedy muſt be repentance and amendment.

Sect. 33. 2. *That to be angry, grieved, troubled at any action of another, is not* [*to be offended*] in the Scripture ſence, nor conſequently doth it follow, that I have done amiſs in doing that which another man is *angry* at, unleſs my action be in it ſelf *Evil*. For if it be not, then firſt *he is angry without cauſe*,

cauſe, and that is *his* fault, not *mine*; yea and κρίνει ἀδελφὸν, he *judges* or cenſures *his brother* that hath done no hurt, which the *weak* is forbid to do. *Rom.* 14. 3. And ſecondly, he is of all men moſt unlikely to do that after me, which he is angry at me for doing, and therefore I have leaſt reaſon to fear, or poſſibility to foreſee, that he will be *Scandaliz'd* in the Scripture phraſe: which fear or foreſight were the only juſt motive to me to abſtain from any juſtifiable indifferent action.

The occaſion of the miſtake (or in the *Philoſophers* ſtile the ἄτιον τῦ ψεύδους) the reaſon that men think it a fault to do any indifferent thing that another is *angry* or *diſpleaſed* at, is firſt the equivocalneſs of the Engliſh phraſe *to be offended*, for that in Engliſh ſignifies to be diſpleaſed; but in Greek (the language wherein the New Teſtament is written) it ſignifies no ſuch matter, unleſs by accident, when *being diſpleaſed with Chriſt*, makes a man *deny him and forſake him*: but then alſo 'tis not the being *diſpleaſed*, but the *forſaking or denying him* that is meant by being *offended*, that is *Scandaliz'd*. *Sect.* 34.

Or Secondly, the uſe of a word that ſounds like this in that chapter concerning this matter, *Rom.* 14. for there *v.* 15. this phraſe is uſed εἰ διὰ βρῶμα, [*If becauſe of* thy eating, *thy brother is grieved*, or made ſorry.] Where yet firſt 'twill be much more juſt that that one ſingle word ſhould receive its importance from the whole context, than the whole context from that one word. The whole context from the 13. to the laſt verſe belongs to the ſecond ſort of *Scandal*, when a weak brother, a ſcrupulous Chriſtian, is by another, that is not ſo, caſt off, and ſeparated from, judged and rejected by him, which cannot but be matter of diſcouragement to the weak, and hindrance in his Chriſtian courſe; and therefore in all probability that muſt be the meaning of the 15. *v.* alſo, [*is grieved*] *i.e.* galled, and diſcouraged from the Chriſtian courſe] explain'd by two words, *v.* 21. being ſcandalized, and being *weak or ſick*. And ſo it may eaſily be reſolv'd to ſignify. For ſecondly λύπη, *grief*, may be taken for the *cauſe* of grief, a diſeaſe, or wound, or gall, *&c.* as ὀδὰξ ψυχῆς *Eccluſ.* 30. 10. one that *cauſeth grief to the ſoul*, and as *fear* in Scripture ſignifies *danger*, which is the cauſe of fear, according to a vulgar Hebraiſm ordinary in the *New Teſtament*, where for want of the conjugation *hiphil*, which in Hebrew ſignifies [to make to do any thing] the Greek is fain to uſe the active to *do*. An obſervation which *Hugo Grotius* makes uſe of to explain that Phraſe (I ſhall not enquire how truly) *Mat.* 19. 9. and reſolves that there μοιχᾶται [*committeth adultery*] muſt ſignify [*maketh* her from whom he divorceth, *to commit adultery*] parallel to what we read, *Mat.* 5. 32. So alſo πενθῶν, to *bewail* 2 *Cor.* 12. 21. ſignifies to puniſh, to uſe ſharpneſs, which will cauſe grief, or wayling in them that ſuffer it. The word is very near this other of which now we ſpeak, and therefore *Heſychius* (the beſt gloſſary for the New Teſtament,) renders πένθος both by συμφορὰ calamity, and λύπη grief: *i.e.* grief and the cauſe of grief; which is alſo very obſervable in the uſe of this very word λύπη or λυπεῖν in the Septuagint; the word דוה which ſignifies *infirm*, or *weak*, or ſick, being rendred λυπούμενος *Lam.* 1. 22. ὅλη καρδία μῶ λυπεῖται, where we render *my heart is faint*; and ſo *Iſ.* 1. 5. πᾶσα καρδία εἰς λύπην, the *whole heart is faint*, faintneſs meaning *ſickneſs*, which is the cauſe of grief; and therefore the ſame Hebrew word, is in other places rendred ὀδύνη, *affliction*, or *pain*, and νόσος *Diſeaſe Deut.* 7. 15. agreeable to the 21. *v.* of that *Rom.* 14. where being *ſcandalized*, or *offended* is explained by *being made weak*, which phraſe is not to be taken in the ſence that weakneſs is uſed in, *v.* 1, 2. that of infirmity or error (for ſuch he is, before ſtumbling) but in this other as weakneſs and diſeaſe, *i.e.* ſin, are all one. So alſo another Hebrew word אבד which ſignifies *perdition*, and deſtruction, and is frequently rendred by ἀπώλεια, is once interpreted λύπη *Prov.* 31. 6. οἱ ἐν λύπαις, for which our Engliſh read *ready to periſh*; very agreeable to which doth St. *Paul* here interpret, *grieving the brother by deſtroying him*, *i.e.* driving him away from the Chriſtian courſe, the notion of Scandal, which all this while we ſpeak of. From all which obſervations, and analogies it will be no raſhneſs to conclude, that λυπεῖται, *being grieved*, in that place, is perfectly ſynonymous with ἀσθενεῖ which we there render, is *made weak*, (and in divers places of the New Teſtament ſignifies κοινῶς *diſeaſe*, or *ſickneſs*, and is ſo rendred by us, *James* 5. 14. ἀσθενεῖ τις; *is any man ſick?*) and with ἀπολλεῖται ὁ ἀσθενῶν 1 *Cor.* 8. 11. in the ſame matter, *thy brother is weak*, and dieth, or *periſheth* through *weakneſs*, and with the like phraſe in this chapter alſo, in the end of verſe 15. All which clearly denote the *diſeaſe* or *periſhing* of the *ſoul*, *i.e.* ſin, which will deſtroy, if repentance and mercy intervene not. *Sect.* 35.

The third (which is indeed the main) occaſion of the miſtake, is an ordinary but an unjuſtifiable humour of men, to accuſe and condemn all whom they do not like, *i.e.* a deſire to lay ſome crime to the charge of them, with whom they are *angry*, if it be but *ſe defendendo*, that they may not be ſaid to be *angry without a cauſe*, and when they cannot find any ſuch real crime, then they fly to the caſe of *Scandal*, and miſtaking that for *offending*, *or diſpleaſing*, *or occaſioning anger and diſlike*, their being angry with them, muſt make them with whom they are angry, criminous; which what a circle it is, firſt to be *angry without cauſe*, and then to make that a cauſe of anger, (*i.e.* a ſin in the other) becauſe I am *angry*, I conceive will not be hard for any to underſtand. *Sect.* 36.

I will only add, that if another mans diſpleaſure or anger at my indifferent action, ſhould make that my indifferent action a ſin againſt him, then any mans ſin of uncharitableneſs againſt me muſt make me to be uncharitable, for ſo I ſhould be, if I ſinned againſt him in ſcandalizing him: but if I were not ſo before, his ſin (being utterly accidental and extrinſecal to me) ſhall not, I hope, make me to be ſo now. *Sect.* 37.

To all which I ſhall here inſert this appendage, that even for proper-ſcripture-ſcandals, the criminouſneſs of them is not to be meaſured by the event, but by the natural ſcandalouſneſs, or aptneſs to give *Scandals* inherent in them; for I conceive God paſſes Judgment upon ſinners by intuition, not by previſion, by ſeeing what the ſin is in it ſelf, and in the aggravating circumſtances that are inſeparable from it (as that it is apt to give ſcandals, *&c.*) not by the caſual conſequents that may poſſibly either follow or not follow. And I conceive, that that opinion of the Papiſts (on which they lay part of the foundation of their Purgatory) that men may after their Deaths ſin, and have more acts of ſin lying on them, (by reaſon of other men ſinning by the ſcandal which they gave in their lives) than they had at their Death, and ſo require in juſt recompence, ſome puniſhments increaſeable above what they could be adjudg'd to at their death, is but a phanſy or School-notion, that hath ſome ſhew of truth, but little ſubſtance, ſeeing God puniſheth every man by the verdict of his own Conſcience; *Sect.* 38.

Conſcience; and therefore that other ſin, which my ſin is apt to produce in another, will be by way of aggravation, laid to my charge by God, that ſees my heart, and the inherent ſcandalouſneſs of that action of mine, (though that other man by the grace of God do reſiſt the Temptation which my Scandal gave him,) as much as if he had not reſiſted it, and ſo as his not ſinning ſhall not excuſe and leſſen my fault which was apt to have brought him to ſin; ſo in like manner, if he do not reſiſt the temptation, or if by occaſion of it, he fall by accident (*i. e.* by the motion of ſome other part of his temper) into ſome other ſin, to wit that of cauſleſs anger (which no action of another can be ſaid apt to produce; for if it might, the anger would ceaſe to be cauſleſs) this accidental fall of his ſhall not add to the ſinfulneſs of my act, any more than his former not ſinning did detract from it, nor conſequently make it ſinful, if of it ſelf it were not ſo.

Sect. 39. You will beſt judge of this truth by an example. That *Heliodor* a Biſhop committed a fault, firſt in writing, then in ſetting forth an amorous light fiction or *Romance*, and then improving that fault by chooſing rather to loſe his Biſhoprick than to ſubſcribe the condemnation of his work, is and may be reaſonably acknowledged; That ſome men alſo by reading that Author have ſince been tranſported to the commiſſion of ſome ſins, may not improbably be imagined; but having granted all this (and withal that the aptneſs to give ſuch *Scandal*, was matter of aggravation to his ſin) let me now ſuppoſe, that immediately after his death that book had been burnt (as before his death it was condemn'd) when he was no longer able to preſerve it, would the Councils condemning and committing that execution upon that work, any whit have mitigated his Sentence in Heaven? to affirm that, were to ſuppoſe Purgatory, or ſomewhat like it, or elſe that God by his foreſight of that act of the Council ſhould have allowed him that mitigation at the day of his particular judgment, *i. e.* imputed the caſual future actions of others to the preſent acquitting of him; and then, beſides the many inconveniences that might attend ſuch conceſſions, it muſt alſo follow, that every reprinting of that book ſince that time, hath been a damnable ſin (not only of giving Scandal to ſuch as have been ſince infected by it, but eſpecially) of uncharitableneſs to that poor dead Biſhop, in increaſing his Torments, or making them capable of increaſe ever ſince, by giving him a capacity, and of corrupting more readers; which humanity and charity, and our great obligations to the nature of which we partake, would not permit any good Chriſtian to do willingly; and beſides though our prayers may not be allowed to be able to fetch ſouls out of Purgatory, yet ſuch a not reprinting of his book might do ſomewhat like it, prevent the enlargement of his pains, though not make expiation for him. So again when thoſe obſcene pictures that hiſtorians mention (as I remember in *Tiberius* his time) after the Authors death were burnt, and not permitted liberty to corrupt the eyes of poſterity, but *Aretynes* have had that luck to do it, it would by that School reaſon follow, that *Aretyne* though in the work and the deſign but equal ſinner, were yet by this miſhap of not periſhing, become far more criminouſly guilty, than that other Author; which ſure to affirm were a very irrational nicety.

Sect. 40. 3. A third Corollary, from the view of all the places together will be this, that to *give Scandal is then moſt criminous, when it ſignifies, by my example to bring another man to a ſin*, eſpecially if this ſcandalous action of mine be of it ſelf a ſin, abſtracted from the ſin adherent of *Scandal*; and then let any indifferent man judge in what degree may thoſe be truly ſaid to *ſcandalize or offend others*, (or indeed how they can be excuſed from that crime) who by being angry with me without a cauſe, and ſo committing that ſin againſt Chriſts law, *Mat.* 5. 22. do alſo by ſo doing not only provoke and tempt me to anger back again, which is a ſin in me, if I yield to it, and that more than accidentally cauſed by them that *provoke* me, *Eph.* 5. 4. but give other men, who have a good opinion of their Judgment and ſanctity, a plain pattern of that ſin of uncharitableneſs to tranſcribe and copy out, I mean, to ſin alſo by cauſleſs anger.

Sect. 41. 4. That *the great ſin of Scandal in the uſe of things* indifferent, that St. *Paul* ſo ſpeaks of, and reſolves againſt, *Rom.* 14. *is the ſin of uncharitableneſs, or pride in deſpiſing and not condeſcending to the weak brother*; meaning by the *weak brother* not every one that may fall into any ſin (for ſo every one living will come under that title) but particularly him that is ἀδυνὸς τῇ πίσει, weak and *ignorant, and unſettled in the faith*, as it is oppoſed to *the ſtrong*, *i. e.* the *knowing Chriſtian*.

Sect. 42. And then let any judge whether this can belong to them who profeſs themſelves leaders of others, and would be unwilling to be counted ignorant, and particularly who in the points wherein they profeſs themſelves to be offended, are ſo knowingly reſolv'd, that they will never be induced to do that after me which they affirm themſelves ſcandalized at: which you may diſcern, becauſe they are angry and inviegh againſt me for doing of it, and do not ſo much as pretend that they are by my example enclined to do what I do, and ſo *ſcandalized*; but only angry at me, or my *Action*, and ſo *offended*.

Sect. 43. Mean while I cannot but confeſs that any mans wilful ſin, though it cannot be called weakneſs in our vulgar notion; yet in the other notion of *weakneſs*, for diſeaſe of ſoul, it may well paſs; and deſerve to be the object of my charity and compaſſion, as much or more than *weakneſs* is: and therefore the uncharitableneſs of my brother or his cauſleſs anger againſt me being ſuch, I conceive my ſelf bound to uſe any lawful means which I can hope may be able to prevent any ſuch ſin in him, or to get or recover him out of it; eſpecially if that ſin of his may become probably over and above his uncharitableneſs, a means to ſtop or hinder him in his courſe of reformation, or farther growth in piety; as probably it will be, if I againſt whom he is thus unjuſtly wroth, be his lawful Paſtor; for then that cauſleſs anger or rage of his againſt me may, through his farther default, occaſion in him ſome vow or reſolution, never to hear me, never to be moved or perſwaded by me in any thing, that out of the Pulpit or in private reaſoning or exhortation, I ſhall (never ſo convincingly) propoſe unto him.

Sect. 44. In this caſe it may be demanded whether I ought in charity to abſtain from this indifferent action, which I foreſee will be the matter, though not the cauſe of all this ſin in him, of uncharitableneſs and non-proficiency in his Chriſtian courſe, and whether if I do not ſo abſtain, this be not to *ſcandalize* my brother? To which I briefly anſwer, Firſt, That this anger or uncharitableneſs of his, is not the being ſcandaliz'd in the ſcripture ſence, nor conſequently in that reſpect my Action a

Scandal,

Scandal, though it be the matter of the anger, or that which he is angry with.

Secondly, 'Tis true indeed that his resolving against my preaching, is in him to be *Scandaliz'd*, *i. e.* to fall and be stopt in the service of God: but this only in a general sence; as every other such hard-hearted obdurate resisting of Gods Grace is, or may be called also: and that which occasions this being *Scandaliz'd*, is not my indifferent action, but his anger or uncharitable conceit of me for it, unless equivocally, or remotely, as my action is the object of that anger, which anger is the Author of that prophane resolution. *Sect.* 45.

Yet thirdly, if I might foresee that my indifferent action would occasion, though unjustly, his anger, and his anger produce the effect before-mentioned, I think I should do well to abstain from that indifferent action, in charity to him. *Sect.* 46.

But that with these cautions, First, Unless my indifferent action be ordinable to some good Christian use, and designed by me to it; for then, as the *Jews* resolve that a tree set for fruit though it chance to be worship'd, is not made unlawful by that means, so that indifferent *useful* action of mine will not be made unlawful by the possibility of that ill consequence: Or secondly, unless that action in it self indifferent, by lawful authority be commanded, and so cease to be indifferent to me who am under that authority: Or thirdly, unless my abstaining may as probably prove matter of anger to some other of contrary perswasions: Or fourthly, unless that my abstaining or receding or undoing what before I had done, be more likely to confirm him in his errour (which otherwise in time being not yielded to, he may forsake) than to prevent or allay his causeless anger and those effects of it. Or fifthly, unless I use some means in prudence not only sufficient, but probable to prevent this sin of unjust anger in him before, or to reform it afterward. *Sect.* 47. *Maimon. Hilch. ca.* 5.

But if my abstaining be like to fall into all or any of these inconveniences, then sure I ought not thus to abstain; because when these consequences do attend my abstaining, they are nearer and more immediate to my abstaining, than his resolving against my preaching is to my doing of it. *Sect.* 48.

And another consideration also may be taken, that he that will so causelesly be angry and resolve against the ordinary means of his salvation, will by the suggestion of the Devil or temptation of his own corrupt humour, be likely to find out some other matter of quarrel against me and my preaching, *i. e.* against his own salvation, though I by abstaining from that particular action, deprive him of that. *Sect.* 49.

And lastly, though I shall not define, yet I would have it considered, whether he that is so disposed in soul and affection, that so gives up the reins of his passions, as upon every or no occasion to break out into causeless anger, uncharitableness, and the effects of it forementioned, be at all the more innocent or less culpable in the sight of God by the not committing of some one act of that sin, only through wanting that or any other one occasion of committing that act. For as in good things God accepts the will for the deed (if it be a firm and ratified will, a full actual intention, and want nothing but opportunity to shew it self) and again accepts him that hath expreſt that will by ten only acts, being by want of opportunity deprived of a possibility of adding one act more to the number, as well as him, which having the opportunity that the other wanted, hath exceeded him in the number of outward acts. So there may be some reason to fear, that an unresisted, unrestrained propension or consent to evil, that wants nothing, but an occasion to actuate it, will be as criminous in the sight of God, as if (without any improvement or change, but only by meeting with that occasion) it break forth into act: or that an habitual inclination to sin in one man ten times actuated in the members, having no more occasions to actuate it, shall be as sadly punished, as the same degree of inclination and intention through presence of occasion once more actuated. *Sect.* 50.

The same Consideration will be proper to other particulars incident to the matter of Scandal. As when any thirsty drunkard actually importunate in the pursuit of his espoused sin, shall by occasion of my feast fall into an open act of that sin, (and a hundred the like.) The question then may be, whether supposing him bent to excess, and not only habitually guilty of it, but actually intent upon it, and only kept off by want of Occasion, He would have had less guilt upon his soul, if I had not then invited him. I conceive it hard to maintain the affirmative, for though with men, who see not the heart, no sin is punishable but that in the members (unless in case of Treason) yet with God the sin of the heart and the hand seems to be equally great, the act of the mind and the act of the body; And the minutely preparations of that to sin as punishable, as the minutely execution of this. As in the Schoolmens resemblance the pressing of the stone to the ground is as great when it is withheld by my hand, as when it is actually moving toward the center. *Sect.* 51.

I confess there is somewhat to be said, and perhaps with probability, on the other side. And I think St. *Augustine* somewhere expresseth his opinion, that though in good things God mercifully accepts the will for the deed, yet out of the same mercy and indulgence he punisheth *not so* in evil things; Yet because St. *Augustine* may perhaps mean the incompleat and not perfect act of the will, (which though we yield to be less than the outward act, yet the compleat act of the will, wanting nothing but opportunity of execution, may still be as great,) Or however, because there are not such demonstrable grounds of resolution, as to yield clear conviction to all in this matter, and to assure the Christian that such an Addition of any outward act of sin shall make the punishment the heavier to the habitual sinner, and so the absence of that outward act alleviate it; therefore although I said I think he should do well to abstain, I dare not yet affirm that he is bound in charity to do so; Nothing but charity binding him to it, and the man that still hath that propension unresisted, being (upon this supposition, which we have made not improbable) like to reap little profit from that charity. *Sect.* 52.

As free, and not using your liberty for a Cloak of Maliciousness, but as the servants of God, 1 Pet. 2. 16.
But I say unto you, That whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the Judgment, Mat. 5. 22.

OF

OF
WILL-WORSHIP.

Sect. 1. THE word ἐθελοθρησκία, or *Will-worſhip*, hath for ſome time had the ill fortune to paſs under an ill notion, and be taken for ſomewhat reprovable in a Chriſtian: how juſtly, I ſhall briefly enquire.

Sect. 2. That this word is not uſed in the Greek Tranſlators of the Old Teſtament, or the Apocryphal Authors, (no not ſo much as θρησκία, of which it is compounded, but once or twice in the Book of *Wiſdom*) will be acknowledged by any which ſhall make enquiry: and therefore it cannot be expected, it ſhould receive any light from thence. And in the New Teſtament, it is an ἅπαξ λεγόμενον, but once uſed, *Col.* 2.23. and for other Authors it may ſuffice to have obſerved, that it is not uſed by any, but thoſe who (in all probability) have it from this place of Saint *Paul*. And ſo the reſult of this enquiry will be, how it is uſed, and what it ſignifieth in this one place: which muſt be done by examining the context.

Sect. 3. The Apoſtles diſcourſe in that place is of δόγματα, or *doctrines of men*, teaching ſome things to be forbidden by God, that God forbiddeth not; where yet you muſt obſerve, he doth not ſpeak of commands, but doctrines, *i. e.* not of the prohibition of the Magiſtrate expreſſed by any act of poſitive humane Law (which in indifferent things is permitted to him to interpoſe, and being ſo interpoſed, by vertue of the Apoſtles precept for obedience will have the power of obliging;) but of falſe teachers impoſing them upon their brethren, as Gods commands, when they are not; this is called *Dogmatizing* in this place, *v.* 20. (and *teaching for doctrines the traditions of men*, *Mat.* 15.9. which if the Magiſtrate ſhould do, he ſhould thereby incur the cenſure of a falſe teacher alſo) *i. e.* (as it is clear by the former part of the Chapter, and particularly, *v.* 16.) urging ſome aboliſh'd Ceremonies as ſtill in force by divine precept, which whoſoever doth, he tells them, *Gal.* 5. 2. *That Chriſt ſhall profit them nothing:* upon this ground, that *Chriſt* coming, as the ſubſtance typified by thoſe legal Inſtitutions, did conſequently ſet a period to the obligingneſs of thoſe Inſtitutions; which, if it ſhould be ſtill urged, would be *interpretativè* the denying of Chriſt, and ſo moſt juſtly the forfeiting thoſe benefits, which are to be expected from him; and therefore though St. *Paul* might lawfully (and did) circumciſe *Timothy*, yet the urging of Circumciſion, (or any ſuch Judaical rite, which Chriſt meant to abrogate) for a Doctrine, or teaching that it was then neceſſary for Chriſtians, was in his opinion, the denying of Chriſt: in like manner, as the teaching the abrogation of any of the moral commandments, meant by *the Law and the Prophets*, *Mat.* 5. 17. which Chriſt meant not to abrogate by his coming, is on the other ſide cenſured as a moſt unchriſtian thing, *v.* 19. and a kind of denying of Chriſt alſo.

Sect. 4. This will by the way explain that difference (convenient to be premiſed) betwixt making of poſitive humane Laws in indifferent things (which the frequent commands of *obeying Magiſtrates* preſuppoſe to be Lawful; for if there were no legality in the giving of ſuch commands, the obedience to them being given could not be impoſed on Conſcience, as it is *Rom.* 13. 5. And if the matter of the command were before commanded by God, 'twere then no longer obedience to the law of the Magiſtrate, but only to God: and for an example of this even in matters of Religion, take the example of *David*, who 1 *Chron.* 23. *v.* 24. and 27. numbred the Levites, or appointed them to ſerve and do the work of the houſe of the Lord from the age of twenty years and upward (upon a ground there ſpecified, *v.* 25.) whereas by the command of God to *Moſes*, *Num.* 8. 24. this ſervice belong'd to the Levites, but from twenty five years old and upward, till the age of fifty years, and then they ſhall ceaſe waiting, *v.* 25.) and urging or teaching things for divine commands, which either never were commanded by God, or elſe are now out-dated, and the obligingneſs taken from them by Chriſt. The latter of theſe is it on which the diſcourſe of the Apoſtle proceeds here, without any reflection on the former.

Sect. 5. His meaning in this particular he farther expreſſeth, by naming ſome forms of theſe dogmatizers, *verſe* 21. [*touch not, taſte not, handle not*] noting thereby thoſe kinds of doctrine, which affirm men obliged to faſting, or abſtinence from ſuch or ſuch meats (the word ἅπτεσθαι, to touch, ſignifying to eat, among good authors) which now 'tis by Chriſt made free to all men to uſe *ſine diſcrimine*. Then *v.* 22. he paſſeth a cenſure on ſuch dogmatizing, and on all ſuch out-dated, yet continued legal performances [ἅ ἐστι πάντα εἰς φθορὰν] *all which are to deſtruction, i. e.* deſtructive or dangerous, (not as we render it [*all which are to periſh*] τῇ ἀποχρήσει, *by the abuſe* (not as we render it [*with the uſing:*] The Original enforces no ſuch ſence, and the way of interpretation that is ordinarily affixt to that ſence [the periſhing of the meat by going out into the draught] (when the Apoſtle ſpeaks not of the meat, but of the commands of abſtaining) makes the ſence ſufficiently improbable. The full importance of the words is, that when theſe abſtinences are thus impoſed and taught, as divine obliging precepts, this is an *abuſe* of them, (which were otherwiſe innocent things) and that abuſe annext, makes the very uſe of them dangerous or *deſtructive:* which is the ſence of what the Latine Fathers St. *Auſtine*, and St. *Ambroſe*, have ſaid on this place; *Sunt in interitum & æternam perditionem, ſi credant ea neceſſaria ad ſalutem, They are to deſtruction and eternal perdition to them that believe them neceſſary to ſalvation.*

Sect. 6. Having thus ſet a mark on them for caution, he adds a diſtinct ſpecification of that which makes them ſo dangerous, or deſtructive (which in themſelves were not) [κατὰ τὰ ἐντάλματα καὶ διδασκαλίας τῶν ἀνθρώπων, *after the commandments and doctrines of men*] which words, whether they be annext to

δογματίζεσθε,

δογματίζεσθε *verſe* 20. (the middle words being read in a parentheſis, as our Engliſh reads them) or whether to the immediately precedent, they do point out that wherein the danger doth conſiſt, to wit, impoſing on men humane *ordinances* or *doctrines*; *i.e.* thoſe things, which though they are not commanded by God, are yet by men affirmed, and pretended, and taught (though as we ſay, magiſterially, or without proof) to be ſo *commanded*.

Having thus far expreſſed the danger of taking up ſuch doctrines upon falſe-Teachers impoſing them, the Apoſtle then by way of cloſe (either to take off the varniſh under which they are commended to mens practice, and by which it is made probable to them, that they are commanded; or elſe to ſet down the ſimple nature of theſe things abſtracted from all ſuch accidental abuſe) adds this brief deſcription of the doctrines themſelves or the abſtinences they teach [Ἅτινά ἐστι λόγον μὲν ἔχοντα σοφίας, ἐν ἐθελοθρησκείᾳ, καὶ ταπεινοφροσύνῃ, καὶ ἀφειδίᾳ σώματος, οὐκ ἐν τιμῇ τινὶ, πρὸς πλησμονὴν τῆς σαρκὸς] theſe words are variouſly rendred by Interpreters, as having great difficulty in them. The moſt ſimple genuine ſence methinks might be this [which things have λόγον σοφίας *rationem ſapientiæ*, ſome true, at leaſt appearing *notion of wiſdom* in them (wiſdom in Scripture phraſe ſignifying piety, *i.e.* have either ſome real matter of piety in them, (for ſo λόγον ſignifies: and this would be more clear, if we ſhould read ἅ τινα, disjoined, not in one, but two words, thus [ἅ τινά ἐστιν ἔχοντα λόγον, &c. *which things have ſomewhat of piety in them*, or being conſidered *in ſome reſpect* have *piety in them*;) or, as the Fathers ſeem rather to have underſtood it, ſome colour, ſome appearance of piety; to wit, *in voluntary worſhip and humility, and ſeverity toward*, or puniſhing of, *the body*; as the word ἀφειδία ſignifies, and the margent of our Bibles acknowledges; and *not in any honour or care of the body*, (for ſo τιμὴ in the New Teſtament by an Hebraiſm ſignifies, that *honour* which is expreſt in relieving of wants, *Mat.* 15. 5. 1 *Tim.* 5. 17.) not in adminiſtring to the body *omnia neceſſaria ad ſaturitatem carnis explendam*, as St. *Hierom* hath it, all things neceſſary *to the filling, or ſtuffing, or ſatiating of the fleſh*: for ſo πλησμονὴ ſignifies. And I confeſs I cannot ſufficiently wonder what ſhould move ſome learned Interpreters to explain that word by *mediocritatem ad ſimplicem uſum reſtrictam, A mediocrity without any exceſs*, when the word in all Authors ſignifieth *ſatiety* or fulneſs: In *Galen* 'tis uſed for repletion or ſurfeit; and in all Attick writers for ſomething like that: which made *Robertus Stephanus* in his Greek Concordance render it *ſatietas* in this place: and among the tranſlators of the Old Teſtament, all the Hebrew words that are rendred by it, are of the ſame nature, ſuch are רשן fatneſs, טרח *gravamen*, רביבים from רבב *multiplicare*, and eſpecially שבעה from שבע *ſatiatus eſt*, which is by them eighteen times rendred πλησμονή. *Sect.* 7.

This laſt part of the verſe is added, I conceive, to illuſtrate the former *à contrario*, and ſo to ſhew that there is ſomewhat of true or pretended piety in thoſe former doctrines by their contrariety to that tending, and filling, and pampering of the fleſh, which is ſo unlike piety or Chriſtianity: and though the connexion of this laſt clauſe with the reſt be ſomewhat perplext, yet you ſhall find it but little more cleared by any other interpretation that will be affixt to it; and upon examination I am a little confident, that this which I have given is the moſt prompt, and proper, and genuine rendring of the verſe, that will be met with among interpreters. *Sect.* 8.

Which being acknowledged, there will be no doubt or difficulty in reſolving, that there is no ill character ſet upon ἐθελοθρησκείᾳ, or *will-worſhip* by the Apoſtle in this place. And if you demand what it is that is noted by it, I anſwer punctually, That voluntary worſhip, or acts of Religion, which the Hebrews call נדבה *the free will-offering* often mentioned in the Pentateuch, which was not required of them by any obligation of particular law, and yet was not wont to be condemned or ſuſpected, but accounted as acceptable to God: under which head the abſtinences here ſpoken of may not unfitly be comprehended. *Sect.* 9.

For the clearing of all which, I ſhall, firſt, give my reaſons for my firſt aſſertion, that ἐθελοθρησκεία is here uſed in a good creditable ſence. Secondly, I ſhall gheſs at the grounds, or occaſions of the ordinary miſtake of it in them that take it for a fault. And thirdly, I ſhall add ſomewhat concerning thoſe voluntary oblations noted by it, as they may be appliable to us Chriſtians. *Sect.* 10.

A firſt reaſon of my aſſertion is, becauſe *will-worſhip* is here joined with two, not only lawful, but laudable Chriſtian vertues: as, firſt, with *humility*, which being by *Calvin* interpreted in this place *Dei & hominum reverentia*, the reverence both of God and men, is without doubt a Chriſtian vertue (and hath nothing in this place to ſet an ill character upon it, what ever it may *verſe* 18. being joined with worſhip of Angels) and being ſo, cannot be ſo ill company as to defame the will-worſhip to which it aſſociates, but will rather plead for it, that it is of the ſame making, a Chriſtian vertue alſo. Secondly, 'tis joined with puniſhing, or not ſparing, or (as *Calvin* varies the phraſe) mortifying of the body, which as an Act of ſelf-denial cannot be unacceptable to Chriſt, and as a ſpecies of ἐκδίκησις, *revenge*, 2 *Cor.* 7. 11. will deſerve to be numbred among the effects of godly ſorrow. *Sect.* 11.

A ſecond reaſon is, becauſe theſe very doctrines of abſtinence, *&c.* are here ſaid in reſpect of the will-worſhip, *&c.* diſcernible in them, to have λόγον σοφίας, *rationem ſapientiæ*, ſomewhat of wiſdom or piety in them: which [ſomewhat] if it be real according to the former interpretation of the word λόγος, it will then be parallel to that which is ſaid upon the like occaſion of σωματικὴ γυμναsία bodily exerciſe, 1 *Tim.* 4. 8. which doth belong not to the *gymnici agones*, the Olympick exerciſes, as ſome contrary to the context would wreſt it, but to ſuch kind of ἀσκήσεις abſtinence, continence, *&c.* mention'd, *v.* 1. which though, when they are taught as neceſſary (to the defaming of marriage or meats, as ἀποβλασία, unlawful, and to *be refuſed*, *v.* 4. and in the ſtyle of the Fathers, and Councils, βλαβερὰ καὶ βδελυκτὰ *hurtful* and *abominable*) are then ſigns of apoſtaſy from the faith, *v.* 1. yet conſidered in themſelves as voluntary acts, are there ſaid to be profitable, or (though in an inferiour degree, being compared with piety, yet) ὠφέλιμοι, *a little profitable* ſtill, or profitable for a little. But if that interpretation of [λόγον] will not be accepted, but [*ſpeciem*] *ſhew of wiſdom* be required to be taken in its ſtead, yet will the argument be ſtill of validity: For can any thing be ſaid to have ſo much as a *ſhew* of wiſdom or piety in reſpect to *will-worſhip* in it, if that *will-worſhip* thus pretended, paſs confeſtly either for fooliſh, or impious? Can any thing be repre-

ſented to me as having ſo much as a *ſhew* of piety, in reſpect to rage or luſt diſcernible in it? Certainly, whoſoever would make ſuch a recommendation, muſt, if he ſpeak in earneſt, ſuppoſe ſomewhat really of piety in thoſe paſſions alſo, or otherwiſe they cannot impart ſo much as a *ſhew of piety* to any thing elſe.

Sect. 13. A third reaſon is, becauſe the Greek Fathers in their expoſitions of this place, though they interpret λόγον, only of appearance or ſhew, as contrary to δύναμις and ἀλήθεια, power and truth, or as *Oecumenius* hath it, πιθανολογίας λόγον ψιλὸν, a bare ſhew of probability, yet generally they paraphraſe will-worſhip, and humility, and not ſparing of the body, by words of good ſavour. Thus Saint *Chryſoſtom*, δοκεῖ γὰρ εὐλαβὴς τις εἶναι καὶ μέτριος καὶ τοῦ σώματος καταφρονεῖν, ἂν τύχῃ δὲ· *He appears pious, and moderate, and a contemner of the body*; and then all the fault is, that he is not truly what he appears: and *Theophylact* hath the ſame words, and *Oecumenius* comes very near ὑποκειμένων εὐλάβειαν ἐν τῇ θρησκείᾳ, &c. pretending (*i. e.* having a ſhew of) *piety and devotion in worſhip*: by which 'tis clear what notion they had of ἐθελοθρησκεία, to wit, that of devotiouſneſs, piety, the thing which is commended (by that word) in *Simeon*, *Luke* 2. 25. δίκαιος καὶ εὐλαβὴς, juſt and devout: and *Acts* 2. 5. and 8. 2. and preſcribed by St. *Paul*, *Heb.* 12. 28. and ſo ſure far enough from any
P. 447. ill notion; even ſo far, that the interpreter of *Clemens Alex.* rendreth ἐν ἐθελοθρησκείᾳ *in religione*, in religion.

Sect. 14. A fourth reaſon, becauſe by this way of interpreting, that very obſcure place, which hath poſed ſo many, may conveniently be underſtood, and this prove the importance of it. That ſuch doctrines are deſtructive of Chriſtian Religion, in obtruding humane out-dated *Judaical* conſtitutions for *divine precepts*, ſtill obliging Chriſtians (as they that urge the neceſſity of circumciſion, *evacuate the doctrine of the Goſpel*, *Gal.* 5. 2.) and yet in ſome reſpects have *piety* in them, at leaſt a *ſhew of it*, to wit, in *Will-worſhip*, *Humility*, &c.

Sect. 15. A fifth, becauſe that which *Heſychius* ſaith of this word, is very agreeable to this interpretation, for he renders ἐθελοθρησκεία by ἐθελοσέβεια, voluntary worſhip or piety (as ἐθελοκωφῶν, a word uſed *Eccl.* 19. 27. is, ſaith he, ἐθελόπλως κωφεύων, ἐθελοπερίεργος, ἑκὼν περίεργος) the very notion of the נדבה I told you of, ſo ordinarily rendred by the LXXII. ἐκούσια, voluntary gifts, or offerings, or performances.

Sect. 16. A ſixth, becauſe reaſon it ſelf aſſures us, that thoſe things which are done in the ſervice of God, are not therefore ill becauſe they are ſpontaneous, (the [a] voluntarineſs of an action is not able to defame it, if there be no ἀνομία, no irregularity imputable to the action it ſelf, abſtracted from the voluntarineſs: there being no *univerſal negative* command in the Scripture, eſpecially the New Teſtament, prohibiting all things and degrees of things, beſides what are in particular commanded) but on the other ſide, when in the ſervice of God, a man out of a pious affection (of love and gratitude inciting to do things acceptable to God: as well as of fear deterring from all that is prohibited) ſhall (in conformity to God's *general* commands, and the doctrine of the Goſpel) do any thing elſe, beſide what God hath commanded by any particular precept, this action of his, is to be accounted ſo much [b] more commendable and acceptable to God, piety being one of thoſe vertues *quarum tantæ ſunt amplitudines, ut quantò auctiores ſunt, tantò ſint etiam laudatiores*; *which have ſuch width of compaſs, that the larger they are, they are alſo ſo much more commendable*; and withal, the more *voluntary* and *ſpontaneous*, the more *acceptable*. To which that of the ſon of *Syrach* is agreeable, *Eccl.* 43. 30. *When you glorifie the Lord, exalt him as much as you can, for even he yet will far exceed*; *and when you exalt him, put forth all your ſtrength, for you can never go far enough, i. e.* how far ſoever you exceed the *particular* command, you are yet within the compaſs of the *general*, and in reſpect of that can never be thought to have done enough, though the particular act or the degree of it, be ſomewhat that you are not particularly obliged to.

[a] *Vide Socr. Eccl. hiſt.* l. 5. c. 22. Ἐπειδὴ οὐδεὶς οὐδὲ τοῦτο (ſpeaking of Eccleſiaſtical rites) ἔγγραφον ἔχει δεῖξαι παράγγελμα ὅλον ὡς περὶ τούτου τῇ ἐκείνου γνώμῃ καὶ προαιρέσει ἐπέτρεψαν οἱ Ἀπόστολοι, ἵνα ἕκαστος μὴ φόβῳ, μηδ' ἐξ ἀνάγκης τὸ ἀγαθὸν κατεργάζοιτο ſuppoſing that to be good when 'tis done, which yet was not commanded. [b] Ἃ μὲν ὑπὲρ τὴν ἐντολὴν γίνεται, πολλὴν ἔχει τὴν μισθὸν καὶ τοῦτο, ἂν ἐν ἐντολῆς τάξει ᾖ τοσοῦτον. *Chryſ.* in 1 *Cor.* 9. 18. *A. Gellius Noct. Att.* l. 4. c. 9.

Sect. 17. Having thus vindicated this word from the abuſe and reproach laid on it, it follows in the ſecond place that I point at the αἴτιον τῆς ψεύδους that which ſeems to have cauſed or occaſioned this abuſe, and that I conceive to be ſome one or more of theſe four things.

Sect. 18. 1. That the vulgar Latine tranſlation renders ἐθελοθρησκεία *ſuperſtitio*, from whence I conceive it is that Maſter *Calvin* hath taken confidence to ſay, that *Superſtitio Græcis dicitur* ἐθελοθρησκεία, and St. *Jerome* agreeable to that tranſlation, (which in this was moſt probably his) *Infelices Judæi quantâ ſuperſtitione vivant inter nationes, dicentes, Ne tetigeris, ne guſtaveris*, &c. Whereas the truth is, δεισιδαιμονία is the Greek for Superſtition, and ἐθελοθρησκεία ſignifies it no more, then θρησκεία doth, which although it be by *Etymologiſts* deduced from θρῶξ, and ſo appropriated to ſome cuſtoms of the *Thracians*, and abuſively belongs to καλαχόρους καὶ ἀδείφαγους ἱερουργίας, ſuperfluous and curious worſhips, as *Plutarch* hath it, yet in ſimplicity of ſpeech ſignifies worſhip, and in holy writ is uſed in this good ſence, *Acts* 26. 5. *Ja.* 1. 17. (and never otherwiſe but when the adjuncts alter it) and from thence the compound ἐθελοθρησκεία, voluntary or ſpontaneous worſhip.

ad Gal. c. 3. t. 9. p. 171. *Sic. & qu.* 10. *ad Algas.* t. 3. p. 171. *In Alex.*

Sect. 19. 2. That as among the Jews in the time of the θεοκρατεία, or *God's immediate preſiding among them*, all was to be done according to the pattern (*in monte*) in the mount; ſo ſome men have reſolv'd themſelves and laboured to perſwade others, though without any New Teſtament evidence, (Chriſt having no farther interpoſed in this matter, nor the Apoſtles, than that all be done decently and ordinately, and that obedience be paid to the higher powers in thoſe things, wherein the law of nature, and the Goſpel hath neither commanded, nor prohibited) that no rite, no circumſtance, no degree of worſhip may be uſed in the Chriſtian Church, but what hath Chriſts example or particular precept to authorize it; which aſſertion being ſo irrational and proofeleſs, and yet ſo reſolute not to yield, hath been fain to catch at any thing to ſuſtain it, which can come within its reach, and in deſtitution of other auxiliaries, hath faſtened on this (though but ſound of) word, and taken advantage by the obſcurity of this one Text to impoſe upon eaſy readers this falſity, that what-ever is not commanded by Chriſt by his particular precept, or juſtified by his example, is cenſurable under the title

title of Will-worſhip, though otherwiſe in reſpect of the matter of it, it would not be cenſurable. Which concluſion when we conſider what ſmall ground it hath in that obſcure Text thus explained; we ſhall have little temptation to reſolve on, as a foundation to ſuperſtruct any other doctrines upon, (which we muſt not do but upon plain undoubted Texts) or to conclude thoſe actions *criminous*, becauſe *voluntary*, which we may rather moſt juſtly conclude juſtifiable, becauſe not prohibited; and not only ſo, but alſo acceptable to God, if agreeable to his general commands, and the doctrine of the Goſpel, and the more acceptable for the voluntarineſs, as being in that parallel to thoſe oblations which are pronounced moſt acceptable. Two paſſages I have lately obſerved, which though they be not of any great authority, yet appearing at the firſt ſight diſtinctly contrary to my preſent affirmation, I have thought not impertinent here to take into conſideration. The firſt is in *Photius*'s ἐκλογαὶ out of *Philoſtorgius* ſet out very lately by *Jacobus Gotofredus* in Greek and Latine. The words in Latine (which is the language which thoſe who are moſt ſubject to be abuſed in this matter will be moſt likely to read him in) are theſe. *Theophilus ad Indiam profectus eſt, multaq; quæ apud eos haud ritè fiebant, emendavit; nam & ſedentes audiebant lectiones Evangelicas, & alia quædam faciebant quæ lex divina non præcipit.* Which words affirming [*that 'twas a fault, to be mended in them, to do ſome thing which the divine Law commands not*] ſeem to conclude againſt all voluntary worſhip uncommanded by the word of God, as abſolutely unlawful; how juſtly, you ſhall now diſcern. To which purpoſe you muſt firſt obſerve the words in the Greek, which in *Gotofreds* copy run thus, ἢ ἄλλα τινὰ οὐ μὴ θεῖος διατάξει διατέτακτο, but in the manuſcript in the publick Library, have ἐπιτρέπει inſtead of διατάξει; this undoubtedly is the truer reading, and the meaning of the word is, to admit, permit, or to uſe, *invaleſcere, vel obtinere*, to prevail or obtain for the uſage of any thing. To which if you add that θεῖος διατάξις ſignifies not the *Law* or *word of God*, but the *ſacred Canons* or cuſtoms of the Church (which beſide other * arguments is clear by *Nicephorus* his repeating thoſe ſame words (out of *Photius*, for 'tis clear by other evidences that *Nicephorus* made uſe of *Photius*'s *Ecloga*, and not of the entire copy of *Philoſtorgius*) only with this change of ἐκκλησιαστικὸς for θεῖος, as *Gotofred* in his notes acknowledges) the product will then be only this, that the thing which in thoſe *Indians* was amiſs, and reformed by *Theophilus*, was the ſitting at the reading of the Goſpel, and doing ſome other things which the Eccleſiaſtical or ſacred Canons did not allow of, or uſe, for which they were not in force, and ſo the place will yield us an authority from the antient Canons for ſtanding at the reading of the Goſpel, but offer us nothing which we ſhall need to quarrel with. He that is not ſatisfied with this account which I have given him of this place, I ſhall deſire, will conſider whether it be probable that the ſitting at the reading of the Goſpel ſhould go for a fault, only becauſe the Scriptures command it not. This I am confident will not be affirmed by the adverſaries of my preſent aſſertions, who for the moſt part chooſe to ſit at the reading of the Goſpel, upon this very ground, becauſe ſtanding at that time is not commanded in the Scripture. The caſe I conceive ſo clear that I ſhall not farther enlarge upon it.

Hiſt. Eccl. l. 3. c. 8.

* As *Epiphan. Hær. 8. adv. Meſſalian.* ſpeaking of the *Conſtitutions* of *Clemens*, [ἐν ταῖς διατάξεσι τῶν Ἀποστόλων φάσκει ὁ θεολόγος] thoſe *antient Canons* being indeed antiently accounted and read among *Apocryphal* Books of Scripture, ὃ κανονιζόμενα μὲν, τετυπωμένα δὲ παρὰ τῶν πατέρων ἀναγινώσκεται.—*Athanaſ. in Epiſt. ἑορταστικῇ 39. Et in Synopſi.* (nay *Jo. Damaſcenus* numbers the *Canons* of the *Apoſtles* among the *Canonical* Books of Scripture, and the *Pſeudo-Clemens* commands his *Conſtitutions* to be admitted among the Scriptures of the New T.) and in the στιχομετρία (telling how many lines every Book contains) of *Nicephorus Patriarch* of *Conſtantinople*, among the *Apocryphal* writings of the New T. is numbred Διδαχὴ Ἀποστόλων στιχ. σ and Κλήμεντος στιχ. βχ. and ſo in the Index of *Canonical* and *Apocryphal* Books ſet in the *Oxford* Library at the end of the Queſtions of *Anaſtaſius Nicænus*, there is both Διδαχαὶ Ἀποστόλων, and Διδασκαλία Κλήμεντος.

The ſecond place that I promiſed to mention, is in our *Anglican Councils* ſet out by that excellent Gentleman, Sir *Hen. Spelman*, p. 449. *Canon. ſub Edgaro, Can.* 60. where among other particulars we find theſe words, þe læra ð —— *We teach that all Prieſts ſhall blot out all Superſtitions of the Gentiles, and we forbid* þilpeorþunga, which word from the ſound of it (*wilneorthunga*) is there tranſlated in *Latine* into *fictas ad libitum adorationes*, and in the margin a reference is made to ἐθελοθρησκεία, *Will-worſhip, Col.* 2. But there is a miſtake in that tranſlation; which will be evident to any, by putting theſe two things together; firſt by comparing with this place, an antient *Saxon Pœnitential* which repeats thoſe very *Canons*, where an ancient hand hath expounded that word by *fontis veneratio*, the *worſhip of wells*, or *Well-worſhip*: (the probability of which interpretation will be the greater, not only by obſerving, that the *Saxon* word þil ſignifies a *well* or *fountain*, as frequently as *voluntatem, will*, but alſo becauſe in this very *Canon*, he ſpeaks of heathen *worſhips* of *ſtones* and *trees*, to which the rendring this of *Wells* or *fountains* will be moſt agreeable:) ſecondly, by adding to this another *Canon* in that *Pœnitential*, l. 7. c. 22. where there is a prohibition againſt *vowing*, or *bringing almes* or *offerings to any well, or ſtone, or tree, or to any other creature, but only in Gods name, to Gods Church*, and when we conſider how ordinary it was in former times to *worſhip*, and bring *offerings* to *wells* and *fountains*, the reaſonableneſs of ſuch prohibitions will be acknowledged. Of which kind are divers Injunctions to be ſeen, particularly in the office of *Lincoln*, of *Oliver Sutton* againſt the *worſhipping* of St. *Edwards well* without St. *Clements* in *Oxford*, and St. *Laurences well* at *Peterburgh*. So in a *Saxon* Homily of Biſhop *Lupus*, ſpeaking of vitious men, by the aſſault of tribulations, brought to ſome ſenſe of their eſtate, he ſaith, that then ſuddainly by the ſeduction of the Devil, they vow their almes oðþonto pylle, oðþonto ȝrane —— *fol.* 6. *either to well, or ſtone.* —— And in another *De Baptiſmo, f.* 20. he warns them againſt *luxury, adultery*, and *witchcraft*, &c. and then adds, ne peorðian ȝe pyllar, &c. *and worſhip not wells, nor trees*, for all theſe are idle phantaſms of the Devil. But this by the way, to prevent miſtakings.

A third ground or occaſion of this abuſe of the word I ſuppoſe to be the affinity of the 18. verſe of that chapter to the *Col.* [*Let no man deceive you in a voluntary humility* ——] to this now in hand. For I am perſwaded, many men have not obſerved the great diſtance between them, and for want of doing ſo, have thought ἐθελοθρησκεία here ſubject to all the ſame charges which the worſhip of Angels is there guilty of, and ſo particularly of that crime of Superſtition, which the worſhippers of Angels cannot be freed from, eſpecially ſeeing that they, like the Dogmatizers here, did teach that worſhip to be the will of God, and that God was honoured in the worſhip of thoſe Officers of his; the error which, as *Maimonides* obſerved, hath brought the greateſt part of Idolatry firſt into the World,

Sect. 20.

De Idolol. c. 1.

exiſtimando hanc varietatem eſſe Dei voluntatem, when men conceived and taught that theſe vain Idolatrous or ſuperſtitious worſhips were the will and pleaſure of God.

Sect. 21. For the clearing of this matter, and rectifying the miſtake, I ſhall not doubt to affirm, that the prohibition in the 18. verſe (though in ſome tranſlations it ſeems to belong to this matter of Will-worſhip, and conſequently to ſet an ill character upon it, and although *Clemens Alexandrinus* compound both theſe verſes together, reading thus, μηδεὶς ὑμᾶς καταβραβευέτω ἐν ἐθελοθρησκείᾳ ταπεινοφροσύνης καὶ ἀφειδίᾳ σώματος, yet) will be found not at all to belong to it, if the Greek Text in that Chapter be conſulted with, and the Hebraiſm in θέλων be taken notice of.

Strom. l. 3. *p.* 447.

Sect. 22. To which end you may obſerve theſe two things, Firſt, That the words are not in the original ἐν ἐθελοταπεινοφροσύνῃ, καὶ ἐθελοθρησκείᾳ, but θέλων ἐν ταπεινοφροσύνῃ, καὶ θρησκείᾳ. Now the word θέλων hath in the Septuagints tranſlation of the old Bible, (and by proportion may have alſo here) a ſence which Attical writers have not taken notice of, and it will by Analogy be fitteſt rendred thus [pleaſing himſelf, or delighting in humility and worſhipping of Angels;] or as St. *Hierome* explains it, *Superbus ficta humilitate*, proud of a feigned humility) as 1 *Sam.* 18. 22. the Septuagint read θέλει ἐν σοὶ ὁ βασιλεύς, which the Engliſh out of the Hebrew render [The *King delighteth in thee*,] and ſo 2 *Sam.* 15. 26. and very often in other places, upon this ground or Original that the Hebrew ſignifies both *acquievit*, and *voluit*, to *delight in*, and to *will*; and ſo in the old Teſtament is rendred promiſcuouſly, εὐδοκέω *I am well pleaſed*, and θέλω *I will*, and one ſometimes uſed when the other would be more proper, (which cuſtom is not unuſual in the New Teſtament, for thus you ſhall find it, *Mat.* 27. 43. ῥυσάσθω αὐτὸν εἰ θέλει αὐτόν, which though we there render, (*Let him deliver him if he will have him*, inſerting the word [have] and by that indeed ſomewhat changing the ſence) yet, *Pſal.* 22. 8. (whence 'tis apparent the words are taken, and where the Septuagint render חפץ by θέλει) we render it, *let him deliver him, if he delight in him*; In like manner as *Tob.* 13. 6. Τίς γινώσκει εἰ θελήσει ὑμᾶς; we render, *Who knows if he will accept you*, i. e. be pleaſed with you?

חפץ

Sect. 23. But beſides, as this *delight or will* in this 18. Verſe is faſten'd on an unlawful thing, to wit, *worſhipping of Angels* (a thing not only not preſcribed, but prohibited by God) and includes ſuch an impious kind of miſtaken humility that takes in others either as Mediators to God, or as to be adored beſide him, (as the *Angelici* in the Chriſtian Church, and the *Eſſeni* among the Jews did) ſo and in this ſence this worſhip (if you would from hence ſtile it *Will-worſhip*, or what you pleaſe) ſhall be without any difficulty acknowledged by me to be an unlawful thing, as being the willing of that which God forbids; which though it be readily granted, yet it will remain true nevertheleſs, that *voluntary worſhip*, where the matter is perfectly *lawful*, not forbidden, nay *approved* by a *general* (though not commanded by any particular) *precept*, is far enough from having any tincture of evil in it. But this would deſerve a larger diſcourſe by way of comment on that Verſe. In the mean while, this may ſerve to ſhew how groundleſs the miſtake is that ariſeth from hence.

ἀναξίων λόγου τῆς μεταλήψεως τοῦ μονογενοῦς τὸ προσάγειν ἡμᾶς τῷ πατρὶ, καὶ μεῖζον ἢ κατ' ἄνθρωπίνην σμικρότητα. ἐνλογώτερον δ' ἂν εἴη λέγειν, ὅτι, οἱ ἄγγελοι ἀνάρχησαν τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ προσαγωγῇ, ἐκ τούτου δὲ ἀσῶζον τὴν ἀγγέλων θρησκείαν, καὶ ἔπεθον τὸ ἀφελεσίφες τούτοις προσέχειν, ὡς σωτικὸν ἡμᾶς. *Theophyl. in Col. cap.* 2.

Sect. 24. The fourth and laſt occaſion of this miſtake which I ſhall obſerve, is the uſe of a word in *Epiphanius* (which I perceive to be taken notice of by learned men) ἐθελοπεριτροθρησκεία, which being attributed to the *Phariſees* there, (who, ſaith he, were ſo called for that reaſon, the word *Phariſee* coming from an Hebrew primitive, which ſignifies *ſeparation* or *diſcrimination*, and ſo denoting ſome performances in them, wherein they *exceeded* other *Jews*) may perhaps ſeem to be taken in an ill notion.

פרש

Sect. 25. To which I anſwer, Firſt, that if ἐθελοπεριτροθρησκεία were a denotation of ſome ill, it would not yet neceſſarily prejudice ἐθελοθρησκεία which we ſpeak of; becauſe the περισσὸν added in that word, noting *abundance* or *ſuperfluity* (which perhaps may refer either to ſome unlawful, or at leaſt vain luxuriant matter, taken into that worſhip; as for example, either prohibited *objects*, or noxious, at leaſt burthenous in the number, or in the quality ridiculous *ceremonies*) might turn that into evil which the *voluntarineſs* or *uncommandedneſs* of them were not able to do.

Sect. 26. But then, Secondly, I cannot acknowledge, that that word is by *Epiphanius* there taken in an ill ſence: all that the context enforces, is but this, that that is the meaning or interpretation of their name; and ſure it is not neceſſary, that becauſe the *Phariſees* were evil men, or had ſome great faults, therefore their name ſignified ſome ill thing, for ſure if their name was aſſumed by their own choice, they would not be ſuch ill Carvers to themſelves, (I am ſure other *Hereticks* were not, as the *Novatians* called themſelves καθαροί. *pure*, and the Montaniſts, οἱ πνευματικοί, *the ſpiritual*, &c.) and that it was impoſed on them by other men 'tis not affirmed: and beſides I remember that ſome other ancient Writers interpret that name by ἀφωρισμένοι τῷ θεῷ, *ſeparate or ſet apart to God*, and no man will think there is any hurt in that, ſave only the vanity of uſurping that title, and incloſing it from all others.

Chryſoſtome, Oecumenius, &c.

Sect. 27. The truth is, that was the main crime that defamed the *Phariſees*, their cenſorious proud deſpiſing of other men, whom they thought not ſo godly as themſelves; and therefore I remember 'tis Saint *Chryſoſtom*'s advice, that when the *Phariſee* and the *Publican* are compared by *Chriſt*, and the Publican prefer'd, we ſhould be careful, not to prefer the Publicans *ſins* before the Phariſees *good qualities*, before his *faſting* and *tithing*, but only the Publicans *humility* before the Phariſees *pride*, the *Publicans judging himſelf*, before the *Phariſees* faſtidious *contemning* of others. For the Phariſees exactneſs in thoſe particulars neglected by others, or not obſerved in that height, is ſo far from being reprehended in the Scripture, that 1. 'Tis diſtinctly ſaid, that the ἔδει or *oportuit* [*theſe things ought ye to have done*] belonged (to the doing of thoſe other things omitted by them, *judgment*, *mercy*, *and faith*, and) not to the *leaving* thoſe *undone*, which they did obſerve. 2. Saint *Paul* ſpeaking not contumelioufly or ſarcaſtically, but ſadly of himſelf, calls that *Sect* of the Phariſees by an honourable title ἀκριβεστάτην αἵρεσιν τῆς θρησκείας, *Act.* 26. *a way of the greateſt ſtrictneſs in religion.* Which though it excuſes not the *Phariſees* other faults, yet it is far from being it ſelf any ill character, or leaving any blemiſh upon their voluntary religious performances, wherein their ſuperlative ſtrictneſs conſiſted.

To

To theſe I ſhall add a third anſwer, which the learned Critical Writers concerning the Sects among the *Jews* will authorize, that the original of theſe *Phariſees* was from the חסידים or *Haſidæi*, who were ſo called for their exceſs of piety and charity, their voluntary performances above what the Law required of them. Theſe are mentioned, 1 *Mac.* 2. 42. and defined to be ἐκουσιαζόμενοι τῷ νόμῳ, we render it *voluntarily devoted to the Law*, but the phraſe ſignifies thoſe that in their obedience performed voluntarily ſome things which the Law required not, (or perhaps particularly in that place, thoſe that liſted themſelves voluntarily to defend the Law by arms) and ſo differed from the *Karraim* or *Karæi* who did that only which was commanded by Law. Of both which compared together, 'tis the learned and the Proteſtant *Scaligers* obſervation, *Elench. Trihæres. cap.* 22. that as no man is required to do more than is commanded him, (and ſo the *Karraim* are juſtified) ſo no man is to be quarrel'd with for doing better, when he is bound to do well; or for performing much when a mediocrity is required of him, and ſo the *Haſidæi* juſtified alſo, and with them the ἐθελοθρησκεία we ſpeak of. But when that ἐκουσιασμὸς (ſaith he) became ἀνάγκη, when thoſe voluntary free-will-offerings began to be formed into precepts, and entred into books, then from *Haſidim* or pious men, they became dogmatizers, laid obligation upon all to do as they did, and then being not obeyed in their ſevere preſcriptions, diſcriminated themſelves from all others, as the only obedient ſervants of God, and ſo called themſelves פרושים *Phariſees*, divided not only from the reſt of the prophane World, which did not as they did, but from the very *Haſidim* themſelves, who performed as much as they, but thought not themſelves obliged by Law to do ſo. Which being the notion of the *Phariſees*, may by *Epiphanius* be expreſt and cenſured by the word ἐθελοφαρισαιοθρησκία, as they that in *Coloſſ.* 2. offended not in the Will-worſhip, did yet in the dogmatizing, and ſo the *Haſidæi* we may juſtify, though not the *Phariſees*, the ἐθελοθρησκεία though not the ἐθελοφαρισαιοθρησκεία. And this I thought not amiſs to add *ex abundanti*, more than the neceſſity of the preſent diſquiſition required of me, that I might have my נדבה or *voluntary oblation* to preſent to the Reader alſo. *Sect.* 28.

Now for the third and laſt thing propoſed, concerning thoſe voluntary oblations under the Law, it will be worth obſerving; firſt, that they were a part of the worſhip and ſervice of God when they were performed, and therefore avowed by thoſe *General precepts* which reſpect that worſhip of his; Secondly, that they were not commanded particularly by any *particular* command of God's in the Law, but were left to every mans liberty (except it were in caſe of vow, which yet it was free to him not to make,) and ſo were *Spontaneous*, not neceſſary; to which purpoſe 'tis obſervable what the *Pſeudo-Clemens*, an antient Writer, Διαταξ. 1. 6. *c.* 22. affirms (I ſay not how truly) that before the *golden Calf* and their other *Idolatries*, *ſacrifices* were not commanded or impoſed on the *Jews*, but only left to their free power, ἐὰν ποιῆς, *&c.* and upon thoſe provocations of theirs, impoſed ὅπως πεζόμενοι ἢ ὑπὸ κλοιὸν ἀγχόμενοι ἢ πολυθέω πλάνης ἐκσῶσι, *that* theſe *weights might traſh, and keep them from Idolatry*; and thirdly, that *Lev.* 22. there is a Law, by which he that offers them is forbid to offer them *maimed* or *blemiſht*, *ver.* 20. from all which together it appears, that they were *voluntary*, and yet allowed by God and accepted. And then I cannot ſee why there may not be ſomewhat in Chriſtianity of the ſame conſtitution alſo, *voluntary* and not *particularly* impoſed, and yet allowed by (and acceptable to) God; Nor why he that doth any ſuch thing, may not be called ἐθελοθρησκὸς, and the oblation or action it ſelf ἐθελοθρησκεία. Under which head or title I ſhould place whatſoever may by the doctrine of the Goſpel appear to be *acceptable* to *Chriſt*; and yet is not *commanded* by any particular command of his; or which is commanded for the *act*, but not for the *ſpecification* of it to time, or place, or degree, *&c.* *Sect.* 29.

Of which kind there be many particulars incident, both in the worſhip of God, (as *Abels* oblation, which the Fathers generally obſerve, not to have been by any precept from God; and as the day of *Dedication* among the *Jews*, not commanded by God again, though by pious Princes brought into their Church, and obſerved by Chriſt himſelf; ſo the celebration of *Purim*, and the faſts of the fourth, and fifth, and ſeventh, and tenth month, all acceptable to God, though not commanded by him:) and in actions of common life, if it were ſeaſonable to inſert them here. I ſhall only mention one or two πρὸς δεῖξιν. God commanded not *David* to build him a Temple, nor to make tender of that ſervice, as will appear, 2 *Sam.* 7. 5, *&c.* Nay, profeſſes himſelf content to live in Tents and Tabernacles. And yet *David*'s intention to build a Temple for God, that magnificent deſign of his, though never ſo much exceeding God's command, is very acceptable to God, as appears by *Nathans* meſſage to him in that place, and *Solomons* comment upon it, 1 *Kings* 8. 18. *Thou didſt well that it was in thine heart.* *Sect.* 30.

In like manner [a] Saint *Paul* might have received hire for his labour from the *Corinthians*, but would not; which matter is ſet down at large by him, 1 *Cor.* 9. The *preaching* of the *Goſpel* was *committed* to him as a *truſt*, and was under *precept*, and therefore that was no *free-will-offering* of his. That is his meaning, when he ſaith, εἰ γὰρ ἑκὼν τοῦτο πράσσω, μισθὸν ἔχω, εἰ δὲ ἄκων, οἰκονομίαν πεπίστευμαι, *If I do this as a volunteer, i. e.* [b] If I did preach the Goſpel without any command, and ſo no neceſſity to do ſo, if I did it of my ſelf freely, *this would be rewardable in me, i. e.* the very *preaching* would, without any other more *honourable* circumſtances to enhaunſe it: *but if involuntarily, i. e.* [c] If my *preaching* be an act of obedience to a plain *command*, and ſo *neceſſary*, ver. 16. (and *woe to me if I do it not*) and not voluntary in me, then all that can be ſaid of me is, that being *truſted with a ſtewardſhip*, I do diſcharge it, and [d] ſo there is nothing of *excellence* in this, nothing of *contention* toward that which is *heroical* or *high*. Upon which it follows, Τί οὖν μοί ἐστιν μισθός; *what reward then ſhall be to me? i. e.* what in this whole matter ſhall bring in any *reward to me?* To which he anſwers ἵνα εὐαγγελιζόμενος, ἀδάπανον, θήσω τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, *that preaching the Goſpel*, I do it freely, *without making it chargeable* to the Auditors, εἰς τὸ μὴ καταχρήσασθαι τῇ ἐξουσίᾳ μου, *ſo that I make not uſe of my power* or liberty *which I have in the Goſpel, i. e.* of the *power* of *receiving maintenance* from others (ſuch as *Phœbe*, and the like, referr'd to *ver.* 5.) *without* putting my ſelf to bodily *labour*, v. 6. or by any other ſuch means perfectly juſtifiable for me to uſe, *ver.* 7. 12. The doing of this thus, was that which would yield him the *reward*. And although this was not obſerved by *Cephas*, and other *Apoſtles*, ver. 5. yet ſure *Cephas* is not conceived *Sect.* 31.

[a] *Potuit Beatus Paulus ex Evangelio ſibi vitam quærere; quod maluit operari, amplius erogabat.* Aug.

[b] εἰ μὴ ἑκὼν ἐνεχειρίσθην τὸ κήρυγμα, ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ δὲ τοῦτο ἐποίουν—— Theophyl. in 1 *Cor.* 9. 17.

[c] οὐδὲ ἐνεχειρίσθην, περίδηλον ὅτι οὐκ ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ τοῦτο ποιῶ, ἀλλὰ δεσποτικῷ ἐντολῷ πλη-

ρῶ· τοῦτο γάρ ἐστι τὸ ἄκων. Ibid. [d] διὰ τοῦτο ἐ φιλοτιμία τὸ πρᾶγμα.

ceived to have ſinned thereby, but 'tis poſitively ſaid, that 'twas *lawful* for all, *ver.* 7. 11. 14. for *Paul* as for *Cephas* and others, though only *Paul* would not uſe it, *ver.* 12. and accordingly both there, *ver.* 15. and after, 2 *Cor.* 11. 9, 10. he diſtinctly counts and calls this, *matter of boaſting*; This was a נדבה in the Apoſtle towards his *Corinthians*: and ſo 'twas eſteemed by Saint *Chryſoſtome*, τὸ μὲν ἦν ἐπίταγμα, τόδε τῆς ἐμῆς προαιρέσεως κατόρθωμα· *One was a precept, the other a vertuous action of his choice*: ἃ μὲν γὰρ ὑπὲρ τὴν ἐντολὴν γίνεται, πολὺν ἔχει τὸν μισθὸν κατὰ τοῦτο, *for what is done above the command, hath proportionably a plentiful reward.* And again, of the word *neceſſity*, that it refers to the *command* πρὸς ἀντιδιαστολὴν τῆς ἐλευθερίας τῆς ἐν τῷ λαμβάνειν, *in oppoſition to the freedom in receiving* (i. e. the *power* to *receive*, ver. 12.) *forementioned.* So again *Theophylact*, Τὸ εὐαγγελίζεσθαι ἐπίταγμά ἐστι μοι καὶ χρέος, κἂν ἐὰν πληρῶ τοῦτο, οὐδὲν κατόρθωμα — *Preaching the Goſpel is a command to me, and ſo a debt, and if I do it, there is no great matter of vertue in it*: τόδε δὲ ἀδαπάνως κηρύττειν προαιρέσεως φιλοτιμία, κἂν διὰ τοῦτο καύχημά ἐστι· *but to preach without charging them, is the honour of my will, and in that reſpect there is place of boaſting*, or *I may boaſt.*

Sect. 32. So again, he might have abſtained from going up to *Jeruſalem*, *Act.* 21. a Prophet told him that *bonds expected him there*, if he went, *ver.* 11. and in that caſe to fly was juſtifiable by *Matth.* 10. 23. yet *Paul would needs go up*, ver. 13. that was his נדבה again.

Sect. 33. Thus works of mercy or Alms-giving are commanded by God; liberality and largeneſs of hand and heart commended and promiſed a liberal reward, 2 *Cor.* 9. 6. *Laying by us weekly in ſtore*, as God hath proſpered us, is by Saint *Paul* appointed, 1 *Cor.* 16. 2. But then for the *quotum*, how much every rich man ſhould ſet apart for this purpoſe out of his yearly revenue, what proportion of the whole, whether a thirtieth, twentieth, or tenth part, is not at all particularly defined. Or ſuppoſing that one of theſe proportions were defined, namely the thirtieth part every year, (equivalent to the tenth every third year, which among the *Jews* was deſigned for the δευτερόδεκάτη, πλουσιόδεκάτη, the *ſecond* or *poor mans tithing*) yet if I acknowledging this my duty, ſhould yet reſolve to exceed this proportion, and ſet aſide a twentieth, or tenth, or fifth part of my eſtate, this muſt be acknowledged more than what I am particularly obliged to; and then ſo much of it as is more, will be my נדבה or free-will-offering, that now I ſpeak of. And ſo 'tis apparent by Saint *Paul*, who ſpeaking of the *Corinthians* equalling the *Macedonians* in liberality to the poor *Jews*, 2 *Cor.* 8. 2. he gives them no *precept*, *ver.* 8. but γνώμην, his *advice* or opinion, as in the matter of ſingle life, 1 *Cor.* 7. 25. Juſt as among the *Jews*, that proportion which they were by Law obliged to, was called their צדקה (from whence the *Tſadikim* or *Sadduces*) their *righteouſneſs*, which he that performed, ſatisfied the obligation of the Law in that behalf; and that which exceeded, חסד (from whence the *Chaſidim*, or *Aſidai*, or *Eſſeni*) יתרון הטובה *abundance* or *excellency of goodneſs*, or mercy, or piety, τὰ ἐπιμετρα τῷ νόμῳ, *the additions to the Law*, as among the *Rechabites* antiently in *Jeremiah*'s time, and with the acceſs (as I told you) of dogmatizing among the *Phariſees* after.

Sect. 34. In like manner prayer is a Chriſtian duty, part of divine worſhip; Or all prayer a part of that, and that in the Cloſet as well as the Congregation.

In the performance of this duly qualified, there is no doubt, but the adjoyning of bodily worſhip, whether of the eye, or hand, or knee, is not only lawful, but acceptable in the ſight of God, yet thoſe not commanded particularly by any *particular command* of *Chriſt*, but only avowed by the *general command* of *glorifying* God in our *bodies* as well as *ſpirits*, by the example of approved precedents in the Scripture, *&c.* Or if any ſhall conceive theſe to be under any particular command, then inſtead of diſputing againſt him, I ſhall ſuppoſe it, and proceed, and inſtance in proſtration as a lowlier and humbler act of bodily worſhip than kneeling is, and this not affirmed to be particularly commanded, and ſo voluntary, yet ſure acceptable to God if it flow from that vehement zeal of ſpirit and dimiſſion of mind, in confeſſion and ſenſe of ſin, that I ſhall hope it doth, and be not polluted by any appendant vanity, or corruption, more than kneeling might be ſuppoſed to be, and then this is a נדבה again, a free-will-offering of the ſame kind alſo.

Sect. 35. So again, in reſpect of the frequency of performance, *prayer* is a duty commanded, and for the frequency of uſing it, *inceſſant*, *continual prayer*, *i. e.* ſay the learned, in proportion to the *continual* or *daily ſacrifices* among the *Jews*, prayer morning and evening every day, (or as the word uſed by Saint *Paul*, 1 *Theſſ.* 5. 17. [ἀδιαλείπτως] is uſed by the Author of the firſt Book of *Mac. cap.* 12. 11. ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ ἀδιαλείπτως *we render them at every ſeaſon inceſſantly*, *i. e.* as the reſt of the Verſe explains it) *both in our feaſts and other convenient days, in the ſacrifices, and in our prayers, &c.* Not omitting the daily conſtant times of prayer and ſacrifice.) To theſe two, *David* and *Daniel* added a third time, and a Chriſtian now may ſurely do well to improve it in publick and in private to ſix or ſeven times a day; which number though countenanced by *Davids* reſolution of [*ſeven times a day will I praiſe thee*;] yet being not preſcribed by Chriſt will be his נדבה *free-will-offering* again. The *matter* of it commanded, to wit, *prayer*, but not the frequent reiterating of it daily. For if it ſhall be pretended that the precept of praying *inceſſantly* doth particularly deſign this frequency; I ſhall anſwer that the [inceſſant] ſo interpreted, doth either require uninterrupted continued prayer, in that ſence that as *Paul* in preaching *continued his ſpeech till midnight*, *Acts* 20. 7. (which to affirm, is the hereſie of the *Euchitæ*, and that which the Objector cannot in earneſt think himſelf obliged to; For then, ever to give over or intermit, or do any thing elſe, muſt be acknowledged a ſin) or elſe denotes particularly that definite number of ſeven times, which if it ſhall be affirmed, will firſt be prooffleſs, and denyed as reaſonably as demanded: and then ſecondly, I ſhall add one time more to my ſuppoſition, (and yet ſo as not to neglect the other duties of my calling) and that will be the נדבה I ſpeak of.

Sect. 36. If to all or any of theſe inſtances it be excepted or oppoſed, that theſe may be ſuppoſed in Saint *Paul*, *&c.* to be *incitations* and motions of the Spirit, diſobedience to (and reſiſting of) which would have been a ſin; I anſwer, firſt, that every ſuch free-will-offering is not a particular incitation or motion of the Spirit, ſuch as was obſervable in the Prophets of old, or indeed any farther than that ſignifies an act of a ſoul firſt renewed, then aſſiſted and excited (which differs much from being incited) by the Spirit of God. That Spirit is a ſoul to the ſoul, and is to that as the ſoul to the body; the body having a ſoul, and animated by it, moves and works by that principle, and ſo the ſoul animated

mated and ſtrengthen'd by Chriſt and his Spirit, ἰχύει πάντα, *is able to do all things*, and actually doth them by the ſame ſtrength.

Not to enter any deeper into that queſtion, than to this preſent matter is neceſſary, that which I mean will be beſt underſtood by noting the difference between the grace of ſanctification, and the ſpirit of prophecy ſo vulgarly known; and I deſire it may be extended no farther than one example of *David* will explain and juſtifie, ſet down by way of narration, 2 *Sam.* 7. but repeated more clearly to our purpoſe, 1 *Kings* 8. 17, 18. *It was* (ſaith *Solomon*) *in the heart of* David *my father to build an houſe for the name of the Lord God of* Iſrael, *and the Lord ſaid unto* David *my father, Whereas it was in thy heart to build an houſe unto my name, thou didſt well that it was in thine heart; Nevertheleſs thou ſhalt not build the houſe.* On occaſion of this paſſage I ſhall ask; Was this which was in *Davids* heart, by the incitation of God, in the ſence that the Objector underſtands incitation, or was it not? If it was, then God incited him to do ſomewhat which God had determined he ſhould not do; as it's plain by the laſt word, *Nevertheleſs thou ſhalt not build.* 1. I ſhall in charity hope the Reader will not affirm this, that God incites, or inwardly moves to that which he will not have done; therefore the ſecond muſt be reſolved on, that he did not incite; and yet the thing which was in *Davids* heart pleaſed the Lord [*Thou didſt well that it was in thine heart*] and thence it follows that what is in good mens hearts, what they reſolve to do, may be without this incitation of Gods, and yet be acceptable to him, which is the ſum of the firſt part of my anſwer. *Sect.* 37.

But then 2. I anſwer, that if it be ſtill called an incitation of God, yet having expreſt what a kind of incitation it muſt be, the non-obedience to it will not be a ſin; for to make it ſo, it will be required, 1. That it be expreſt to come from God, And 2. That it comes from him *ſub ratione præcepti*, under the notion of a precept; whereas this incitation being ſuppoſed to be an inarticulate ſilent motion, not revealed in Scripture, or by voice from Heaven, or as the Prophets were, (φερόμενοι, *moved* or *carried by the Holy Ghoſt*, 2 *Pet.* 2. 21.) or by any other extraordinary way, ſo as to be clearly intelligible or diſcernible, whether it be from God or no, much leſs that it is a precept of Gods, it cannot be thus obliging as a precept would be, to which obedience is ſo due, that non-obedience would be ſin. *Sect.* 38.

In brief, this voluntary oblation, as *every good gift* or Chriſtian action, I ſhall acknowledge to deſcend *from above, from the father of lights*; and thereupon *David* put it into his Thankſgiving or *Magnificat*, 1 *Chron.* 29. 14. (bleſſing God that the *people offered ſo willingly.*) But this will not conclude the particular, to which he or they were thus enabled and thus moved or inclined by God, to be leſs, but rather more voluntary, the action being the action of the man, thus willingly doing what he is by God enabled and moved by the Spirit, (God working in him both to will and to do, the firſt by his renewing, the ſecond by his aſſiſting and exciting Grace) and voluntarily working or operating upon that ſtrength and motion, and then all that this infers is the obligation to gratitude, to humility, and not *boaſting* in them that have thus *received*, but not any kind of obligation to that particular action, for that muſt ſuppoſe a particular command. *Sect.* 39.

And there is great difference between theſe two, the precept, and the grace. 1. In that the precept belongs (becauſe given) to all, the grace to none but him that hath it, (and not obliging him neither, unleſs the matter of it be *ſub præcepto* already, *i. e.* unleſs the thing to which he is thus moved by the Spirit of God, he were otherwiſe obliged to by ſome other command, For in that caſe it is that Saint *Stephen*'s reproof hath place, *Acts* 7. 51. [*Ye do always reſiſt the Holy Ghoſt,*] which in the caſe in hand we ſuppoſe him not to be. 2. Becauſe it is the deſign of a precept to lay an obligation, and that *ſub periculo animæ*, if it be not obeyed; but of grace not ſo; but only to ſtrengthen and incline, which he that makes uſe of as he ſhould, is promiſed a reward for ſo doing, *more grace* here, (according to the parable of the Talents concluded with *Habenti dabitur*) and a richer Crown or reward hereafter; and upon not uſing of it, is threatned particularly with the withdrawing of the grace before given, *Take from him the pound*, &c. *Luke* 19. 24. and whereas in Saint *Matthew*, 'tis added [*take him and caſt him into utter darkneſs,*] 'tis clear by Saint *Luke* that there was a precept of *occupying*, verſe 13. to the neglect of which this puniſhment was apportioned. 2. I ſhall acknowledge, that the bringing God no return of all his grace, is a great and damning ſin. But then 3. that comes not home to prove it a ſin, to omit the doing of any one particular, in that degree which God's grace enables me to do, there being no obligation in this matter *ad ſemper*, or *ad gradum*, to do it always, or to do it in ſuch a degree; though *ad ſpeciem* (or that the thing be done) there be. For in the Parable of the Talents, though the bringing in no encreaſe at all be puniſhed; yet the bringing in increaſe in a lower degree is accepted, and rewarded according to its proportion; he that *had of his pound made five pounds*, Luke 19. 18. is *rewarded with five Cities*, as well as he that *had gained ten pounds is rewarded* with ten. *Sect.* 40.

If again it be objected, that, all concomitant circumſtances conſidered, nothing remains free and voluntary; and that affirmation proved by this, becauſe in this caſe prudence added to other Chriſtian rules of piety, mercifulneſs, *&c.* will require us to do that which is fitteſt to be done. *Sect.* 41.

To this I anſwer, 1. That every man is not bound under pain of ſin to be prudent, or pious, or merciful in ſuch a degree; there is a great latitude in prudence, and piety, and in mercifulneſs. I may give ſo much, as will denominate me merciful, and pray ſo often as to denominate me pious, and yet be capable of growing in each of theſe graces; nay, I may in prudence give ſo much to ſuch a man, and yet this not ſo conſiſt in an indiviſible point, but that if I had given leſs, or given more, it might have been prudent too. *Sect.* 42.

It is, I confeſs, poſſible to offend againſt prudence in too prodigal a giving, as in too parſimonious againſt piety, and then I ſhall not juſtifie that imprudence any more, than excuſe that unmercifulneſs, I deſire my voluntary oblations may be free from both, but then ſtill the poſſibility and danger of ſuch faults in the extreams proves not either the unlawfulneſs or neceſſity of any other degree which is within thoſe extreams, but ſtill allows a latitude within which one may be more or leſs merciful, and yet *merciful* ſtill, yea and *prudent* too. 2. Though prudential conſiderations do always help to direct us, yet do they not always command or lay obligations upon us, and therefore are ſtill compatible with voluntary oblations. *Sect.* 43.

For

Sect. 44. For if it be affirmed from prudential conſiderations, that a man (knowing the greateſt perfection, to be moſt gloriouſly rewarded, and that reward far above all other deſigns, that to the neglecting of that he may faſten upon) ought therefore, and is bound to aſpire to perfection, and not to content himſelf with any thing but the beſt: To this I anſwer, that this whole reaſoning is falſe.

For 1. although *prudence* would adviſe one to this, yet doth it not lay any command which hath power of obliging ſo, as not to obey will be preſently ſinful; for if any ſuch command be ſuppoſed, it ceaſes to be prudential, and becomes neceſſary, and mean while by being only prudential, appears to be under no ſuch command.

Sect. 45. 2. Though 'tis *prudent* to uſe thoſe means which may advance us higheſt in glory, and though perfection will do that, yet 'twill not be always *prudence* to undertake the way of perfection, becauſe that being an high ſteep, may be alſo a dangerous way, *every man cannot receive it*, ſaith the Apoſtle; and for him that cannot overcome the difficulties, to reſolve upon the courſe, may perhaps be precipitious, and even the precept of God may interpoſe ſometimes, and traſh us, and make it unlawful for us to aſpire to the moſt perfect eſtate; as if the diſcharge of a duty of our calling ſhould await us on one ſide, and an opportunity of Martyrdom on t'other ſide, then in that caſe obedience will be better than that richeſt ſacrifice; and as *Cyprian*, though moſt paſſionately deſirous of Martyrdom, yet on ſuch an occaſion avoided it, when he was near it, and (as *Pontius Diaconus* ſaith of him,) *maluit præceptis Dei obedire, quàm vel ſic coronari*, he preferr'd the conſcience of his duty before the glory of ſuch a Crown, ſo may it be reſolved the Chriſtians duty ſometimes not to aſpire to *ſome perfection*.

Sect. 46. But then, 3. the perfection that we are by Chriſt commanded to aſpire to, is capable of degrees; for if you compare *Matth.* 5. 48. where that precept is given [*Be ye perfect, as your Father in Heaven is perfect*] with *Luke* 6. 36. where the ſame paſſage is recited, or if you conſult the context in either place, you will find that *perfection* to ſignifie *mercifulneſs*, and ſo *Matth.* 19. 21. [*If thou wilt be perfect, ſell all, and give to the poor*] which is another argument that that is the meaning of *perfection*, and then the ſame degrees that are in mercifulneſs, will be in perfection alſo. Or if you will not admit of that ſence, yet if it be any perfection acquirable in this life, 'twill be capable of degrees and growth alſo; or if it be not here acquirable, 'tis certainly not under Evangelical precept now, that *light*, *i. e.* ſupportable *burthen*, that *Codex* of *not grievous*, *i. e.* of poſſible commands, which he and his grace brought into the World.

Sect. 47. As for that ordinary ſaying that ſeems ſo plauſible, that every one is bound to do that which is beſt, it is moſt diſcernibly falſe; (and that which a world of falſities are built on) which to prove, I ſhall need no farther teſtimony, than that of the Apoſtle, 1 *Cor.* 7. 38. (*He that giveth in marriage doth well, and he that giveth not, both better*) nor argument than this, that the beſt being a *ſuperlative* ſuppoſes the *poſitive* to be good; whereas if all were bound to do that which is *beſt*, that which were *only good*, were *evil*, for ſo is that whatever it is, which comes ſhort of what we are bound to.

Sect. 48. Once more, if it be objected that whatever is thus performed, is commanded by thoſe large incluſive words [*Thou ſhalt love the Lord thy God, with all thy heart, with all thy ſoul, &c.*] nothing being of ſuch latitude, as that the [*with all*] ſhould not contain it.

Sect. 49. I anſwer, that that phraſe denoteth two things only, firſt, *ſincerity* of this love of God, as oppoſed *to partial divided love*, or ſervice; and withal, that what they do according to the precepts of Gods Law, they ſhould do out of love toward God, not hypocritically, nor as on conſtraint: ſecondly, the loving him above all other things, and not admitting any thing into competition with him, not loving any thing elſe in ſuch a degree; and in neither of theſe reſpects excluding all other things from a ſubordinate place in our love; which being ſuppoſed, 'twill be eaſie to diſcern that this ſincere love of God above all, is capable of degrees, and that it is very poſſible for two men *to love God with all their hearts*, *i. e.* ſincerely and above all other things, and ſo both to obey that precept, and yet one to love him in a more intenſe degree, than the other doth. (Which may be obſerved amongſt the Angels themſelves, the *Seraphin* being ſo called, becauſe they are more ardent in Zeal, than other Angels.) Nay, for the ſame perſon conſtantly to love God above all, and yet to have higher expreſſions of that love at one time than another. Thus we read of Chriſt himſelf, *Luke* 22. 44. (who we know did never fail in performing what was mans duty, in prayer, or any thing elſe: Yet) that he at that time prayed more earneſtly; which is a demonſtrative evidence, that the lower degree is not neceſſarily ſinful, when the higher is acceptable to God. Which when it is granted, there is no doubt, but theſe free-will-offerings will be reconcileable with that command, and he that loves God with all his heart may have ſome poſſibility of loving God better than yet he doth, and ſome room left for a voluntary oblation.

Sect. 50. I deſire to foreſee the worſt that is imaginable, and therefore though in conſcience very guiltleſs, and free from having any favourable thoughts of the doctrine of ſupererogation among the *Romaniſts*, ſhall yet conceive it poſſible for ſome body to be ſo unwary as to add that objection to the former, that this may tend to the aſſerting of that doctrine, that if it be acknowledged poſſible for a Chriſtian to do more than he is commanded, he may then ſupererogate.

Sect. 51. To which I anſwer, 1. That there is a great difference between affirming that a man may do more *than is commanded*, and that he may do *ſomething which is not commanded*; the former ſuppoſes him that doth more to have done all, whereas the ſecond may be true, though in moſt or all other things he have been wanting. Now it is the ſecond we aſſert, not the former; which being ſuppoſed,

Sect. 52. I anſwer ſecondly, That to ſupererogate ſuppoſeth one of theſe two things, either that the perſon ſpoken of hath paid God all that is due to him, by way of perfect obedience, *i. e.* hath never ſinned: Or 2. that having ſinned and ſo become a debtor to God, he hath paid that debt by ſatisfaction, *i. e.* done ſomething elſe which may ſatisfie God for his former ſins; the latter of which is the way which the *Romaniſts* pitch upon, and not contenting themſelves with the ſatisfaction wrought by Chriſt, teach the doctrine of their own ſatisfaction, which, ſay they, they may perform ſo far, as not only

to

to ſatisfie for their own ſins, but alſo to do more than ſo, help toward the raiſing of a bank, or treaſure for others alſo, and that is it they mean by ſupererogating.

Now from either of theſe our preſent doctrine is perfectly free; for 1. it ſuppoſeth no perfect obedience, but willingly yieldeth as much of the corruption of our nature, and of our daily failings and treſpaſſes, as ever any Catholick affirmed againſt *Pelagius*. And 2. ſuppoſing every man to have ſinned, it pretendeth not to the leaſt degree of ſatisfaction to God for any the leaſt ſin to be wrought by any means, but only the ſufferings of *Chriſt*, and ſo is out of all poſſibility of thinking to ſupererogate, acknowledging ſo heavy an arrear of ſin lying unremoveably upon every ones ſcore, if God be not mercifully pleaſed to accept of Chriſts ſufferings for perfect ſatisfaction, that there is nothing compaſſable by us, or within our reach, that can ſatisfie for any the leaſt ſin we have committed; and from thence 3. forbiddeth any the moſt juſtified man to pretend toward ſatisfying for others; but to *work out his own ſalvation with fear and trembling*, *i. e.* with all the humility in the World. And to this ſence I deſire to apply that ſaying of Saint *Cyprian* in the Epiſtle *ad lapſos*. *Qui in Eccleſia ſemper gloriosè & granditer operati ſunt, opus ſuum Domino nunquam imputaverunt*, *They which have wrought gloriouſly and heroically in the Church, yet never thought their Maſter beholden to them.* That is the meaning of *imputare*, to *reckon* their layings out, and charge him with whom they reckon to be in their *debt*: For want of underſtanding of which, or from ſome worſe principle, the latter Edition of *Cyprian* by *Pamelius* leaves out the word *nunquam*, which the old *Baſil* Edition doth retain, and the ſence requires in that place. Sect. 53.

If I could foreſee any further Scruples or difficulties in this matter, I ſhould be as free in producing them, as in theſe I have been, and find no reaſon to fear, but that by Gods help I ſhould be able to ſatisfie them alſo. In the mean time, till by the fate of this Paper I be further inſtructed, I have no temptation to importune or detain the Reader any further, than with my Prayers for him, that the Lord give him a right underſtanding in all things.

He that ſoweth ſparingly, ſhall reap ſparingly, and he that ſoweth bountifully, ſhall reap bountifully. Every man according as he purpoſeth in his heart, not grudgingly, or of neceſſity; For God loveth a chearful giver, 2 Cor. 6. 7.

In our law ſome things are commanded, and lay a neceſſity on Chriſtians, and the not obſerving of them brings danger: Others have no neceſſity, but choice, which brings honour and rewards to thoſe which obſerve them, but no danger to them who obſerve them not. Nazianz. contr. Julian. Orat. 1.

Vende omnia & da pauperibus. Non cogo, non impero; ſed propono palmam, præmia oſtendo: Tuum eſt eligere, ſi volueris in agone atque certamine coronari. Hieron. ad. Demetriad.

Non tibi imponitur neceſſitas, ut voluntas præmium conſequatur. Id ad Pammach.

Virgo majoris eſt meriti, dum id contemnit, quod ſi fecerit, non delinquit. Id. ad. Helvid.

Ideo plus amat Virgines Chriſtus, quia ſponte tribuunt, quod ſibi nec fuerat imperatum. Adverſ. Jovinian.

Οἱ πνευματικοὶ πάντα πεπλήρωσι ὑπομονῇ καὶ πόθῳ, καὶ τοῦτο δηλοῦσι τῷ καὶ ὑπερβαίνειν τὰ ὑπτάγματα. Chryſ. in Rom. 8.

Quidam præcepto Legis perfectione virtutum tranſcendunt. Greg. Moral. in Job. 1. 6. c. 24.

OF SUPERSTITION.

Sect. 1. SUPERSTITION being a crime ſo ordinarily charged on thoſe whoſe Conſciences aſſure them that they are far enough from the guilt of it, it will be an Act of double charity, firſt to the honeſt calumniated Proteſtant, Secondly, to the contumelious unjuſt defamer of his beſt actions, to conſider a while of this matter, and firſt to enquire what is the natural importance of the word in Latine and Greek, eſpecially as we find it in the New Teſtament.

Sect. 2. Superſtition in Latine is moſt clearly according to the uſe and Origination of the word, *Superſtitum Cultus, The worſhip of ſome departed from this World, ſuppoſed yet to have life in another.* This is obſerved and acknowledged amongſt many others by *Lactantius*, and made probable even by the different conceit of *Cicero*, who deduceth the word from the [a] practice of thoſe that uſed to pray whole days together, *ut ſibi liberi ſuperſtites eſſent, that their children might outlive themſelves*, (agreeable to which is the original of Dæmon-worſhip ſet down by *Daiphantus* a *Lacedemonian* in his Books of Antiquities, out of a ſtory of *Syrophanes* an *Ægyptian*, as *Fulgentius* tells us, *Mythol. l.* 1. and not far from it is

[a] *De Nat. Deor. l.* 2. 53.

Sect. 3. that of *Wiſd.* 14. 15.) by that acknowledging the truth of the Etymology from the word [*Superſtites*] but diſguiſing it into a ridiculous phanſie, *out of fear*, ſaith Saint *Auſtin*, *to condemn the practice of the Romans, among whom he lived.* Theſe *Superſtites*, whom the Heathens thus worſhipped, were by them called *Heroes*, men of worth and excellency ἀποθεωθέντες, *aſſumed into the ſtate of Gods*, but among Chriſtians, the *Souls* of the *Saints* departed, *quæ ſuperſunt corporibus*; which when *their bodies are buried in peace*, are imagined *to live for evermore.* And the worſhipping of theſe (as among the Papiſts 'tis moſt ordinary) is moſt properly called *Superſtition.* And in that ſence I conceive it is, that in ſome authentick Writings of our Church, the *Idolatry* and *Superſtition* of the Papiſts is cenſured; by *Idolatry* meaning the worſhip of *Images* among them, and by *Superſtition* the worſhip and prayers to Saints departed. A cenſure authorizable by that part of Saint *Auſtin*'s words, *De Doct. Chriſt. l.* 2. *Superſtitioſum eſt quicquid inſtitutum eſt ad colendum, ſicut Deum, Creaturam, partémve ullam creaturæ. Superſtition is the worſhipping a creature as God, or any part of a Creature.* By the latter of which I know not what he ſhould mean ſo probably, as thoſe ſuppoſedly deified *parts of* Creatures, the ſouls of dead men.

Sect 4. *De var. relig.* The Greek word parallel to this is δεισιδαιμονία, which literally is, as Saint *Auſtin* defines the Latine *Superſtition*, *Dæmonum cultus*, the *worſhip of Dæmons.*

Sect. 5. The full importance of which muſt be taken, 1. from the various uſe of the word δαίμων. 2. of the other word [δείδω] ingredient in the compoſition.

Sect. 6. δαίμων ſignifies ſometimes in a wider ſence a *God*, as generally among the Poets, *Juno* and *Apollo* and *Minerva*, and all beſide the ſupreme *Jupiter*, are numbred among *Homer*'s δαίμονες. This *Maximus Tyrius* demonſtrates at large, and adds πολλὴν τὴν δαιμόνων ἀγέλην εἶναι, that there are a great flock of thoſe δαίμονες. Sometimes 2. in a ſtricter ſence the Angels, as 'tis uſed among the Philoſophers, eſpecially the *Pythagoreans* and *Platonicks*; for ſo the deſcription of them in *Hierocles*, and *Maximus Tyrius*, and *Plotinus*, and *Proclus* will evidence, particularly that every man's proper *tutelary Angel* the συνὼν or οἰκεῖος or ἰδιαιχὼς ὑμᾶς δαίμων, as *Plotinus* calls him, The *cohabitant* or *domeſtick Dæmon* or Angel that is *allotted* us. So when in *Ignatius*, Chriſt ſaith, ὐκ εἰμὶ δαιμόνιον ἀσώματον, it ſignifies ſimply a *ſpirit*, *Ep. ad Smyrn.* So δαιμόνια ἄσαρκα, *Conſtit. Ap. l.* 6. *c.* 25. So *incorporale dæmonium*, *Hieron. proœm. l.* 18. *in Iſa. & in Catal. Script. Eccl.* though *Sophronius* his *Greek* tranſlator read σωματικὸς, as *Marianus Victorius* on that place obſerves. This ſaying of Chriſt, Saint *Jerome* cites out of the *Nazaren-Goſpel*, *proœm. l.* 18. *in Iſa. Origen. l.* 1. περὶ ἀρχῶν, out of a Book called *Doctrina Petri.*

Sect. 7. A thing ſo frequent among thoſe Philoſophers, that the word φιλοσοφία *Philoſophy*, *Col.* 2. 8. ſeems to me to be directly all one with θρησκία τῶν ἀγγέλων, *worſhipping of Angels*, v. 18. And ſo thoſe two exhortations in thoſe two Verſes to be coincident, καταβραβεύειν in one (which we render *deceiving of reward*) being equipollent to συλαγωγῶν, *ſpoiling* in the other, only in divers notions. The firſt referring to *prizes* in the Olympick games, the other to ſpoils in War, the reaſons of which conjecture it will not be ſeaſonable here to inſert.

Sect. 8. And thirdly again the *departed Worthies*, which (beſides the frequency of that acception among the Philoſophers) may ſeem to be meant *Apoc.* 9. 20. where the δαιμόνια, which are ſaid to be worſhip'd, are join'd with *Idols of Gold*, &c. and communicate with them in their effects and liveleſneſs, that they *neither ſee, nor hear, nor walk.*

Sect. 9. To theſe ſences might be added that other moſt vulgar for *evil ſpirits*, agreeable to which, is that definition of δεισιδαιμονία, in the *Etymologicum magnum*, that 'tis ἡ πρὸς τὺς πονηρὲς δαίμονας ἐπιμέλεια ἐν φόβῳ, a care and fear of evil ſpirits. And a fifth leſs frequent, yet to be found among the Philoſophers, for *wiſe men* here in this life, which *Hierocles* deſcribes at large under the Title of καταχθόνιοι δαίμονες earthly ſpirits, or Dæmons.

Sect. 10. Now the word δεισιδαιμονία refers indifferently to the three firſt of theſe, and ſignifies the *worſhipping* either of the many *Poetical Gods*, or *Angels*, or *Dead-men*, or indeed any thing but the one ſupreme God. Thus is it ſaid of the Gentiles, 1 *Cor.* 10. 20. *That what they Sacrifice, they Sacrifice* δαιμονίοις, and not to God, *i. e.* not to the one true God. And in the book of *Baruch* 4. 7. *Offering* δαιμονίοις, and *not to God.* Where (as alſo in many other places of holy Writ) 'tis not proper to render it [*Devils or Infernal Spirits*] but (with Maſter *Mead*) *Dæmons*, meaning thereby either *Angels* or *Dead men*, or any thing elſe beſide the true God. Which ſeems to be expreſs'd *Rom.* 1. 25. by worſhipping

worshipping the Creature παρὰ τὸν κτίσαντα, *besides* (not as we render *more than*) *the Creator*; and by *Phavorinus* saying of the word δεισιδαιμονία, that it signifies τὸ πάντα σέβειν καὶ τὰ μὰ σεβάσμια, *worshipping all things, even those which are not to be worshipt*, and that δεισιδαίμων signifies sometimes ἀμφίβολος περὶ τὴν πίστιν, καὶ ὁ δεδιὼς τὰ δαιμόνια, *one that is doubtful concerning the faith*, knows not in whom to believe, or worship, or *who worships* or *fears the Damons also*.

Thus when Saint *Paul* tells the *Athenians Acts* 17.22. κατὰ πάντα ὡς δεισιδαιμονεστέρους ὑμᾶς θεωρῶ, *I consider and behold you in all things* (or in all that I see of you) as men that are *more superstitious than any other*; He means they worship'd more *Gods* or *Damons* than the *Romans*, or any other sort of Heathen people; or were more devout, more pious in the Heathen worships than any others; for so it follows εὐσεβῶτε, *ver.* 23. *Te worship*; and accordingly *Phavorinus*, having explained δεισιδαίμων by ὁ εὐσεβὴς, *pious*, he adds, ὡς ὁ θεῖος Παῦλος, δεισιδαιμονεστέρους ὑμᾶς θεωρῶ, as Saint *Paul* saith in those words, *Acts* 17. 22. and so indeed 'tis generally attested by the Greek Writers [a] *Pausanias*, [b] *Philostratus*, *Strabo*, *Max. Tyr. &c.* That the *Athenians* were more religious than other people, at least were more hospitable to new and strange Deities, than the *Romans*, who (saith *Dionysius Halicarnassæus*) were so averse from all Foreign Deities (unless some few that their Ancestors had from the *Grecians*) that they might be more truly said μισοξενῶν περὶ τὰ θεῖα, ἢ φιλοξενῶν, to be haters of such kind of hospitality or admission of foreign Gods, than lovers of it. *Sect.* 11.

[a] *Pausan. in Atticis* p. 15. οἷς θεὸς εὐσεβῶν ἄλλων πλέον, & Ἀθηναῖοι παρεσκευάσθαι τι, ἢ τοῖς ἄλλοις εἰς τὰ θεῖα δοκοῦσι σεμνότερον.

[b] *Philostratus of Apollonius l.* 4. *c.* 6. φιλοθύτας τοὺς Ἀθηναίους ἴσμεν. & *Strabo.* Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ ὥσπερ περὶ τὰ ἄλλα φιλοξενοῦντες διατελοῦσιν, ἕτω καὶ περὶ τοὺς θεούς· πολλοὶ γὰρ τῶν ξενικῶν ἱερῶν παρεδέξαντο, *&c. Max. Tyr.* διαλ. λθ. ὁ Ἀθηναῖος ἡμῖν ἕτερος καινὸς δαιμόνια εἰσφέρων. So *Josephus* 2. *contr. Appion.* Ἀθηναίους τῶν Ἑλλήνων δικαιότατους ἅπαντες λέγουσιν: and *Sophocles Oedip. Col.* θῆ' ἵππι' ὅστις γε θεοὺς δίκαιος τιμαῖς σεβίζειν, ἥτε τῆδ' ὑπερφέρει.

So *Acts* 25. 29. *Festus* or Saint *Luke* in his story saith, That the *Jews* had certain ζητήματα, *Questions*, or Accusations against *Paul*, περὶ τῆς ἰδίας δεισιδαιμονίας, *concerning his own Religion*, or Superstition, or Worship, peculiar to him from them, and (as it follows to explain what they meant by the word) περὶ τινὸς Ἰησοῦ τεθνηκότος, *Of one Jesus that was dead*, putting him under the vulgar notion of a δαίμων or *dead Heros*, and so meaning the worship of him by δεισιδαιμονία. *Sect.* 12.

Beside this method of examining the sence of this word, another I mentioned by observing the force of the word δείδω, the former part in its composition, which though it signifies simply *to fear*, (and therefore the word is rendred by *Hesychius* φοβοῦμαι, *fearing God*, or *Religion* in general; by others φίβος θεῶν καὶ δαιμόνων, *The fear of God and Damons*) yet perhaps may be set sometimes to import a cowardly trembling fear; and so may have an influence on the word in some Authors. Thus *Phavorinus*, δεισιδαιμονία, ἡ περὶ τὸ θεῖον δειλία, ἢ ὁ ἄλογος φίβος τῆς θεῶν, it signifies a cowardice toward the Deity, or an irrational fear of the Gods. And the Etymologist, δεισιδαίμων, δειλαβὴς καὶ δειλὸς περὶ θεούς, the superstitious man is religious and cowardly, *fears the Gods, and is afraid of them*; and *Clemens*, ὁ γὰρ δεισιδαιμονία πάθος, φίβος δαιμόνων ἐστί, *Superstition is a passion, being a fear of the Damons*; and [a] *Theophrastus* δειλία πρὸς τὸ δαιμόνιόν ἐστι, 'tis a cowardly fear of the Damon. Thus *Maximus Tyrius* having compared a *pious man* to a *friend*, a superstitious to a flatterer, [ὁ μὲν εὐσεβὴς φιλοῖ θεόν, ὅτι δεισιδαίμων κόλαξ θεοῦ] he explains the meaning in the words following, *the pious man comes to God* ἄνευ δέους *without fear*, the superstitious μετὰ πολλοῦ δέους *with much fear*, δυσκολῶς, καὶ δεδιὼς τοὺς θεοὺς ὥσπερ τοὺς τυράννους, &c. *dreading* the Gods as so many Tyrants: So saith *Diod. Sic.* of *Bomilcar*, δεισιδαίμονές εἰσιν οἱ μέλλοντες ἐγχειρεῖν ταῖς παρανόμοις καὶ μεγάλαις πράξεσι, *l.* 2. *p.* 779. *they that are about to undertake any unlawful or notable actions* are generally *afraid of the Gods* or *Damons*: according to which notion of the *Greek* word, Saint *Austin* is affirmed to say, *Deum à religioso vereri, à superstitioso timeri, The Religious man reveres God, the superstitious is afraid of him*; and consequently to that, *Religio Deum colit, superstitio violat, Religion is the worshipping of God, Superstition the wronging and violation of him.* So again *Plutarch.* ὃν οἴεται ὁ ἄθεος θεοὺς εἶναι, τούτους δεισιδαίμων ἐβούλετο, *The Atheist thinks there are no Gods, but the superstitious wishes there were none, but in spight of his Teeth believes that there are. An argument whereof is, that he is unwilling to die.* Where the believing of any punishment after this life is the main piece of *Superstition*. *Sect.* 13.

[a] *Char.* περὶ δεισιδ. δειλαξ. δ.

I conceive my self able to give the Reader some light in this matter, by what I have gathered out of some scattered λείψανα of *Epicurus*'s Philosophy, and it is this: *Epicurus*, we know, was willing to rid God of the trouble of a providence or care of humane affairs, resolved that all things were done *naturalibus ponderibus, & motibus, by natural weights and motions*, and consequently that men were to *revere and adore God for his greatness, and excellency, and beatitude, and immortality, and transcendent beauty*; *but not to fear, or dread, or be afraid of him.* Of those therefore that differed from him in judgment, As they which thought there was no God at all, were the down-right ἄθεοι, and for that by him censured; so those that believed a *providence*, and consequent to that, *rewards* and *punishments*, he rejected also, as the other extreme, under the title of δεισιδαίμονες, or *Superstitious*, or fearers of a Deity. This appears not only by the title of a Book of *Plutarchs* not now extant, inscribed περὶ δεισιδαιμονίας πρὸς Ἐπίκουρον, differing (it seems, both by the addition of πρὸς Ἐπίκουρον, and in all probability by the subject of it) from that which is now extant of his περὶ δεισιδαιμονίας, which looks very little on *Epicurus*, either to defend or accuse him; But also by several passages in *Cicero* and other of the Ancients out of him, and by what we find in the lives of the *Epicureans* in *Laërtius*. In *Cicero l.* 2. *de nat. deorum*, *Ut Superstitione liberarem*, &c. *to be freed from Superstition*, is explicated by *metum omnem Deorum pulsum esse, to have all fear of the Gods banished from us.* And again, having described the wise man to be such as can *sine metu vivere, live without fear*, he repeats it again in these other words, *Omnium rerum naturâ cognitâ levamur Superstitione, liberamur mortis metu, the knowledge of the nature of all things* (and among them of God himself) *frees men and releases them from Superstition and the fear of death.* This in the same Book he calls *metum religionis, fear of Religion*, or such a fear as the believing Gods providence was apt to beget in men, (especially in those which did what they ought not) *viz.* terrours and expectations of evil from God, which they which took it to be an errour in Divinity (as *Epicurus* did,) must needs count a very uneasy, unplea- *Sect.* 14.

Cic. l. 2. *Academ. Quæst. Sic ille deum opere magno liberat, & me timore; Quis enim potest, cùm existimet à Deo se curari, non & numen divinum horrere? &c. Cic. ib. Intelligitur à beata immortalique natura & iram & gratiam segregari, quibus remotis nullos à superis impendere metus. Cic. l.* 1. *de nat. deor.*

Imposuistis in cervicibus nostris sempiternum Dominum quem dies & noctes timeremus. Quis enim non timeat omnia providentem, curiosum & plenum negotii Deum? Hinc δεισιδαιμονία, Hinc μανικὴ, qua tantâ imbueremur superstitione, si vos audire vellemus, ut, &c. His terroribus ab Epicuro soluti non metuimus eos, quos intelligimus nec sibi fingere ullam molestiam, nec alteri quærere, &c. Cic. l. 1. *de Nat. Deor.*

ſant errour, and ſo as much diſlike Superſtition, *i. e.* a Religion that brings ſo much affliction to their lives, as any man now adays doth under the moſt odious notion of it.

Sect. 15. Agreeable to this is that of *Ariſtippus* and the *Cyrenaici* in *Laërtius*, which upon the ſame principles reſolve that it is the part of a wiſe man *neither to be moved with envy, nor to be ſuperſtitious*, and afterwards explained the [δεισιδαιμονίας ἀπὸς εἶναι] *being without Superſtition* by τὸ μὴ δεδιέναι φόβον ἀφυγῶν, *putting off all fear of death*, and as a foundation or conſequent of that fearleſneſs, a reſolution that *nothing is by nature juſt or unjuſt, but only* νόμῳ καὶ ἔθει, *by poſitive law or cuſtom*, and from thence *never doing any* (ἄτοπον) *unbecoming thing*, never admitting any unfaſhionable piece of *Piety* on contemplation of any Mulct or danger.

Sect. 16. Whereupon it is, that *Lucretius* an *Epicurean* Philoſopher ſpeaking of the eternity of Torments threatned in another World, confeſſeth that, if that were true, there would be no way of *reſiſting the religions and threats of the Divines. Nam ſi nullum finem eſſe putarent Ærumnarum homines, nullâ ratione valerent Religionibus atq; minis obſiſtere vatum.* Making that *belief of the infinite Torments in another life*, and the *menaces of the Prieſts* attending it, to be the *Religion* or *Superſtition*, that was to be confuted and baniſht out of the World. And I wiſh 'twere now uncharitable to ſuſpect, (what the actions of many make too viſible) that the abhorring of Superſtition (which many ſo boaſt of, and by which they ſo diſcriminate themſelves from other men) hath at leaſt brought them to this piece of Epicurean faith, To diſcarde all fear of another life as a relique of Superſtition, and to reſolve with him in *Plutarch*, Δεινὸν ἀπιστία πρὸς τὰ θεῖα, καὶ καταφρόνησις αὐτῶν, δεινὰ δ' αὖθις δεισιδαιμονία. *Unbelief and contempt of all that is Divine is a ſhrewd fault indeed, but on the other ſide Superſtition is a ſhrewd fault too*, the ſhrewder of the twain, and meant by *ſuperſtition* what you had even now from the ſame Author, The *fear of death*, or *any ill thing* after it. But this by the way.

Sect. 17. This generally is the notion of δεισιδαιμονία, Superſtition, (and the ſame of Religion too) among the ancient heathen Writers when either *Epicureans* or *Atheiſts* ſpeak of any *Religion*, or thoſe who are neither, ſpeak of *ſome kind of Religion* which they do *not like*. For in both theſe caſes whatſoever they ſee men of other perſwaſions do, which they like not, or think them not bound to, they call it ſtraight their *Superſtition* or *Religion*.

Sect. 18. Thus in *Plutarch*'s Tract περὶ δεισιδαιμονίας, it goes indefinitely for *Religion*, but particularly for ſome *fearful apprehenſions of the Gods*, which he makes to be contrary to *Atheiſm*, and to offend as ill in the other extream; *a being awed with ſome frightful Doctrines to do ſome things which* he thought not men obliged to, *an Aſtoniſhment of ſoul*, looking on the Gods as ſo many δείματα, *furies* or *ſprights*, conceiving them to be *cruel, bloody-minded, and other ſuch things, which rather than he would believe*, he profeſſeth he would wiſh there had been never a man in the World, μηδὲ εἶναι Πλουτάρχου, and that *Plutarch* himſelf had no being. All which are but odious expreſſions faſtned on thoſe practices of Religion which he did not approve of, and the very ſame that *Epicurus* before him had laid upon Religion or belief of Providence.

Sect. 19. Among theſe he mentions keeping of *Sabbaths, and caſting on the face, or Proſtrations*, particularly that ſo ſtrict obſervation of the Sabbath among the *Jews*, that when they were invaded by the Enemy they would not riſe from their ſeats δεισιδαιμονίᾳ ὡς σαγήνῃ συνδεδημένοι, *tyed and bound by their Religion or Superſtition as with a Net*, that they could not move. And then adds the killing and ſacrificing of children which by the deſcription one would think referred to the cuſtom in the valley of *Hinnom*, or *Tophet* mentioned in the Scripture.

Sect. 20. And ſo have we paſſed through the ſecond part of our deſigned courſe or method to find out the meaning of the word.

Sect. 21. From whence it appears that the word in Greek and Latine both in the claſſical Authors and the Scripture uſe is ſet to ſignifie one or more of theſe ſeverals.

Sect. 22. In general, *Religion* or worſhip of God without any cenſure or mark ſet upon it of true or falſe; agreeable to which is that of the old Greek and Latine Lexicon found at the end of ſome of *Cyrils* works Δεισιδαιμονία, *Superſtitio, Religio*, rendring it indifferently by thoſe two words. And what *Stephanus* obſerves of *Cicero* that he renders δεισιδαιμονία *Religio*, and that in *Athenæus* δεισιδαιμονίᾳ θεὸς ἔχεσθαι is *religione teneri*, (and thereupon *Budæus* hath ſo rendred it) and an ancient gloſſary, δεισιδαίμων, θεοσεβής. To which purpoſe a conſiderable place there is in *Polybius* a grave and an excellent heathen Writer, who ſpeaking of the Romans, *l.* 19. *p.* 497. and giving his opinion of their Government that it excelled other Commonwealths extreamly ἐν τῇ περὶ θεῶν διαλήψει in the opinion and apprehenſion they had of the Gods, expreſſes what it was, he ſo commends in them, λέγω δὲ δεισιδαιμονίαν, I mean, ſaith he, their Superſtition, which διὰ τοσοῦτον ἐπετεχνήθησαν, was raiſed ſo tragically, or to ſo high a pitch, καὶ παρεισῆκται, *&c.* was ſo far taken in both to their private and publick affairs ὥστε μὴ καταλιπεῖν ὑπερβολήν, that it was no leſs than an exceſs. Where although (that I diſguiſe not any part of his words) it be by him affirmed, that this was παρὰ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἀνθρώποις ὀνειδιζόμενον, made matter of reproach to the Romans among other men, as indeed every thing in Religion is ſpoken ill of by thoſe who are of other perſwaſions and practices) yet 1. that which thoſe others are laid to reproach in the Romans is their ὑπερβολὴ, or exceſs, or that which others counted to be ſo, and not δεισιδαιμονία it ſelf, and ſecondly *Polybius* himſelf doth not only commend and extol extreamly (μεγίστην διαφορὰν ἔχειν μοὶ δοκεῖ πρὸς τὸ βέλτιον) both the δεισιδαιμονία and the exceſs of it, but attributes much of the good Government of that Nation to it, and that it doth συνέχειν τὰ Ῥωμαίων πράγματα, keep their affairs in good order and compaſs. If any doubt be made of this importance of this place, I ſhall then, inſtead of farther aſſerting it, add three other to it which ſeem to me beyond all exception to demonſtrate the word to be uſed in a good ſence; The firſt is in *Diodorus Siculus bibl. l.* 5. *p.* 305. Where ſpeaking of the ancient *Gauls*, he taketh notice of one ſpecial thing in them in their behaviour toward the temples of the Gods, There lies (ſaith he) in their Temples a great deal of gold conſecrated to the Gods, which yet no one of the Natives toucheth διὰ τὴν δεισιδαιμονίαν, *through their ſuperſtition*, or *Reverence* they bear their Gods, καίπερ ὄντων αὐτῶν Κελτῶν φιλαργύρων καθ' ὑπερβολήν, although theſe Countrey men are extreamly covetous. Which words muſt needs ſet a good notion on δεισιδαιμονία to any that do not count *ſacriledge* a good quality, and abſtaining from that a vice, or ſcrupulo-

ſity.

sity. The only thing I can foresee possible to be objected to it, is, that the *not touching* of the gold may be such a scrupulosity; But that will be soon answered by putting the Reader in mind that ἅπτεσθαι to *touch* signifies to *take away*, and that it doth so in this place appears by the addition of the mention of their covetousnes which surely would not put them upon the desire of touching only, but also of taking it away. So the same Author speaking of *Imilco*, *l.* 14. *p.* 295. after an act of *sacriledge*, saith he, he condemn'd himself, and died, πολλῷ τοῖς πολίταις ἀπολιπὼν δεισιδαιμονίαν (which the Interpreter rightly renders *Dei reverentiam*) *leaving* behind him *to his Citizens a great superstition*, or *reverence*, or *fear* of *God*. The second testimony is out of *Heraclitus* περὶ Ἀπίστων speaking of *Orpheus*, κεφ. κγ'. εἰς δεισιδαιμονίαν ἀγαγὼν, ᾗ ὅτι τὸ εὐσεβὲν παρεκάλυψαι, *leading to superstition*, or *worship of the Gods, and exhorting them to be pious*. The last is out of an *Edict* of the Emperour *Tiberius*, set down by *Josephus Ant. l.* 19. *c.* 4. where immunities are by him allowed the *Jews*, on condition that *they misuse not the Emperours kindness towards them*, ᾗ μὴ τὰς πρὸ ἄλλων ἐθνῶν δεισιδαιμονίας ἐξουθενίζειν, and that they do *not set at nought the superstitions*, *i. e.* the *Religions* (some of which, he that wrote the Edict thought to be the *true*) *of other Nations*.

Secondly, the *worship of the deified dead men* and Angels which the Heathens took to be true Gods, but the Christians do not, and therefore saith the *Etymologist*, ἰσθι ὅτι παρὰ μὲν τοῖς Ἕλλησι δὴ καλῶ λαμβάνεται, παρὰ δὲ ἡμῖν τοῖς χριστιανοῖς δὴ ἐπ' ἀσεβείας λέγεται, *The word among the Heathens is taken for a good thing, but among Christians for impiety*. *Sect.* 23.

Thirdly, any part *of Divine worship*, which in obedience to his God, or for fear of vengeance from him, any worshipper doth perform to him. A thing which every sect or sort of people liking in themselves, but disliking in others of a distant worship, do either honour or defame with the Title (as of Superstition, so) of Religion also. *Sect.* 24.

Fourthly, *A trembling* fear of Gods punishment due for every sin, which the *Epicureans* were willing to scoffe out of the World, lest every man being a sinner, every man should be left to terrours and astonishments of Conscience, and so lose that γαλήνη τῷ βίῳ, that tranquillity and ease of life, which they proposed to themselves as the chiefest good. *Sect.* 25.

To which I need only add a fifth not yet toucht upon, *The use of magical Spells, Ligatures, Characters*, &c. *Execranda superstitio ligaturarum, in quibus inaures*, &c. *non ad placendum hominibus sed ad serviendum Dæmonibus adhibentur*. Aug. Ep. 73. *that execrable superstition of ligatures, among which are the ear-rings*, &c. *used not to please men, but to serve devils* (of auspicious and ominous days, the not observing of which *Hesiod* makes to be impiety, ὅλβιος ὃς τὰ δὲ πάντα (that whole book being a direction to that purpose) Εἰδὼς ἐργάζηται, ἀναίτιος ἀθανάτοισιν, Ὀρνίθας κείνων, ᾗ ὑπερβασίας ἀλεείνων) and all the observations and books of the *Augures* and *Aruspices*, a Catalogue of all which *Clemens Alexan.* (*Strom.* 3. *p.* 312.) tells us, was to be seen in a Comedy of *Menanders* called δεισιδαίμων, in which he scoffs at those that make every Accident almost σημεῖόν τινος, a presage, or *sign of something*, divining by the flight of birds (δεξιὸς ὄρνις Αἰητοῦ ὑψιπετὴς, in *Homer*,) by the feeding of Chickens, as in that famous story of *Valens* which cost so many men their lives for having names which began with those letters which the Chicken peckt at on the Table; to which you may add the Ῥαβδομαντεία by striking a staff against the ground; to which 'tis thought the Prophet referred, *Hos.* 4. 12. and Κλειδομαντεία, and a many more collected by learned men out of their books, and the rest of the ἐναίσιμα σήματα auspicious signs, such as ἀστράψειν ἐπὶ δεξιὰ, lightning on the right side in *Homer Il.* β. The like with more ease you shall find in Saint *Austin de Doctr. Christiana l.* 2. under the Title of *Significationes superstitiosæ, superstitious significations*, which, saith he *Epist.* 73. *ad serviendum Dæmonibus adhibentur, are used to serve the Devils*, and thence it seems are called *Superstitious*, and they that use them δεισιδαιμονοῦντες ἐπὶ τοῖς σημείοις *in Suidas, superstitious observers of signs*. *Sect.* 26.

All which being thus premised, three things there are in our modern customary use of this word among men, that will appear very inconsequent and improper at least. First, that *Superstition* simply and abstractly taken should be resolved in all Authors to signifie somewhat which is *evil*; That sin particularly of *False-worship*. Whereas first those that use the word to express their own worship either of *God* or *Angels*, or *Saints*, conceive that to be a creditable word, or else would not call it by that name, and the *Etymologist* even now affirmed that among the Heathen ἐπὶ καλῷ λέγεται, *'Tis taken for a good thing*, and for religion in general. And secondly, When St. *Pauls* Religion, or Christianity it self is called by that name by *Festus* an Heathen, *Acts* 25. 19. it appears not that he did use that word as an accusation, or in an ill sence, but only in general to signifie *Pauls Religion*, or somewhat in that different from the Religion of the *Jews*, and no whit less favoured by him than the *Jews* Religion. For he that reads the story, shall see that he rather favoured St. *Paul's* part against the *Jews*, or at most doubted whose side to judge on, so far is he from prejudging Saint *Paul's* cause, or his Religion in comparison of theirs, or expressing that by this word. Thirdly, St. *Paul* himself *Acts* 17. 23. saith, they do εὐσεβεῖν worship the true God, though ignorantly, (taking him for a δαίμων as the rest of their many Gods were) whom he had called δεισιδαιμονεστέρους. Fourthly, he calls them δεισιδαιμονεστέρους, *more religious* than other men, not in relation to any vitious rite or performance, wherein they exceeded others, but in relation to their worshipping the *unknown God*, which others worshipt not, which saith he was the true God of Heaven whom he preached, though the truth is they knew him not. *Sect.* 27.

A second inconsequence is, that the use of Ceremonies or Rites in the worship of the true God, if they be not distinctly prescribed either by the example or precept of Christ, should 1. be called superstition, then without farther matter of accusation be condemned only for deserving that Title. Whereas first there is no example in the Scripture, nor ancient Author, nor ground in the nature of either Greek or Latine word to affix that Title to that matter *(Superstition to unprescribed Rites)* or if there were, yet secondly no Authority to defame that Title, being so applyed; or to conclude every thing evil that were called by it, unless it might appear to be in it self evil, *abstracted* from the *Odium* of that Title. *Sect.* 28.

The third Inconsequent thing is, that men on pretence and in the name of Piety should abstain from some observances (in themselves and their own nature acknowledged to be *indifferent*) as *superstitious*, *Sect.* 29.

ous, either becauſe they are commanded by lawful authority, or at moſt, becauſe they are or have been *uſed* by *Papiſts*; And yet themſelves not expect to be accompted *ſuperſtitious* in hating and deteſting and not daring to practiſe any one of them (and that ſometimes for no other crime but becauſe they are by lawful *authority commanded* to practiſe them) but as ſtrictly obliging themſelves to do the contrary ſometimes, that which *Anabaptiſts*, and other Perſons (1. not in authority, ſecondly as much or as well condemned by our Church both for doctrine and manner of worſhip as the Papiſts) are wont to do; Whereas in things indifferent, firſt it is certainly as criminous, and *Superſtitious* to place piety in the *Negative*, as the *affirmative*, in *not* kneeling, as in *kneeling*; in *abſtaining* ſcrupulouſly from Ceremonies, as in *uſing* them as ſcrupulouſly; And ſecondly 'tis as dangerous a kind of *dogmatizing* to teach the neceſſity of abſtinence from lawful unprohibited *Ceremonies*, as from lawful unprohibited *meats*, *Col.* 2. And thirdly it is not imaginable that the intervening of a command on one ſide and not on the other, ſhould leave the *Superſtition* only on that ſide, where the command lies, for then the *Superſtition* muſt conſiſt in obeying lawful magiſtrates, or elſe the magiſtrates themſelves be the only Superſtitious Perſons in commanding. Either of which acts (either of giving or obeying commands in things indifferent) if it were acknowledged a fault, might ſure be *Adultery*, or *Witchcraft*, as well as *Superſtition*.

Sect. 30. If to all which hath been ſaid in this matter, it be ſtill objected, that *ſuperſtition* may and doth in ſome authentick Writers either ſacred or profane ſignifie a *nimiety or exceſs in Religion*, I ſhall briefly make this return,

Sect. 31. 1. That the word *Superſtitioſus* may indeed denote ſuch exceſs from the force of the termination [*oſus*] and ſo alſo (ſaith *Agellius* out of *Nigidius Figulus*) the word *Religioſus* denotes; but then, firſt, by that Grammatical obſervation I might conclude, that *Superſtitio* denotes this no more than *Religio* doth; Nay ſecondly, that 'tis *Agellius* his animadverſion upon *Nigidius Figulus*, that all ſuch exceſſes are not culpable, nor conſequently all words of that termination to be taken in ill ſences.

Sect. 32. But then Secondly, granting the word to be thus uſed by ſome Authors, I muſt firſt ſay, That ſome, and thoſe not of the meaneſt of the ancient Heathens (as appears by what we produced out of *Cicero*) did it on that ground of Epicurean Divinity, Gods no providence, no puniſhments in another life, to which it was but conſonant to condemn all ſuperſtition (becauſe all fear of God) for a Nimiety in opinion firſt, and then in practice. Secondly, That for other later Chriſtian Writers the uſe of a word in this or that ſence in ſome Authors, is ſo ſlight and caſual a thing, that it muſt not be thought ſufficient to faſten an ill character on any thing, to which thoſe Authors have applied it, unleſs that thing be firſt proved to be ill by ſome other Topick. Thirdly, that thoſe Authors which come home to the point in hand, are ſo few or ſo modern and of ſo ſmall authority, that they would ſcarce be worth producing. Fourthly, that this ſuppoſed Nimiety or exceſs in matters of Religion may be reduced to theſe two ſorts, as conſiſting either in the *degree*, or in the *number* of Actions; either in the *quality*, or *quantity*; in the *intenſion* or *extenſion*.

Sect. 33. If it be ſuppoſed in the firſt kind only, then I ſhall without ſcruple deny, that there is any ſuch thing as Nimiety or exceſs in Religion. There is no poſſibility of being Religious in too high a *Degree*, of praying *too fervently*, or *too often*. For though the *Meſſalians* or *Euchitæ* were condemn'd in this matter, yet 'tis clear, that that which was their crime, was not that exceſſive *practice*, but the *laying* that *obligation* upon themſelves and all others, to be always a praying, upon authority of that Text [*Pray continually*] which being by the Apoſtle delivered in reference and in analogy to the *continual i. e.* daily *Sacrifices*, was by them miſinterpreted and applied to *uninterrupted*, *inceſſant* pouring out of Prayers. And again though 'tis poſſible alſo, that in too frequent or intenſe a practice of holy Duties ſome incident fault there may be, as for example, if by ſo doing a man neglect the Duties of *Charity* or of his own *particular calling*, yet then alſo 'tis clear that this fault is the neglecting of thoſe *Duties*, and not the *Exceſs* of Devotion (to which this neglect is but extrinſecal and accidental, and ſo not fit to deprave the nature of that devotion it ſelf) which you will diſcern by this, that if that ſuppoſed exceſs might be ſeparated from thoſe adherent *Neglects* or *Omiſſions*, it would then never be accounted criminous, no man that diſcharges all his other Duties will ever be ſaid to be *too* zealous, or to pray *too* often; and that he doth not diſcharge thoſe Duties, though a fault it is, and an argument of partial hypocritical obedience in him that is wilfully guilty of it, yet ſure not properly the ſin of ſuperſtition. For 'tis St. *Auſtin*'s argument againſt *Cicero* (who thought that the praying day and night, *ut filii eſſent Superſtites*, was ſuperſtition) *de Civit. l.* 4. *c.* 30. *Si Superſtites dicti, qui dies totas precabantur & immolabant, nunquid non & illi qui inſtituerunt deorum ſimulachra? If't were Superſtition to pray and ſacrifice whole days together, then ſure they were ſuperſtitious alſo that ſet up thoſe Images of the Gods to which they ſo Prayed and Sacrificed*, intimating his opinion that the frequency of Prayer could not be Superſtitious, unleſs the worſhip and inſtitution it ſelf were Superſtitious: that is, the Gods or Images to whom they thus pray'd, falſe Gods.

Sect. 34. But if this exceſs be ſuppoſed to be in the *extenſion*, *i. e.* the taking in *too* many *things*, to wit too many *Rites* and *Ceremonies*, &c. into the ſervice of God, I ſhall then ſay, Firſt, that by this it ſeems to be granted, that the *Rites* and *Ceremonies* themſelves are not *ſuperſtitious*, but only the *multitude* of them. I make ſuch haſt to aſſume this as granted, becauſe I conceive it ſuch a reaſonable poſtulatum, that I would perſwade my ſelf no pretender to rational diſcourſe would deny it me; it being demonſtratively as impoſſible to deveſt Religion of all Rites and Ceremonies wholly, as to perform the duty of Prayer in an humane body, and yet to do it at no time, in no place, with no geſture.

Sect. 35. Or if our oppoſite Brethren will diſtinguiſh betwixt *Circumſtances* and *ſignificant Ceremonies*, and only diſclaim the latter; Then firſt they muſt fall out with their friends who generally uſe *elevation* of the *hand* in taking of Oaths, and that is a *ſignificant Ceremony*. And ſome of them aſſert the neceſſity of ſitting at the Sacrament as *ſignificative* of their aſſurance of their Familiarity with Chriſt on Earth at his ſecond coming. And ſecondly, they muſt affirm it to be a fault too in a Ceremony, that it is *ſignificative*, which ſeems very unreaſonable alſo.

Sect. 36. For the ſignificancy of a Ceremony may be of three ſorts. *Firſt, when it naturally ſignifies the thing which I am about, and properly floweth from it*; as the lifting up the Eyes to Heaven *floweth* from zeal in Prayer,

Prayer, and ſignifies or expreſſeth it; and no ſober man would ever think fit to quarrel with that for being *ſignificative*, or to preſcribe limits to the uſe of ſuch kind of Ceremonies. Secondly, *When by the cuſtom of the place it becomes in like manner alſo ſignificative of the Action in hand.* As among us, *kneeling* ſignifies humility, *&c.* and to blame ſuch a ſignificancy again, or ſuch a Ceremony, becauſe it is *ſignificative*, were as irrational. 'Twill not be fault in any thus to uſe it privately himſelf, or being a Magiſtrate to preſcribe others (for decency and uniformity) the uſe of it. Thirdly, when it is ſet to ſignifie ſomething elſe, whether that which it ſignifies be matter of Chriſtian Doctrine; as in the Antient Church, the cuſtom of *ſtanding* in the Church between *Eaſter* and *Whitſuntide*, was deſign'd to ſignifie the *Reſurrection* of *Chriſt*; or whether it be matter of promiſe, as the Types in the *old law* were of Chriſt to come; or whether matter *of fact* and Story, *&c.* and then alſo to quarrel with the *ſignificancy* of them, and diſlike them more than if they were empty and *unſignificant*, is Firſt, very irrational again (for it will not be more fault to have ſome profit in them, than to have none.)

Secondly, it will lay a cenſure upon the Types of the Law appointed by God himſelf, for they were ſuch; And though thoſe particulars are now out-dated by the coming of Chriſt whom they ſignified, yet ſince that, others that are now ſtill ſeaſonable by ſignifying and commemorating ſomewhat *paſt*, or prefiguring ſomewhat yet future, will by that Analogy and proportion which they hold with thoſe which were then lawful, be evidenced to be lawful too. *Sect.* 37.

The not obſerving of which matter, and of the ſole reaſon why the old *Jewiſh Ceremonies*, *Circumciſion*, &c. are interdicted us Chriſtians (not becauſe ſignificative Ceremonies are *toto genere* unlawful, but becauſe the obſerving of thoſe particularly which foreſhewed Chriſt, and teaching the *neceſſity* of obſerving them, would be *interpretativè* the denying of Chriſt, or that the *Meſſias* was come) is, I conceive, that which hath given occaſion of the miſtakes of thinking ſignificative Ceremonies to be now unlawful; which errour if upon this advertiſement it may now be reformed, and this ſo reaſonable a *poſtulation* for the lawfulneſs of Ceremonies *ſignificative* be thus granted, the greater part of this preſent Controverſie will be at an end; for I ſhall not then be Advocate for the multitude or abundance of that laſt ſort of *ſignificative* Ceremonies, but rather give my full vote to the confirming of the old rule concerning them, that they be *pauca & ſalubres*, *few and wholſome*; and particularly *few* for theſe Reaſons: *Sect.* 38.

Firſt, becauſe there are really not many ſuch wholeſome Ceremonies to be found; Secondly, becauſe thoſe that by Law are received into the Church, are but very moderate for number; which with me hath no ſmall Authority. Thirdly, becauſe 'tis not impoſſible that the number may encumber the Soul, by buſying it about many things, and ſo diverting it from the *One great Neceſſary*. Fourthly, becauſe the multitude of ſuch was counted a Burden to the *Jews*. Fifthly, becauſe it ſeems ſometimes to be an ill ſymptom of ſome inward neglect, to ſpend over-much Care and Time in the Outer-waſhings; as in the Phariſees it is noted to have been; And as *Ariſtotle* obſerves of the inſectile Animals, that the want of blood was the cauſe that they ran out into ſo many legs. *Sect.* 39.

But then Secondly, I muſt add by way of caution, that in this matter men are ſometimes miſtaken (as Miſers are in judging of exceſſive expences, or ſluggards of exceſſive labour) think, they or others excede, when they do not. *Sect.* 40.

To which purpoſe you may pleaſe firſt to take this direction, that though the premiſed caution concerning Ceremonies in a Church be very good, that they be *pauca & ſalubres*, *few and wholſome*, yet if they be *wholſome*, not only negatively, but poſitively, not only harmleſs but tending to edification (for ſo *ſalubrity*, or wholſomeneſs imports) then there will be little reaſon to accuſe them of *exceſs*; for if they be *ſalubrious*, they will then more probably *help* the inner devotion, than *encumber* it. *Sect.* 41.

Secondly, you muſt diſtinguiſh of ſuch Acts, wherein that exceſs is ſuppoſed to be, that they either are *ordinable*, *fit*, &c. *proper* to that end, the ſervice of God, to that which they are annex'd; and then again being uſed in their kind, they are *ſalubrious*, and no danger of *exceſs*; or Secondly, they are inordinable, unfit, improper, of which nature there are great ſtore noted in the Church of *Rome*; and in this caſe though any one may be a nimiety, and that nimiety a fault, yet ſtill this is not the fault of *Superſtition*, but rather of *folly* and *vanity*, or whatever other *guilt*, the uſing things in the worſhip of God, which do no whit tend to that end (but are aliene from it) may amount to. And theſe *vanities*, or this fault, I deſire to allow no favour or patronage or countenance to, but have as full diſlikes to them as any charitable man hath, though as yet I am not ſatisfied, that they are to be called *Superſtition*. *Sect.* 42.

And yet concerning a word I ſhall not contend neither, but rather grant them liable to that title alſo, on condition that I may but evince, and be granted this one thing, that it is a circle of injuſtice, and a noxious fallacy, firſt to apply the title of Superſtition to ſuch trifles or faults as theſe, then to extend it farther to thoſe things which have no ſuch fault to be charged on them, and then to condemn thoſe alſo, as faults and crimes becauſe they are *Superſtitious*; juſt like the old Heathen Tyrants dealing with the primitive Chriſtians, firſt to entertain themſelves with the bloody ſpectacles of baiting of Wild-beaſts, then to take off thoſe Wild-beaſts Skins, and put them upon Chriſtians, then to bring forth thoſe Chriſtians to be baited and devoured in thoſe ſhapes. The injuſtice of which is the ὅπερ ἔδει δεῖξαι the prime thing which this paper was deſigned to demonſtrate. *Sect.* 43.

And if ſtill it be urg'd and preſſed that *Superſtition* is a *Nimiety* and *Exceſs* in the uſe of good Authours, and demand be made wherein, or what is that *Nimiety*, that may properly be called Superſtition? I anſwer, that if we will needs take *Superſtition* in that notion, then the moſt proper matter of it will be, *Sect.* 44.

Firſt, The placing more vertue in ſome things than either naturally, or by the rule of Gods word, or in the eſtimation of purer Ages of the Church of Chriſt may be thought to belong to them; as the placing virtue or force *in the ſign of the Croſs*, and the womens *parvula Evangelia* in St. *Jerom* on *Mat. Cap.* 23. The *Opus operatum* of the Sacrament, and other Chriſtian performances, (parallel to the φελάκτηρια or amulets among the Heathen, to the φυλακτήρια the Phylacteries among the *Jews* (having *Sect.* 45.

(having their *audi Iſrael, Deut.* 5. faſtned to their wriſts and foreheads) to drive away Devils, and to the *precatiuncula* the little Prayers that the *Turk* carries about with him, as a defenſative againſt all dangers, The doing of which is either utterly groundleſs, and then it is folly; or elſe it faſtens ſome promiſe on Chriſt which he hath not made in the Goſpel, or ſome doctrine on the antient Church, of which that is not guilty neither, and ſo is a Nimiety: or elſe,

Sect. 46. Secondly, (That to which the literal importance of δεισιδαιμονία refers) *An exceſs of fear*, or δειλία πρὸς τὸν θεὸν, *being afraid of God*, when we need not, thinking our ſelves bound (or obliging others) *as from God*, when God immediately neither commands nor forbids, nor the lawful power under which we live (which would be mediately the command of God alſo:) of this kind is the doing or abſtaining religiouſly (*i.e.* upon pretence of divine precept or prohibition) from thoſe things which the word and the law of *Chriſt* doth neither immediately, nor by conſequence of commanding obedience to the higher powers, command nor interdict us. I ſay not, the ſimple doing and abſtaining (for that may be ſimply lawful) nor the doing and abſtaining upon ground of command or prohibition from our lawful ſuperiours, (for if there be any ſuch, we are bound by the word of God to ſuch obedience, and the not paying thereof is as truly, I will add, as immediately a breach of Gods Law and ſin againſt God, as any act of theft or adultery, or ſin againſt the ſecond table: for though the commands of the Magiſtrate are but mediately the commands of God, yet the diſobeying of thoſe commands is an immediate diſobedience to God, in the fifth Commandment which commands to honour, *i. e.* to obey him; and then to be moſt exact and preciſe in caution never to ſin againſt that obedience, cannot be ſuperſtition, or fault, though perhaps by being in a man that makes little Conſcience of greater diſobedience, it be an ill *Symptom* of that *Hypocriſy* which conſiſts in *ſtraining at Gnats and ſwallowing Camels*) but the doing or abſtaining *religiouſly* (which is in effect *dogmatizing Col.* 2. 20. *laying burdens* upon our ſelves, and others as from *Chriſt*) where *Chriſt* hath wholly left us free. As if a private man ſhould think himſelf obliged by (or a Magiſtrate preſs upon others by vertue of the Moſaical Precept, the obligation of) the Jewiſh Law long ſince abrogated by *Chriſt*, or any other out-dated or not-yet-given command; This might be called *Superſtition*, under this Notion of *Nimiety*, becauſe that man adds to the *Commands* of *Chriſt* (as the former to the *Promiſes*) annexes to the Chriſtian Religion, to the Goſpel Rule, thoſe things which belong not to it, and ſo is an exceeder in the *fear* and *ſervice* of God, doth things in obedience to God, which he neither immediately nor mediately commands, and ſo walks ἀκριβῶς ὡς ἄφρων, *Epheſ.* 5. 15. *Circumſpectly, but as a fool, fearing where no fear is*, doing ſome things ſervilely (that is, fearing damnation if he ſhould not do them) *wherein Chriſt* hath left him *free*, and no authority of the Church or lawful Magiſtrate reſtrain'd that Liberty.

Sect. 47. And this is a culpable or criminous *Exceſs*, not in doing what God commands not (for that may be innocent enough) but in affirming (as a falſe Teacher) God to command when he doth not command, or to forbid when he doth not forbid; and ſo inthralling himſelf or others, whom God hath freed. Which way of *dogmatizing*, or impoſing as neceſſary ſuch things as the law of *Chriſt* hath not made neceſſary (no, nor ſo much as the higher powers authorized by *Chriſt*, nor the Primitive or univerſal Church of *Chriſt*, which will have authority amongſt all ſober men) and ſo proceeding to make ſuch things marks and characters to condemn others and illuſtrate themſelves by, is the ſpecial kind of *Superſtition*, which I have reaſon to believe any kind of Proteſtants to be guilty of. Yea and

Sect. 48. The only one, unleſs it be that ridiculous one of making groundleſs obſervations of ominous things, inauſpicious events, unlucky days, and ſuch like old-wives divinations, to which one part of *Theophraſtus* his Character of Superſtition, and of *Agellius* his notion of it, and of S. *Auſtin*'s alſo refers; which yet is rather *believing* firmly what we have no ground to *believe*, and ſo an *exceſs of credulity*, than *doing* what we are not bound to *do*, and ſo an *exceſs* of *Religion*; or if you will, a *civil Superſtition* (being not in any order to the worſhip of God) in an affected retaining or embracing of ſome old Heathen Traditions, taken up by the δεισιδαίμονες, firſt fooliſh in them, and then of evil report for us to continue from them, being ſo much better inſtructed than they were; and if taken up upon their authority, and continued under that notion, then alſo poſſibly matter of ſcandal (as the eating of the εἰδωλόθυτα, *Things offered to Idols*, was 1 *Cor.* 10. 29.) But then ſtill this is rather an effect of natural magick, or Heatheniſh perſwaſions, than an *Exceſs* of the Chriſtian *Religion*; and not at all the thing which is now adays preſt with that odious title of *Superſtition*, and therefore it may ſuffice to have named this without farther enlarging on it.

Sect. 49. As for thoſe other things which are ſo ordinarily branded under this name, by many that are now ill pleaſed with the legal ſtate of things in our Church, though I ſhall not deſcend to the particular conſideration of them, and vindication of each, yet this it will not be unſeaſonable to have adverti-ſed in this place, that that main proof and common way of evidencing the *ſuperſtitiouſneſs* of ſome obſervances or performances among us, only becauſe either we do place (or others have placed) *holineſs* in them, is, (whatſoever may be ſaid of it in *theſi*) in *hypotheſi* or *application* to the particular caſes generally very falſe, or impertinent.

Sect. 50. For, whenſoever in any ſuch particular I ſhall be thus accuſed, I ſhall firſt ask what is meant by קדש * *holineſs?* any real inherent vertue? or only (according to the * Hebrew, and ſo Scripture notation of the word) ſeparation from common uſes? For the firſt of theſe, that real *inherent holineſs*, no Proteſtant that I have heard of, affirms it of any created *thing*, but only of *perſons*, as *God*, in the high degree, and *Saints* of his, in a lower and imperfect degree, by way of communication from him. Either therefore the charge muſt be falſe, or elſe by *holineſs* muſt be meant that ſecond kind of it, *ſeparation* to *holy*, from common uſes; and thus times, and things, and actions, *&c.* may be truly called *holy*, and if we place no more of *this holineſs* in them, than thus truly belongs to them, then ſure we offend not again, nor are to be defamed for *Superſtitious* in ſo doing.

Sect. 51. In this caſe the only thing behind for inquiry will be, by whom and how far this thing whatever it is, is thus ſeparated, and that I ſhall ſuppoſe will be found to be done either by *Chriſt* or the *Apoſtles*, or the *univerſal Church* in the pureſt ages, or the *particular Church* (and rulers thereof) wherein we live; or if by none of theſe, then (being left free and at our own diſpoſing) by our own voluntary act,

act, or that confirmed with a reſolution, or vow perhaps in ſome caſes. Now if theſe or any of theſe be the authors of the *ſeparating* any thing, then to diſcern whether we exceed in any of theſe, and whether we place more *holineſs* than is due to them, it will not be very difficult: For, if that, which is thus ſeparated by *Chriſt*, I ſhall count *holy* in that degree, and conceive my ſelf obliged to it *virtute præcepti divini*, *by virtue of divine precept*, I ſurely offend not. And ſo in the ſecond, If I count my ſelf obliged by the *Apoſtolick precept*, or in the third by the example or *precept of the primitive univerſal*, or in the fourth, of *the particular Church*, (each of which ought to have their authority with us, though that in different degrees) all this while I offend not, becauſe the *holineſs* which I place in them is ſtill proportioned to the ground of it, the authority of him that thus *ſeparated them*.

And ſo again, if my *voluntary oblation* I perform as a voluntary oblation, and only expect that God that hath promiſed to *accept* ſuch, will, if it be as it ought, *accept* this; and in caſe of *reſolution* and *vow*, add that reſpect in my performance, which is due to ſuch, all this while I am not blame-worthy. *Sect.* 52.

But if I ſtrain either of theſe any degree above its rank, elevate an Eccleſiaſtical or humane Conſtitution into a divine Precept, *&c.* then I ſhall acknowledge this a fault, and that fault perhaps capable of the title of *Superſtition*: which yet muſt not be extended thus far, that the giving of the like *obedience* to one as the other, is this fault, (for *obedience* being due to both Divine and Humane Laws (keeping their terms of ſubordination) I am alike bound by *Chriſt* to *obey* both, and I muſt not make any difference in that Obedience, but do both *for Conſcience ſake*) but that the *confounding* the *grounds* or *foundations* of my obedience, which ought to be *diſtinguiſhed*, is in it ſelf an errour, and that which may prove of ill importance, by making me *equal* them, when perhaps they come in competition with (and ſo thwart) one another; in which caſe the inferiour ought *to give place* to the ſuperiour. *Sect.* 53.

If to this it be replied, that though I do not elevate this above its pitch, do not thus attribute more *holineſs* to this or that than it deſerves, yet *Papiſts* or other *Superſtitious* perſons have done ſo, and therefore the thing is become *Superſtitious*, and conſequently muſt be forborn by me alſo. To this I anſwer Firſt, That the ill uſe of any will not corrupt a thing in it ſelf either commanded, or but laudable, or only innocent before; and conſequently though the Papiſts be ſuperſtitious, yet will not every thing from thence be ſufficiently proved to be ſuperſtitious, unleſs it have ſome crime beſide their uſing it; for otherwiſe, not only the *Creed* and *Pater-noſter*, but even the *Scripture* it ſelf muſt be ſuperſtitious alſo. *Sect.* 54.

This inconſequence being acknowledged, I add, Secondly, that there is nothing which can oblige me to abſtain from that which they have uſed ſuperſtitiouſly, unleſs either the danger that I be thought to do ſo too, to be as *Superſtitious* as they, or the poſſibility that others following me in doing it, may follow them in doing it *ſuperſtitiouſly*, and either of theſe dangers being ſuppoſed, will not yet come home to prove it *Superſtitious*, (which is the only thing we have now to conſider) the moſt that they can do, is to make it *ſcandalous*, and (beſide that this belongs to another matter and is abundantly handled in *another Diſcourſe on that Subject*) I ſhall add one thing more that this conſideration of the danger or poſſibility, is not ſo much a *religious* as a *prudential* one (for an act of *prudence* it is to weigh and ponder whether this be a probable danger or no) and ſo belongs to the higher powers to conſider of (not to every private man) who if they think fit by law to forbid it, I muſt not then venture on it; if (*non obſtante* this appearance of danger) to command it, though 'tis poſſible they may do amiſs in ſo doing, yet I (having nothing to do in that act of theirs, unleſs I am a Counſel adviſed with in it) may be innocent enough in ſo obeying, and if they have thought fit neither to command nor forbid, then am I left free in my own particular, and may do either, ſo I do it with thoſe cautions, that in the *tract of Scandal* are ſet down. *Sect.* 55.

To which if it be replied, that though this be true in *theſi*, yet in *hypotheſi* 'twill not be pertinent in this Kingdom. The Laws of this Kingdom have taken away all Ceremonies uſed in the *Roman* Church, ſave thoſe that are named in thoſe Laws, and ſo have left no man any ſuch liberty. I anſwer, They have taken away the *obligingneſs*, but not *lawfulneſs* of them, unleſs of thoſe which either our Church or ſome higher principle hath pronounced unlawful; my meaning is, that whatſoever laudable performance was taken up by the Papiſts, and by them commanded, now though that command be taken away, and ſo we free from the obligingneſs or burthen of it, 'tis not therefore made unlawful or prohibited to us (for that were to reſtrain our liberty alſo, and only to exchange one burthen for another) or if it were, I ſhould then think my ſelf obliged to abſtain alſo. *Sect.* 56.

The Concluſion from all this diſcourſe will be, that if ſome men, as they will abide no *Rites*, ſo they would avow no *quarrels* but what *Scripture* will give them particular directions or commands for, and conſequently if they would not judge or damn their brethren, when neither *Chriſt* and his writ, nor the authority of the primitive univerſal Church, nor the orders of the particular within which they live, nor the *indecency* of the thing it ſelf (of which yet every *private* man muſt not be allowed a competent judge) condemns them, it might be hoped that *truth* and *peace* and *juſtice* and *charity* that have taken their joint flight from this earth together, might together return to it again, which till it be done it muſt be ſtill expected that they who have learn'd one of the Devils attributes, that of Satan, *Adverſary*, or ἐχθρὸς ἀνὴρ *enemy Man*, will alſo advance to another, that of διάβολος *calumniator*, and κατήγορος ἀδελφῶν *accuſer* (as of the *brethren*, *i. e.* true *believers* ſo) of every Chriſtian or innocent action of theirs, and that if there be no known plain ſin to be charged on them with any probability, then ſome unknown, obſcure, miſunderſtood name ſhall ſupply that place, and as once *Herodius* obſerved that there was a Law made that no crime ſhould be capital but *treaſon*, but then every the leaſt *misbehaviour*, or even innocent harmleſs action, in ſuch whom they had a mind to puniſh, was brought in under the title of *Treaſon*, and ſo every thing became capital by that means, ſo now it being by ſome men reſolved (if the teſtimony of the reſt of their lives may be believed) that there is no capital damning ſin, worth heeding, or abſtaining from but *Superſtition*, every *rite* or *geſture* or *motion* in them whom they pleaſe to quarrel with, ſhall be accuſed and arraigned and ſentenced under that title. *Sect.* 57.

It were to be wiſh't that the pains that is taken in defaming all *bodily worſhip*, under the *mormo* of *Superſtition*, were more profitably employed, either in finding out means to encreaſe our inward at- *Sect.* 58.

tention and fervour in performing that great duty of prayer (to which purpose (I am confident) *fasting*, and *humility* of *bodily gestures*, those two main branches of the *modern Superstition*, will not be found unprofitable) or else in the search of that spiritual *pride* and *uncharitableness* and *contention*, that *filthiness of the Spirit*, which is apt to steal into and defile the best mens hearts, and if it may please, of one real, *blasting*, *damning*, and yet (as if out-dated) *little considered sin*, you may take your option, either that of ἱεροσυλία *Sacriledge*, *Rom.* 2. 22. or that other of *irreverence* and *prophaneness*.

Take heed that no man deceive you with vain words.

OF IDOLATRY.

Sect. 1. AS the Judgments of other men have perswaded me to think it pertinent and seasonable to add this one unto four former disquisitions, with which it holds some analogy and cognation, So the nature of the enquiry hath prompted and directed me to take rise (as those former have) from the examination of the word, and that by observing the *origination* first, and then *Critical* peculiar importance of it among *ancient* writers, those especially of the *Scripture*.

Sect. 2. To that end, the word Εἴδωλον, *Idol*, of which it is compounded, must first be viewed. And of that there is no question, but that in the literal notation of it, it signifies an *Image* or *representation* of any kind, and accordingly in the *Old Testament* is set to express both צלם *an Image*, or *similitude*, any kind of figure in *general*; and פסל *a carved* or *graven Image* in *specie*, a statue of wood, or stone, any kind of *Sculpture*: Though the truth is, εἴδωλον is not the most ordinary rendring of either of these, but εἰκὼν *imago* of the former, and εἴδωλον but twice; and γλυπτὸν *sculptile* of the latter, and εἴδωλον but thrice.

Sect. 3. Three words there are to which it is most ordinarily applied. 1. אליל a *nothing*, that hath no being, (to which St. *Paul* refers when he saith *an Idol is nothing*) or if you please a no God, אל אל that hath no *Divinity*, no power to help the Client or Worshipper; parallel to that passage, *Deut.* 32. *they have provoked me* בלא אל with that which is no God, and the Author of the Book of *Esther*, c. 14. 11. μὴ παραδῶς, Κύριε, τὸ σκῆπτρόν σου, τοῖς μὴ οὖσι, *give not thy scepter, O Lord, to them that are not.*

1 Cor. 8. 4.
1 Cor. 10. 19.

Sect 4. Secondly, אלהים *Gods*, the many false *Gods* of the Heathens, by the Greek seven times rendred εἴδωλα *Idols*, unless perhaps it may be conjectured, that they which so rendred it in those places, mistook, or misread אלהים *Gods* (which in other places they constantly render θεοὶ, at least two hundred times) for אלילים *nothings*, vanities, which is very near in writing and sound unto it, and such mistakes are no great news in those translators.

Sect. 5. Thirdly, נדוד *Pollution*, *Filth* by which any man is contaminated; This is rendred sometimes βδέλυγμα *abomination*, but more frequently εἴδωλον (*Idol*) than any thing else, (and sometimes the idol or false God meant, when the word βδέλυγμα *abomination* or *pollution* is used, as *Wisd.* 12. 23.) which certainly refers not only to the *pollution* of the Soul by the commission of that sin, (for by every other sin some such pollution is contracted;) nor only to that other notion of spiritual fornication; but principally to the abominable sins of *uncleanness*, and *filthiness*, which those *Idol worships* were ordinarily guilty of, (and of which, saith the Author of the Book of *Wisd.* distinctly, the invention of idols was the beginning, *c.* 14. 12.) and from thence received a great aggravation and heightning of their guilt, and punishment. And to the same purpose the word שקץ *abomination*, or filthiness, (and so most commonly rendered βδέλυγμα and μίασμα) is sometimes εἴδωλον *Idol* also.

v. Grot. in Hos. 9. 10.

Sect. 6. Other words there are, that sometimes (but more rarely) are thus rendred also, as 1. במה (from whence the Greek βωμὸς) *high places*, the Altars or Temples of their false Gods peculiarly, (as may appear 1 *Mac.* 1. 59. where βωμὸς the Heathen Altar was by *Antiochus* set upon the θυσιαστήριον or Altar of the Jews) and these would be more properly rendred εἰδωλεῖα *Idol Temples*, or Altars, than εἴδωλα *Idols*; and therefore perhaps in that one place, *Eze.* 16. 16. where 'tis rendred εἴδωλα, it may be a false print for εἰδωλεῖα: I am sure our English most properly renders it *high places*, and those are called εἰδωλεῖα not only by the Author of that Book 1 *Mac.* 1. 47. but by St. *Paul* himself 1 *Cor.* 8. 10. speaking of him that eateth ἐν εἰδωλείῳ *in a Temple* or other place *where those false Deities were worshipt.*

Sect. 7. Secondly, הבל *vanity*, so *Esth.* 14. 10. μάταια is set by the Greek, and rendred by us [*Idols*] and so 3 *Mac.* both κενὰ and μάταια signifie, from whence it is that the Gentile-Idol worshippers under the title of [πάντες ἄνθρωποι] *all men*, the generality of mankind (or all the World but the Jews) are said to be φύσει μάταιοι, *Wisd.* 13. 1. *vain* or Idolatrous by *Nature*, *i. e.* either by *birth*, born in that Idolatrous Age among those Heathens; or else by *long popular*, *natural*, *œcumenical custom*, which is, saith *Galen*, ἐπίκτητος φύσις, *an acquired nature*; Thus hath *Suidas* intepreted the word φύσις *nature*, that 'tis sometimes χρονιὰ καὶ πονηρὰ συνήθεια, a *chronical evil custom*, (as on the other side *Dion Chrysostom* ἀγαθὴ ἔθος, *of custom*, comprehends the Law of *Nature* under that stile) and instances in that place where St. *Paul* tells the *Ephesians*, c. 2. 3. that they had been by *nature the Children of wrath*, where (as υἱοὶ ὀργῆς *children of wrath* signifies peculiarly Gentiles, so) the *prime* if not *only* intent of that adjunct φύσει is (as many circumstances in the context will convince) that they were such Idolatrous Gentiles either φύσει *by birth*, (born such Gentile worshippers ὡς καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ *as the rest also of* the Heathen World was) or else φύσει *by custom*, by long popular habit of education, or (which will unite both those senses and more fully express the word φύσις from φύω) by a *long habit* deduced from their very first *being* or *birth*, and so continuing till the time of their conversion; *customary Idolaters*, *working* κατὰ τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ κόσμου τούτου *according to the age or vicious custom of the Heathen World*, *v.* 2. and the practices of the υἱοὶ ἀπειθείας *infidels* or *unbelievers*. So when the Apostle saith of the Gentiles, that παρὰ φύσιν, *beside*

beſide nature, they were grafted into a fair Olive tree, being but a wild Olive themſelves, *Rom.* 11. 24. he ſure means by [*nature*] the *cuſtom* of the Jews, which they ſay by analogy with *Lev.* 19. 17. was extended to a prohibition of grafting one fruit-tree into another kind, or elſe he refers to the conſtant rules of gardening, never to graft an ill fruit upon a good ſtock. And ſo will the word be beſt rendered, when the ſame Apoſtle expoſtulates with the Corinthians 1 *Cor.* 11. and demands whether φύσις (we render *nature*) did not tell them, that it was a *ſhame for a man* κομᾶν, which we render to *wear long hair*, but I conceive, would more properly (according to the uſe of the word in the Greek Authors) be tranſlated to *let the hair grow at length*. If either of the Interpretations be accepted, then ſure φύσις muſt only ſignifie the *cuſtom* and *faſhion* of the *place*, or of the * generality of men, or elſe birth, as that containeth in it the diſtinction of Sexes, (as the word γένεσις near kin to φύσις, doth, *Wiſd.* 4. 26.) or in the mixt ſence, an univerſal continued cuſtom from their birth till then; and not *nature* in the ordinary acception, or as it ſignifies the *law of nature* written in our hearts. For then not only *Abſolon's hair* muſt be againſt *nature*, (which yet the Scripture charges not with that crime) but even the *vow* and practice of *Samſon*, and the *Nazarites* had been an *unnatural* ſin. A later Critick would have κομᾶν be taken for *braying of hair*, or making a *dreſſing* of it (which I confeſs the *Apoſtles* argument in that place, and the mention of περιβολαῖον, a *covering*, would perſwade) but then ſtill φύσις muſt ſignifie (though not only a *local*, yet) an *univerſal cuſtom*, ſuch as hath deſigned and fitted *diſtinction* of *attires* to *diſtinction* of *ſexes*, which it would be hard to impute to the dictate of *nature* in every man's heart, ſo that that ſhould be thought to define what attire is natural to a *man*, what to a *woman*, but is an act either of *local cuſtom*, συνήθεια, (which in this matter the *Apoſtle* appeals to, *ver.* 16. againſt all diſputers) or elſe of *univerſal cuſtom* of all nations, which he ſeems to plead in this place. But I conceive it without example in Authors ſacred, or Heathen, that κομᾶν ſhould ſignifie a *dreſſing*, (whatſoever κομάω and other words of ſome affinity may be thought to do.) I remember an eminent place to the contrary in *Libanius*, ſpeaking of *Prometheus* picture, with an horrid uncut beard, of which, ſaith he, σωφρονεῖ αὐτὰ ἡ πρὸς τὸ μετεῖναι κομᾶ. ἀεὶ ἐοικ. pag. 102. and that it noteth not a *dreſſing*, 'tis clear by that other expreſſion * there, κομὴ ἀνειμένη πρὸς ἀνέμους. The notion which at firſt I gave you, will ſatisfie all pretenſions both of the Grammarian and the Textuary, that it ſignifie *to let the hair grow at length without cutting or poling it*; that will ſatisfie the Critick, for that is κομᾶν *comam promittere*, and to do ſo, there can be little reaſon aſſigned, unleſs it be in order to *braiding* it, or making a covering of it, on occaſion of which it is that the *Apoſtle* here ſaith, that it is an *honourable* or *decent* thing *for a woman* to do ſo, *ver.* 15. (and the contrary for a man) and *not to do ſo is all one for her, as to be ſhorn or ſhaven*, *ver.* 5, & 6. and ſo that ſatisfies the Textuary alſo.

* So in the Digeſts *de ſtat. hom. L. Lex noſtra*, that which was but the Law of many nations, *viz. ut qui naſcitur ſine legitimo matrimonio matrem ſequatur* (which though it held among the Græcians and Romans, yet did not among other nations, *Grot. de Jur. Bell.* l. 5. c. 29. viz. *in partu ſervili*) is called *Lex naturæ*.

* Pag. 110.

But this by the way; From this acception of the word הבל *vanity*, for *idols*, it is that *Rom.* 1. 21. St. *Paul* ſaith of the Heathen, that ἐματαιώθησαν *they became vain*, *i. e.* fell to thoſe impious *idol-worſhips*: and ſo *Rom.* 8. 20. where 'tis ſaid of ἡ κτίσις *the creature*, or *creation*, i. e. the whole Gentile world (which *v.* 19. is ſaid to have waited for the Goſpel or Kingdom of Chriſt, and to grone, *v.* 22. and to be delivered from their ſervile cuſtom of beſtial ſins under the phraſe φθορᾶς corruption, *v.* 21.) that ὑπετάγη τῇ ματαιότητι, it *was ſubjected to vanity*, the plain meaning is, that thoſe *idolatrous* cuſtoms reigned amongſt them.

Thirdly, בְּעָלִים *Loras* or *husbands* (or, as we retain the *Hebrew* word in *Engliſh*, *Baalim*) 2 *Chron.* 17. 3. *Jer.* 9. 14. is rendred in the *Greek* again εἴδωλα, *idols*, and ſo clearly ſignifies thoſe other heathen *deities* taken into a rivalry with the *God* of Heaven. *Sect.* 8.

Fourthly, חמנים; we render it the *Sun images* in the margent, *Iſ.* 17. 8. but whoſoever conſiders the places, and *Ezec.* 6. 4. will acknowledge that it ſignifies (not the *images*, but) the *places* of worſhip of חמה *i. e.* the *Sun*, called by the Greeks πυρεῖα & πυρθεῖα, the *places where the ſacred fires* were made in honour to the *Sun*, and the word is therefore by the *Targum* rendred, *Iſ.* 17. 8. חנסנסיא *delubra*, *temples*, (a deſcription of which is given us by *Benjamin* in his *Itinerary*, and by ſome of the *Rabbines* affirmed to have been firſt of a religious inſtitution to God in the thankſgiving for that glorious creature) theſe I ſay are once rendred εἴδωλα, *idols*, *Iſa.* 27. 9. but in other places, ναοὺς, *temples*, &c. *Sect.* 9.

Fifthly, the word עלל (far enough naturally from any ſuch ſignification) is rendred *Ez.* 36. 18. εἴδωλα, *idols*, and our *Engliſh* from thence have continued that rendring [*their idols*] where yet I conceive the *Hebrew* ſhould be tranſlated [*their actions or inventions*] (the word properly denoting any good or evil *work* or *enterprize*) and the Greek rendring may poſſibly have been a *miſtake* of the Hebrew עלל for גלל (from which before he had גלול for *idols*) and then 'twill be the ſame in our *Engliſh* alſo. *Sect.* 10.

Sixthly, the word עצב that ſignifies any *cauſe of grief*, of *toil*, of *frightful paſſion*, is often rendred εἴδωλον, noting again their heathen *Gods*, which uſed their Clients exceeding ill, the δαίμονες, *dæmons*, the *fear* and dread of whom produced the Greek word which we render *Superſtition*. And near of kin unto that, is a ſeventh מפלצת which once is rendred εἴδωλον alſo, and from the origination of the word is juſtly rendred [*horrors*] in our Margent, 2 *Chron.* 15. 16. *Sect.* 11.

Once more, the word תרפים *Teraphim*, thoſe which *Rachel* ſtole from *Laban*, are rendred εἴδωλα, *idols* alſo, and ſeem to have been ſome *images* (τύποι θεῶν, ſaith *Joſephus*, *images of his Gods*) but as others gheſs, *images ſet to a certain poſition of the Stars*, with the figures of the *Planets* upon them, according to the cuſtom of the *Syrians* then, by which they were wont to divine; not any thing like the *Cup*, *whereby*, ſay the *Egyptians* of *Joſeph*, *he divineth*, for that I conceive was but a *drinking Cup*, wherein he uſed to drink in thoſe *ſacrifices* by which he prepared to receive *preſages* from God (and therefore I ſhould render thoſe words *Geneſ.* 44. 5. [*with which he receiveth preſages*) but *Aſtrological inſtruments*, with pictures of Stars upon them, which ſome conceive to have been ſo made, that they were able to ſpeak ſometimes, and then they will differ but little from the Sun-Idols even now mentioned, for thoſe they ſay, by the operation of the fire, became *vocal*. *Sect.* 12.

This ſo particular wearisome trouble have I given the Reader at the entrance, to give him occaſion of obſerving that the word εἴδωλον, idol, though it ſignifie an *image*, or *ſculpture*, or *repreſenta-* *Sect.* 13.

tion ſometimes, yet it ſignifies ſomewhat elſe beſides that, particularly theſe two things, 1. the *Heathen Gods* under the notion of *falſe* (together with the *Temples* wherein they were worſhipped.) 2. The ſame again, and their worſhip under the notions of *filthy*, *unclean*, and *abominable*. Which two notions of the word (that we may proceed a ſtep farther) we ſhall now look on, as they were in order to worſhip, and that will open to us ſome entrance to a view of *Idolatry*, or the worſhip of *idols* what it is.

Sect. 14. For the former, the *worſhipping* of *falſe Gods*, and *images*, I ſhall give you a brief narration of it out of the ſobereſt of the *Jewiſh* writers, *Maimonides l.* 1. *de Idololatriâ.*

The firſt riſe of Idolatry is, ſaith he, *to be referred to the days of* Enoſh, *when men (taking notice how God had created the Stars and Spheres for the government of the World, and by placing them in ſo eminent a ſtate ſeemed to make them partakers of his honour, and uſed them as his Miniſters and Officers) reſolved it their duty to laud, and extol, and honour them, and taught others that this was the will of God, that we ſhould magnify and worſhip thoſe whom he had preferred and dignified (as a King would have his Miniſters honoured) and that that is the honouring of God. Upon this foundation*, ſaith he, *they began to build Temples to the Stars, to ſacrifice to them, bow themſelves before them, that by ſo doing they might obtain Gods favour, and this was the ground of Idolatry, not that they thought there was no God but the Stars, but that they thought this worſhip performed to them to be the will of God. In proceſs of time falſe Prophets aroſe, pretending meſſages from God, and directions for the worſhipping of ſuch or ſuch a Star, nay for the ſacrificing to all the hoſt of them, building them Temples, making Pictures of them that might be adored by Women, Children, and all others; and to that purpoſe they invented certain figures, affirming them to be revealed to them by prophecy, to be the images of ſuch Stars. Thereupon men began to make images in Temples, under Trees, on the top of Hills, and all men to meet, and worſhip them, reſolving and proclaiming that from thoſe images all good and evil did proceed, and therefore in all reaſon they were to be fear'd and worſhipt, the Prieſts promiſing all increaſe and proſperity as the reward of this worſhip, and preſcribing of rules for the performance of it. After theſe, other impoſtors roſe, that affirmed ſuch a Star, or Sphere, or Angel, to have ſpoken to them, and preſcribed their way and manner of worſhip; in ſum, 'twas generally ſpread over the World, that images were to be worſhipt, each by a peculiar manner of ſacrifice, and adoration, and the Name of God was quite loſt out of the mouth and minds of all men; ſo far as not to be acknowledg'd by them, but all ſorts of people worſhipt nothing but images of wood and ſtone, built Temples on purpoſe for them, adored and ſware by their name, and even the Prieſts and wiſe men among them thought that there was no other God but thoſe Stars, &c. for whoſe ſakes theſe images were made. As for the great God of this World no mortal knew him, ſave only* Henoch, Methuſalek, Noah, Sem, *and* Heber, *and ſo it continued, till* Abraham *was born, the pillar of the World.* Thus much *Maimon.* and much more by way of ſtory and obſervation. And what is thus by him obſerved of the *Heavens*, is by *Iſtiæus Mileſius* in *Euſeb. Chron. l.* 1. p. 131. deduced as clearly for the *idolizing* of *Kings* and great perſons, Thus; Of the line of *Japhet* was born *Serug* ὅτις πρῶτος ἤρξατο τῶν Ἑλλήνισμῶ, καὶ τῷ δόγματι τῆς εἰδωλολατρείας, *who began the Gentile Idol-worſhip*: Αὐτὸς γὰρ, &c. *For he and they that were with him did with ſtatues of Pillars honour thoſe which had antiently been Warriers or Captains, or that did any vertuous or valiant act in their lives, worth the commemorating, and worſhipped and ſacrified to them as Gods. After them others ariſing, and not knowing their Predeceſſors intention*, viz. *that they honour'd them as their Anceſtors, and inventors of good things, with memorials only, they worſhipt them as Gods of Heaven, and ſacrificed to them.* (Where yet I ſee not how it can be ſaid that they honour'd them μνημαῖς μόναις, with *memorials only*, when before he had ſaid, ὡς θεὸς προσεκύνουν καὶ ἐθυσίαζον αὐτοῖς. I ſhould rather gueſs, that in *Scaligers* Edition of thoſe fragments there is an οὐκ left out in thoſe words, and that it ſhould be thus, that *Zerug* — οὐχ ὡς θεὸς προσεκύνουν — *did not worſhip them as Gods*, as their followers did.) *And this was their form of making Gods of them. After their deaths they put their names in the Books of their Prieſts, and ſolemnized a feaſt to them at a ſet time, ſaying that their ſouls were gone to the fortunate Iſlands*, &c. And this, ſaith he, remain'd till the time of *Terah* the Father of *Abraham*. Of theſe St. *Chryſoſtom* ſpeaks under the title of ἄνθρωποι ὑπὸ ἀξίαν θαυμαζόμενοι, *men admired by their flatterers*; which beſides the teſtimony of *Wiſd.* 14. 17. and *Ariſtotle Met.* 1. (where he ſhews how *admiration of great men and benefactors* hath been the great principle of *idolatry* or *men-worſhip*) is every where obſervable in the ſtory of the *Roman Cæſars*, no man dying without an ἀποθέωσις, or *being made a God*; and then conſtantly the ſetting up of their ſtatues in their *Temples*, following as an Attendant of it.

Sect. 15. Many Stages you ſee in this accurſed progreſs of *idol-worſhip*, before they came to *images*, and that laſt ſo prodigious a pitch, ſuch a diſhonouring of the *deity*, that the *Pſalmiſt* could not ſay any thing more reproachful of the *makers* of them, and *truſters* in them, than that they were ἰσόθεοι, *like or equal to their God.*

Sect. 16. To this purpoſe there are three notable paſſages which I ſhall but mention, and leave to be view'd at large; the one *Iſai.* 44. 13. to the twentieth verſe; and the other *Wiſd.* 13. 11. and ſo to the end of that Chapter; the third, in the *Epiſtle of Jeremy*; ſhewing the ridiculous progreſs of a *knotty* piece of *wood* into a ſolemn *deity*, and the irrational ſenceleſneſs of that worſhip, even in the judgment of Heathens themſelves, witneſs *Heraclitus*, Ὅμοια, ὡς εἴ τις τοῖς δόμοις λεσχηνεύοιτο, ποιοῦσιν οἱ προσίοντες οὐ θεοῖς τοῖς ἀψύχοις, praying to inanimate things is like talking to Houſes. And yet this madneſs the conſtant diſeaſe of thoſe that had ſet up any other deity but that of the only true God of Heaven, that ever *adored any creature*, παρὰ τὸν κτίσαντα, *Rom.* 1. (not only *more*, as we render it, but) *beſides* or *except the Creatour*: There being no ſtay for thoſe (that became thus vain to *worſhip* any thing but God) no ſtop in their *tumbling* (as *Maimon.* phraſes it) to that deep gulf of impiety, the worſhip of the moſt inanimate mean creatures in the world.

Sect. 17. To this purpoſe there is another memorable paſſage in an heathen *Tragedian* in *Stobæus*, who having poſitively pronounced that there is but * only one *God* that made all the world, mentions the making and worſhipping of, and ſacrificing to images as that which men through the errour of their heart have miſtaken for piety, and made uſe of them for the ſolaces of any evils that befal them in this life.

* Εἷς ταῖς ἀληθείαισιν ἐξ ὄντων θεὸς Ὃς οὐρανὸν τ' ἔτευξε, γαῖαν μακράν, Πόντου τε χαροπὸν εἶδμα κατέμων βίαι. Θνητοῖτε πολλοὶ καρδίαν πλανώμενοι Ἰδρυσάμεσθα πημάτων παραψυχὰς Θεῶν ἀγάλματ' ἐκ λίθων ἢ χαλκέων Ἢ χρυσοδίκτων, ἢ ἐλεφαντίνων τύπους Θυσίας τε τούτοις καὶ κλῆσις πανηγύρεις Τελοῦντες ὕπως εὐσεβῆν νομίζομεν.

The

The truth is, *Maximus Tyrius* gives a yet more favourable ingenious account of this matter, Διαλ. λθ. That *as letters were invented for the expreſſing of words, (that ſo by the help of writing, the weakneſs of mens memories might be repaired) ſo the images of the Gods were provided to help the infirmities of men, in which they may lay up the names of their Gods,* καὶ τὰς φημὰς αὐτῶν, *and the famous things that are worth remembring of them,* and in brief to *help* them to celebrate their Gods as they ought, as ſo many ὑπομνήσεις καὶ ἀναγωγίαι εἰς ἀνάμνησιν, *helps, and manuductions for remembrance,* and σύμβολα τῆς τῶν θεῶν τιμῆς, *ſigns and tokens of their honouring them, Trophees as it were of their Noble acts to perpetuate the memory of them.* So that although, as he acknowledges, *God be inviſible to eyes, yet in reſpect of our infirmity, and again of the nature of Lovers to love to behold their pictures whom they love, it will not be amiſs to uſe any thing that may thus bring us in mind of God*; and all this with a caution, that *nothing be terminated in the picture, but the love, and remembrance, and every thing beſtowed upon God only.* This is a piece of Heathen divinity very handſomely managed, being indeed no pretence of plea for the *worſhipping of Images*, but only the uſing them as helps to perform our duty to God; But 'tis no news to ſee the actions of the many, and the writings of the few very unlike one the other, (it being very eaſie to *write* vertuouſly, and hard to *live* ſo.) And certainly the Heathen *practice* was quite another thing than this *Platonick ſpeculation.* And ſo much of the *firſt* notion of an *Idol.* *Sect.* 18.

Now for the other notion of an *Idol*, as it ſignifies *filthy* or *abominable*, it will be worth obſerving, what the *Author of the Book of Wiſd.* ſaith of it *in univerſum. Wiſd.* 14. where after an enumeration of many other wickedneſſes in their τελεταὶ and κρύφια μυστήρια, v. 23. in their *inhumane ſacrifices* and *ſecret myſteries* (ſuch were the *Cereris arcanum ſacrum*, in *Horace*, *ſecreta Cereris*, in *Seneca*, *Herc. Fur.* and *Cadmais orgia condita ciſtis*, in the *Tragœd. Oetæus*; and alſo their ἐμμανεῖς κῶμοι, i. e. *amorous night-meetings* (as the *Scholiaſt* on *Theocritus* explains that word, Κωμάζειν λέγεται ἐπὶ τῶν νύκτα εἰς τὰς ἐρωμένας ἀπερχομένων, he concludes with μίασμα, γνώσεως ἐναλλαγὴ, γάμων ἀταξία, μοιχεία καὶ ἀσέλγεια, *pollution, inverſion of nature, diſorder of marriage, adultery, and ſhameleſs uncleanneſs*, v. 26. and at length concludes that *the worſhip of the nameleſs Idols*, or *thoſe not to be named, is the beginning and cauſe and end of all evil*; all the villanies in the world the deſign and ſpecial parts of thoſe worſhips. And ſo *Jer.* 44. 19. by the *Ægyptians* juſtifying themſelves to *Jeremy*, that they did no harm in their *ſacrifices* to the *Queen of Heaven*, becauſe they did it not *ſecretly* without the privity of their Husbands, 'tis clear that there were ſuch private *night-ſacrifices* uſed by the *women*, and *ſuſpected*, and diſliked by the Husbands. *Sect.* 19.

To that purpoſe that I may not lead my Reader into the Heathen ſtories, or the relations made by the Fathers in thoſe acts which they wrote againſt the Gentiles, (that excellent * ſet of Books, which may ſerve any ſtudent for the *Iſthmus*, or μεσθεῖον, or *paſſage* between the ſtudy of *humane* and divine learning) I ſhall only point to ſome paſſages in the ſacred writ that look this way, 1 *Kings* 14. 24. after the mention of the *Idols* and *Groves* follows that *there were Sodomites in the Land, doing according to the abomination of the Heathen, which the Lord had caſt out before the Children of Iſrael*; which gives you moreover a view of the particularity of the ſin of the *Amorites* and other *Nations*, which provoked God to that fatal *ſlaughter*, and *eradication* of them, which is more fully ſet down *Lev.* 18. 24, 25, 27, 28. and an expreſs threat added from Heaven *verſ.* 29. that *whoſoever ſhall commit any of theſe abominations ſhall be cut off from among their people.* *Sect.* 20.

* Orig. contra Celſ. Juſtin. Mart. Apol. Clem. Alex. περὶ. Athanag. Theophilus ad Autol. Tatianus. Theodor. περὶ θεραπ. Euſeb. Præpar. Ev.

Cyril. Alex. cont. Julian. Tertul. Apol. Minut. Felix. Arnobius. Lactantius. Aug. de Civ. Dei. Firmicus. Vid. Sibyll. Or. *l.* 3. *p.* 231. & *p.* 264. & 279. & 315.

And perhaps it will not be unworthy a *digreſſion* here to mark, that at the *rooting* out of thoſe *Nations*, and the *planting* in of the *Jews* in their ſtead, by way of *Covenant*, (the *condition* of that *Covenant* being that they ſhould *fear the Lord, and not walk in the ways of thoſe Nations*) the *ſign* or *ſeal* of that *Covenant* was deſigned to be ſuch as had a particular reference to theſe ſins of the fleſh, σύμβολον ἡδονῶν ἐκτομῆς, ſaith *Philo*, *a ſign of the exciſion of pleaſures*, and denoted the *amputation* of the περιττὰς κακίας *ſuperfluity of naughtineſs*, which had been practiſed among thoſe *Gentiles*, and which would infallibly bring as certain *exciſion* upon them, (if they reformed it not) as was threatned by God to every *male Iſraelite*, that ſhould continue *uncircumciſed*. To the ſame purpoſe were all thoſe *laws* and *rites* concerning *legal pollutions*, to bring them to the greateſt *alienation* of mind, and *deteſtation* of this piece of *Heatheniſm*; Yea and one main part of the *promiſe* of God upon their obedience, *viz.* the *multiplying of their ſeed*, (which was ſo remarkable in that *Nation*, that *Joſephus* mentions τεκνοποιητικὴ as the *craft*, as it were, and ſpecial peculiar *excellency* of that people) was a moſt natural proper effect of the *abſtaining* from thoſe *ſins*; and it is as clear that in our *Chriſtian Sacrament* of *Initiation*, the ἀπόθεσις ῥύπου σαρκὸς, the *waſhing away the ſordes of the fleſh*, had a propriety alſo to that, (which is accordingly mentioned in the vow of Baptiſm, *the forſaking of all the ſinful luſts* thereof.) But this by the way. *Sect.* 21.

So again *cap.* 15. 12. the *Idols* and the *Sodomites* are mentioned together, and 2 *Kings* 23. 7. *the houſes of the Sodomites are caſt down*; where there is alſo mention of the *groves* for thoſe *dark* purpoſes, by which under that name of אשרות *Aſtarte* ſeems to be deſigned. So when the *Babylonians* made *Succoth Benoth*, what is meant thereby but the *Tents of Venus*, in which all the *Virgins* were ſolemnly proſtituted to the honour of that *falſe deity Venus* under the title of *Mylitta?* and ſo the *proſtitution* of their *daughters for the honour* of their *Gods*, which is mentioned not only by *Herod. l.* 1. and *Strabo l.* 16. but in the Epiſtle of *Jeremy verſ.* 43. where as the ἐμμώσαι πέπλους (from the Hebr. פתורה *apertura*) hath an unclean notation in it, ſo the *cords* mentioned are undoubtedly the ſigns of their unclean *vows*, and obligation (from thence) to pay that ſacrifice before they went. So *Iſa.* 57. 5. *Inflaming*, or, *you that inflame your ſelves with Idols under every green tree*] noting that proſtitution of men and women in the *Groves* about their *Idol-temples* in honour of their falſe Gods. So 1 *Mac.* 5. 43. the *temple, that was at Carnaim*, is expreſt 2 *Mac.* 12. 26. to be the *temple of Venus*, for ſo Ἀτεργάτειον ſignifies אדרעתא or Ἀτεργάτις being by the addition of but an א, all one with דרעתא or Δερκετὼ, and with אדרעא *Athara* in *Strabo* l. 16. *i. e.* ורעתא or ὁ σπείρουσα, the expreſſion of, and title for *Venus*, and 2 *Mac.* 6. 4. when the heathens profaned the temple of God, and transformed it into their Gentile worſhips, the firſt thing that is mentioned is their ἀσωτία and κωμοὶ, *luxury* and *unclean meetings*, *Sect.* 22.

ings, ῥᾳθυμούντων μεθ' ἑταιρῶν καὶ ἐν ἱεροῖς ἐκβόλοις γυναιξὶ πλησιαζόντων, *&c.* committing all filthineſs in the very porches and precincts of the Temple; which it ſeems the *Jews* themſelves had once been guilty of, I cannot ſay by any imitation of the Gentiles, or from any other incentive but of their own vile riotous luſts. And to inſtance in no more, it ſeems not improbable upon theſe grounds, that the frequent expreſſions of the Idolatrous practices of the *Jews* by *fornication, whoring,* and the like, may be ſomewhat more than a *trope,* or figure of *Rhetorick*, having thus much of reality in it alſo: *Philo* calling the πάθη τῆ ἡδονῆς the *ſenſual* inordinate *pleaſures* εἴδωλα *idols*; and it being clear that their falling off to the *Heathen Idols* brought them oft to theſe *Heathen ſins* alſo; as in the matter of *Baal-Peor* 'tis moſt evident. So *Rom.* 1.26. 'tis affirmed of the Gentiles that as a puniſhment of thoſe *Idol-Heathen worſhips God gave them up* εἰς πάθη ἀτιμίας, *to diſhonourable infamous affections,* and a particular account of them is ſet down, *verſ.* 26. *women changing the natural uſe,* &c. and likewiſe *men* alſo ἀσχημοσύνην κατεργαζόμενοι, *verſ.* 27. and ποιεῖν τὰ μὴ καθήκοντα, *verſ.* 28. guilty of thoſe *moſt reproachful ſhames and contumelies of nature.* Of which there was abundant ſtore in the *Eleuſinia ſacra, Cybeles myſteries, Venus,* and *Flora's feaſts,* and even in the *Luſtrations* among the *Romans* (of which the *Sibylline* Oracle ſpeaking Ἄρσεν δ' ἄρσενι πλησιάσει, σήσυσί τε παῖδας Αἰσχεῖς ἐν τίγεσι. *l.* 3. *p.* 231.) and generally in their Idol-worſhips; and therefore in thoſe Oracles, *p.* 264. ſpeaking of the *Chriſtians* giving over Idolatry —— ὧδ' ἔργ' ἀνθρώπων χρύσεα —— 'tis added immediately, Κοὐδὲ πρὸς ἀρσενικὰς παῖδας μίγνυνται ἀνάγνως. Ὅσσατε Φοινίκες —— naming all the ſeveral nations of the heathen world that were guilty of it, and *p.* 279. exhorting againſt Idolatry, φεύγετε λατρείας ἀθέμιτος, πῶ ζῶντι λάτρευε, μοιχείαν περφυλάξω, καὶ ἄκεπον ἄρσενα ἰυνὸν. and *l.* 4. *p.* 287. the true piety is ſet in oppoſition, as to Idol-worſhip, ſo to ἀλλοτείης κοίτης πίθον ἄισχρον, and ἄρσενα ὕβριν ἀπέχθης τε συγερὴ τε. and ſo *p.* 296. and 315. μοιχείαι παρὰ σοὶ καὶ παίδων μίξις ἄθεμις. of the *Romans*, and ſo *p.* 332. from which it will not be tollerable to repeat them.

Sect. 23. By this ungrateful unſavoury obſervation it will be poſſible to contribute ſomewhat to the illuſtrating of many places in the *New Teſtament*, and particularly of the notion of *Idolatry* there, (for which advantage it is that this Diſcourſe hath thus enlarged it ſelf.) As firſt *Eph.* 4. 19. where ſpeaking of the *Gentiles*, he ſaith ὅτινες ἀπηλγηκότες (*i. e.* in *Heſychius*'s Gloſſary) who *giving over all labour,* (as idleneſs is the mother ſin of the *Sodomites*) *gave themſelves up to laſciviouſneſs, to work all uncleanneſs* ἐν πλεονεξίᾳ, we render it, [*with greedineſs*] the word is interpreted *Covetouſneſs* in other places, but ſignifies not only that, but all *immoderate*, and peculiarly inordinate unnatural deſire, not only *counting* of *wealth*, I ſay, but in *Ariſtotle* any thing, that is oppoſed ἰσότητι *to equality*, when any man *will have* (πλέον ἔξει) above his *portion*. So in *Heſychius* πλεονεξία τὸ πλέον τῆ δίκης ἐκ τινὸς λαμβάνειν, to denote the [more *than is due or ought to be*] whatſoever the ſubject matter be. So in *Lucian de calumn. pag.* 844. the *Calumniator* is deſcribed to be *one that will have all his auditors to himſelf, will let no man elſe be heard,* and for this he calls him πλεονεκτὴν; and ſo *Democrates* in his γνωμ. defines πλεονεξία to be a *ſpeaking all, and not enduring to hear any body elſe:* and in *Themiſtius*'s Paraphraſe of the firſt Book *de Anima*, * πλεονεκτεῖν is taken for any kind of exceeding, and in *Alex. Aphrod.* δὲ Ἐιμαρμ. σωματικὰ πλεονεκτήματα wherein beaſts exceed men, and φυσικὴ πλεονεξία of men above beaſts. And the notion that I now ſpeak of, applied to *inordinate luſt*, though it differ in the object, is the ſame in effect with this, a deſiring and uſurping that which is not agreeable to his condition, ſex, nature, *&c.* and of that we have a Grammatical ground in the *Hebrew* word בצע which ſignifies *covetouſneſs* and *luſt*, and being oft rendred πλεονεξία is once rendred μίασμῶ *pollution*, *Eze.* 33. 31. where though our *Engliſh* read *covetouſneſs*, yet the ſence directs otherwiſe, even to that which *v.* 29. is expreſt by *abominations*. Thus in an ancient Prayer of *Ephraim Syrus*, λεγομένη ὑπὲς ἐξομολόγησιν, *appointed for Confeſſion* of ſins, and the ſin chiefly inſiſted on being that of uncleanneſs (as may appear by ἐμὲ τὸν ἀισχῆ τὸν φλυαρὸν καὶ μιαίνοντα τὸν ἀυτὸν ἀέρα ὑπὸ τῆ ἀισχρῶν καὶ ἀτόπων ἔργων μῦ, τὸν μιαίνοντα τὸν ναὸν τῆ σώματός μυ — ἀτίμοις καὶ πονηρῆς φιληδονίας μῦ, πᾶν μέλος μῦ ἐμίανε ἔφθειρε ——) he prays — ὅπως ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις μῦ, ταῖς ἀδικίαις, ταῖς πλεονεξίαις, ταῖς μοιχείαις, ταῖς πορνείαις, ταῖς ἀισχρολογίαις —— where if we may judge by the company, πλεονεξίαι are taken in this ſence. In this ſence I conceive *Plato* uſed the word, *de Rep. l.* 9. where ſpeaking of ſenſual men he compares them to the beaſts χορταζόμενοι καὶ ὀχεύοντες, full fed, and laſcivious, and farther adds, ἕνεκα τῶν τούτων πλεονεξίας κυείσκοντες καὶ τίκτοντες —— where the πλεονεξία τούτων muſt refer to the fulneſs of luſt and fleſh together. Or if you will needs have the notion of *Covetouſneſs* continued, yet I conceive the company that the word is ſo often found in, will have ſuch an influence on it, that it ſhall belong to that ἀισχροκερδία, getting wealth by theſe unclean proſtitutions, which ſure is expreſt by the Author of the *Sibyllin* Oracles *l.* 3. *p.* 231. where immediately after the mention of thoſe impurities is ſubjoined Ἀισχροβίῳ φιλοχρημοσύνῃ, κακοκερδεῖ πλούτῳ. But for the uſe of the word diſtinctly for this ſin of unnatural luſt I ſhall mention one plain place in an ancient *Apoſtolical* writing, the Epiſtle of *Barnabas*, *Edit. Voſſ. p.* 231. where giving the reaſon why *hares* were forbidden under the Law, intimating that we ſhould not be παιδοφθόροι like them, he adds ὅτι ὁ λαγὼς καθ' ἑαυτὸν πλεονεκτεῖ τὸν ἀφόδευσιν. Of this I ſhould not thus define, were not many places of the *New Teſtament* eminently applyable to this ſence, nor thus far extravagate on this word, did it not much tend to the explaining and aſſerting the *New Teſtament* notion of *Idolatry*, that now we are upon.

μὴ θέλοντες πονεῖν.

* πᾶσαν γνῶσιν, τιμίαν δὲ πλεονεκτεῖν δὲ ἑτέραν ἑτέρας.

Sect. 24. In that *Rom.* 1. 29. you have together in this matter πορνεία, πονηρία, πλεονεξία, κακία, *fornication, villany,* (not *covetouſneſs* again, but) *inordinate deſire and naughtineſs,* πονηρία and κακία in the ſame notion that *Gen.* 19. 7. and 9. πονηρεύεσθαι and κακῶσαι are taken, *i. e.* to ſignifie that ſin of *Sodom* there deſcribed; and ſo πορνεία and πλεονεξία in the ſame ſence alſo: and yet more evidently, *Col.* 3. 5. where ſpeaking of the *Gentile unbelievers*, among their deeds that a Chriſtian is ſo carefully to avoid, the *Apoſtle* mentions *fornication, uncleanneſs,* πάθος (I conceive, in *Salvians* phraſe, and as the *Syriack* there renders it) *paſſivity, evil concupiſcence,* and πλεονεξία, ſure *inordinate* deſire again *which is Idolatry*; and this ſeems to me to have been acknowledged by Saint *Cyprian* (who *Ep.* 52. will have [ἅτις, which] refer to each of thoſe foregoing names) the interpretation of that heathen *worſhip* of theirs, *for which the wrath of God cometh on the children of diſobedience* it ſeems again this was the ſin that brought that fatal deſtruction upon them) ἐν οἷς, *in which ſins* the *Coloſſians had ſometimes walked, when they lived* ἐν αὐτοῖς, *among the Gentiles.* So *Eph.* 5. 3. *let neither fornication, nor uncleanneſs, or* πλεονεξία, *inordinate*

deſire

deſire to be named among you, (thoſe *nefanda*, *ſins* not to be *named*) *as becomes Saints*, as they are oppoſed to *Gentiles* again. And ſo *v.* 5. *Every fornicator*, and *unclean perſon*, and πλεονέκτης, (not *covetous*, but) *inordinate luſter who is an Idolater*. To this may be referred that of *Maimonides*, *More Neb. l.* 3. *c.*38. where ſpeaking of the *unnatural* ſins uſed by the *Gentiles*, and having named one abominable cuſtom of theirs, *propter hoc*, ſaith he, *prohibita eſt inciſio arboris in aliam ſpeciem, ut elongemur à cauſis Idololatriæ & fornicationum.*

This may poſſibly be the notation of *Idolaters* alſo, when the Apoſtle ſaith, 1 *Cor.* 10. 6. *Be not ye Idolaters, as were ſome of them, as it is written, they ſate down to eat and drink and roſe up to play.* For the Greek παίζειν, which we render to *play*, may poſſibly refer in that place to thoſe ſins of *uncleanneſs*. So *Gen.* 21. 9. the *Targum* of *Jeruſalem* renders *Iſmaels mocking*, by *filium Ægyptiæ facientem opera mala, quæ fieri non oportuit, illudentem, & peregrinum cultum exercentem, the ſon of the Ægyptian doing evil works which ought not to be done* (the ἄθεσμα 2 *Pet.* 2 7. and ἀθέμιτα, 1 *Pet.* 4. 3.) *mocking, and exerciſing ſtrange worſhip.* So *R. Samuel* mentions an interpretation, that *Iſmael* had *committed uncleanneſs*, and that that is the meaning of the Hebrew צחק to *mock*, and *Lyra* on *Gen.* 21. ſaith that the *Hebrew* word is equivocal, and ſignifies *ludentem, Idololatrantem, occidentem, & coeuntem vel laſcivientem, playing, committing idolatry, committing uncleanneſs, wantonneſs*, &c. So it is clear that ἐμπαίζειν doth *Gen.* 39. 14, and 17. which we there render [*mock*] and though παίζειν do not, the word there uſed, yet the Hebrew צחק ſignifies both, and is the word uſed both in that place of *Geneſis*, and *Exod.* 32. 6. from whence our Apoſtle cites it; and if comparing the ſtory *Acts* 7. 41. where 'tis ſaid in this matter, ἐυφραίνοντο, *they rejoiced in the works of their hands*) be apt to perſwade any, that παίζειν to *play*, is all one with ἐυφραίνεσθαι to *rejoice*, and ſo that both denote their *dancing before their Idol*, it will be as obvious to reply that ἐυφραίνεσθαι there uſed, ſignifies moſt properly the *rejoycing at a feaſt*, *Luke* 12. 19. and 15. 23, 24, 29, 32. and 16. 19. and ſo following the *offering of ſacrifice to their Idol*, ſhall denote a *ſacrifical feaſt*, and be all one with the *eating* and *drinking* here, but yet with the *playing* that attends it: and ſo ſtill the παίζειν may probably be thus interpreted; eſpecially when in this place it follows immediately after ἐπεθυμηταὶ κακῶν *luſters after evil things*, (in the notion that κακῶς ζῶ is uſed by *Phavorinus* in 'Ασελγὴ, that is, for this very ſin) and is attended with μήδε πορευώμεν, *neither let us commit fornication*, &c. and from thence perhaps it is that *ver.* 14. to his exhortation of *flying from Idolatry*, he ſubjoins, *v.* 15. *I ſpeak to wiſe men, judge what I ſay*; not willing to add more words on that ſubject. This is but a conjecture of which I am not over confident, and yet will receive farther confirmation by Saint *Hieroms* tranſlation of *Tobit*, *c.* 3. 18. where *Anna* to ſhew her ſelf free from all uncleanneſs, ἀπὸ πάσης ἁμαρτίας ἀνδρὸς *ver.* 17. adds, *nunquam cum ludentibus miſcui me*, where it ſeems uncleanneſſes are meant, and 'tis probable that the *Greek* which he tranſlateth was παιζόντων, though our *Greek* Copies wholly leave out that part of the period. But no queſtion this is the meaning of ἀθέμιτοι εἰδωλολατρείαι, the *abominable* nefarious *Idolatries*, 1 *Pet.* 4. 3. as will appear by the ἀσελγείαι juſt before, *i. e.* the τὰ παρὰ φύσιν, *unnatural* acts of uncleanneſs, in *Phavorinus*, and the ἀνάχυσις ἀσωτίας, ver. 4. *confuſion* of ſexes, and all kind of ἀρρητοποιΐα, as thoſe words denote, if this were a place to explain them; of the *fruitleſs works of darkneſs*, whereof Chriſtianity made them *aſhamed*; of the κρυφῇ γινόμενα, *thoſe things that were done in ſecret*, and ἃ λέγειν αἰσχρὸν, *which 'twas a ſhame to name* or *ſpeak* out: to which you may add, 1 *Theſſ.* 4. 3. *this is the will of God*, ὁ ἁγιασμὸς ὑμῶν, *your purification*, conſiſting, as it follows, in *abſtaining from fornication*, &c. and after ἐν ἁγιασμῷ καὶ τιμῇ, *in purification and honour* (as that is oppoſed to ἀτιμία, *diſhonourableneſs, vileneſs*, *Rom.* 1. 26.) *not in the luſt of concupiſcence, as the Gentiles*, &c. To which purpoſe 'tis the conceit of ſome learned men, that that which follows muſt be applied, τὸ μὴ ὑπερβαίνειν καὶ πλεονεκτεῖν ἐν τῷ πράγματι τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ, *ver.* 6. (though our *Engliſh* reading look quite another way) for ſo the context will enforce, *v.* 7. for God hath not called us, ἐπὶ ἀκαθαρσίᾳ, *for uncleanneſs*, but ἐν ἁγιασμῷ, *to* or *in purification*. And ſo every of thoſe words will bear, if 'twere now ſeaſonable to inſiſt upon it. And it is obſervable that *Iſa.* 57. 8. where the Prophet ſpeaks to the [a] adulterous Apoſtate *Iſrael* [*Thou haſt diſcovered thy ſelf to others beſide me, and art gone up*, &c.] the Greek Tranſlators have uſed theſe words, ἐλογίσω ὅτι ἐὰν ἀποστῇς ἀπ' ἐμοῦ πλεῖον τι ἕξειν, &c. by ἀποστῇς ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, [*departing from me*] expreſſing [*the diſcovering her ſelf to others beſide me*] and by [b] πλεῖον ἕξειν [*deſiring more*] rendring [*the going up*] which may therefore ſeem to be ſet in that place (according to the *Hebrew* עלה *conſcendit, aſcendit, tranſcendit*) for [ὑπερβαίνειν] in the notion that we now ſpeak of, and then you ſee the ſympathy betwixt [c] ὑπερβαίνειν and πλεονεξία, according to the *dialect* and *idiom* of thoſe Writers.

[a] That that whole verſe belongs to that matter will appear, if you view it in the Original, Thus, תרחבת *thou haſt been*

diſſolute (laxata es, dilatata) מכשב *by thy lying with them* (ſo 'tis rendred *Num.* 31. 17.) *Thou haſt cut them*, or made them *Eunuchs* for thy ſelf (ſo כרת which perhaps we miſtake for ברית *Covenant*, doth ſignifie, and ſo the Targum renders it וקצצת *ſuccidiſti, detruncâſti*) *thou lovedſt to lye with them*, &c. [b] So in *Alex. Aphrod.* his *Scholia* on *Ariſt. de Anim.* ὁ ἄδικος αὐτῷ πλέον τῶν ἡδέων νέμει, *the unjuſt man allows himſelf more of pleaſant things* i. e. exceeds in carnal delights. [c] So in the *Sybillin* Oracles is this ſin expreſt by ὑπερηφανίης ἀδικίαι, l. 3. p. 231. and the ſinners called ὑπερφίαλοι καὶ ἄναγνοι. p. 232. (the word ὑπερφίαλοι noting all *immoderate* deſires or attempts, πᾶν ὑπέρμετρον· φιάλη being a veſſel, and the filling of it *above* the brim, being noted by this word) and as it is immediately ſpecified, κλεψίγαμοι καὶ πάντα κακοί. So the ſin of *Sodom* is expreſt by ὑπερηφανία, *Eccluſ.* 16. 8. and verſe 9. they are ſaid to be ἐξηρμένοι (not as we render, *taken away*, nor as ſome *Greek* Copies, ἐξερχόμενοι, but) *liſted up* above all meaſure *in their ſins* which they committed, which ſure were theſe βδελύγματα abominable ſins, as is implyed, *v.* 8.

Sect. 25.

So 1 *Cor.* 5. 11. ἢ πόρνος, ἢ πλεονέκτης, ἢ εἰδωλολάτρης, *either fornicator, or inordinate luſter, or idolater.* Which cannot be applyed to the worſhip of *Images*, becauſe he there ſpeaks of Chriſtians in profeſſion at leaſt, who ſure did not then worſhip *Images*, but might be guilty more probably of thoſe carnal heathen *uncleanneſſes*, thoſe *impurities* ſo ſolemnly uſed in the *idol-worſhips*. In which place and the precedent verſe, under the general word πορνοὶ, *fornicators*, are ſpecified πορνοὶ κόσμου τούτου, *the fornicators of this World*, i. e. the Gentiles, πλεονέκται, ἅρπαγες, εἰδωλολάτραι; *The inordinate luſters, and Idolaters* again belong to that matter; and ſo 'tis more than poſſible may the ἅρπαγες too, which we render *Extortioners*, but may rather ſeem to ſignifie the ἁρπαγὴ γυναικῶν, or παρθένων, the *rape or ſtealing of women, or virgins*, the ἅλωσις, 2 *Pet.* 2. 12. preying on them (the literal notion of the word from ἁρπάζω, *rapio*, by which as by ἁλόω, the Hebrew טרף is rendred) and ſo I have obſerved the word to be uſed in

Sect. 26.

* ἐξαβίβλ· βιβ. 5. τιτ. ζ. τὰ τῦ ἅρπαγος οἰς δημόσιον εἰσκομίσονται. *Raptoris bona publicanda esse.* So in the *Sibyll.* Oracles written by some ancient Christian, l. 2. p. 172. with [Ἀρπάλιω πολιτεύοντες, ἀναιδείᾳ πεποίηντες, those that had *put off all shame*] are joyned Ἁρπακταῖοι, *Ravishers*, and p. 216. with [Λεκτεύλοποι ἀδιαλοιδόρητοι] and [Οἷς κακὸς ὢν στρογγὸν ἔνι μεμανήμενος ὄπασσε (which I conceive belongs to *inordinate lusts*) there is joyned Ἁρπάζοντες ἀναίδεια θυμὸν ἔχοντες] *rapes* and *shameful lusts*: and Στίβξυσι κρυφίοις, *secret loves* and adulteries, and a [θοὴν ἐπιβήσεται ὄλμῳ, the judgment of *brimstone*] the portion of *Sodome* for such sins, follows in the end of the Book.

Sect. 27. To this nothing can more clearly belong, than that mention of *Idolaters*, 1 Cor. 6. 9. being so joined on both sides with *fornicators*, *adulterers*, *soft or effeminate*, *defilers of themselves with mankind*. And what if the phrase ὁ βδελυσσόμενος τὰ εἴδωλα, *Rom.* 2. 22. do so also, *thou that abhorrest Idols.*] The word βδελύσσεσθαι, seems to refer to those (so frequently) called βδελύγματα, *abominations*; Whether (those of the *Sidonians*, and the like, *i. e.* whether) *abominable* sacrifices, killing, and *offering their Sons and Daughters unto Devils*, or *abominable* sorceries, *Deut.* 18. or *abominable* senseless stupidity, in worshipping inanimate Creatures, or *abominable* lusts in their idol-feasts, I shall not now define; but only observe, that if we should apply it peculiarly to the last of these (yet not excluding the rest) the rational importance of the place will bear it very well, Thou that dost detest and abominate those Heathen villanies of their Idol-worships, and canst not with patience endure that any degree of them should be brought into the house or worship of the true God, if thou shalt yet so far despise that place and him that dwelleth there, as to rob it of those things that are consecrated to it, surely thou wilt never be able to clear thy self.

Sect. 28. Having gone through so many, there are but few more mentions of these words [*Idolater* or *Idolatry*] in the New Testament; I shall briefly give you a view of them. *Gal.* 5. 20. Where of the *works of the flesh*, carnal sins, there are in the Front, *Adultery*, *Fornication*, *Uncleanness*, ἀσελγεία (that foul sin, which our Translation renders here, *lasciviousness*, but elsewhere *shameless uncleanness*, *Wisd.* 14. 26.) *Idolatry*, &c. all clearly of a making, if this notion of *Idolatry* be accepted. So *Apoc.* 21. 8. where among the eight severals, to which the *Fire and Brimstone*, old *Sodom*'s lot, is apportion'd, you will find these five, *unbelievers* (a general word for *Gentiles*) ἐβδελυγμένοι, (we render it *abominable*, 'tis most probably in that place, and in that conjunction, those that have been guilty of those βδελύγματα, abominations, or bestial sins, as *Apoc.* 17. 4. you have βδελύγματα καὶ ἀκαθάρτητα τῆς πορνείας, the *abominations*, *and uncleannesses of her fornication*, and so ver. 5.) *fornicators*, *and Idolaters*, *and all lyars*, (*i. e.* I conceive all that are guilty of those *false idolatrous* worships) and so again *cap.* 22. 15. *Fornicators*, *Idolaters*, *and every one that loveth and worketh a lie*, (all those that delight in, and practise those *false worships*, which are called a *lie*, Rom. 1. 25.) and φαρμακοὶ, *sorcerers* in the front, either because that sin was so ordinarily joined to those other Heathen impieties, (as may appear by one eminent place, *Deut.* 18. from the ninth to the thirteenth verse) or upon a ground, which I shall have occasion to mention anon, of *conjuring* their *Gods* by *magical ceremonies*, (γοητείαις and φαρμακείαις) to adjoin themselves to the *consecrated images*. And all this under the title of the *dogs that are without*, i. e. the *Gentile World of Idolaters*. So in the Epistle of *Barnabas*, *Edit. Voss.* p. 252. in the bedroll of destroying sins, of which *Idolatry* is the first, these four make up the close, φαρμακία, μαγεία, πλεονεξία, ἀφοβία θεῦ, *witchcraft*, *magick*, *inordinate lust* (I conceive) and *fearlessness of God*.

ἀ-σελγὴς, ἀκόλαστος, ἀκάθαρτος, *Hesych.*

Sect. 30. Thus in some Latine *fragments* of *Polycarpus*'s *Epistle*, speaking of *Valens* a *Presbyter* of *Philippi*, and his having committed somewhat utterly unworthy of that calling (which is *not* there *named*, and perhaps by that may be rather ghessed at what it was) by his example he admonisheth others *to abstain* [*ab avaritiâ*] (that sure was in Greek, ἀπὸ πλεονεξίας) *from inordinate desires*, [*& sint casti*] *and be chast*. Adding, that *whosoever did not thus abstain* [ὁ μὴ ἀπεχόμενος πλεονεξίας] *ab idololatriâ coinquinabitur*, *& tanquam inter Gentes judicabitur*, *will be contaminated by Idolatry*, *and shall be judg'd as among the Gentiles*. And so I have little reason to doubt, but that when *Bede* on *Matth.* 5. 32. speaking of Divorce, saith *Non hic intelligitur tantum fornicatio in stupro quod in alienis viris aut fœminis committitur, sed omnis concupiscentia, vel avaritia, vel Idololatria* — he means by *avaritia*, unnatural *lust*, having no doubt translated that note, out of some *Greek* Commentator who had used πλεονεξία in this sence. And then this will be no place on which to build that strange new interpretation, that *fornication*, *Mat.* 5. may signify * *actum cujuscunq; peccati*, *every kind of sin*, when Christ forbids *divorce* save for *fornication*.

* *Seld. Uxor Hebr.* p. 556.

Sect. 31. I have now sufficiently importuned and tempted my Readers patience with these observations, which might be thought very extrinsecal to the matter in hand (especially as far as concerns the word πλεονεξία) but that they tend immediately (to which I designed them) to that third and main importance of the word [*Idol*] in the *Old Testament*; and more than so, to the explication of the word *Idolatry* (and by the way, of many difficult passages) in the *New*, so as to signifie those *Heathen baseneses*, that the *Gnosticks* had received, and were so diligent to infuse into the *Christians*, and is probably the thing from which the Apostle so dehorts his *little children*, i. e. *his new born babes in Christ*, or *Gentile* converts that they *abstain* or *keep themselves from Idols*, 1 John 5. 21. See 2 *Pet.* 2. which Chapter being read and weighed in the Original, will appear to be almost wholly spent on this matter. I will give the Reader a little light to it.

Sect. 32. There was it seems, a villanous *sect* of *false Teachers*, ready to creep in among those *Christians*, verse 1. bringing in αἱρέσεις ἀπωλείας *Doctrines* of *destruction*; you will ghess what that means, if you mark what some antient Copies set instead of that word which we render [*destruction*] when it returns again *v.* 2. For there the old Manuscripts that were sent to his Majesty from *Constantinople*, and an antient one in the Library of *Magdalen Colledge* in *Oxford*, have ἀσελγείαις *wantonnesses*, instead of ἀπωλείαις *destructions*. Our English reads *damnable heresies* in the first place, and *pernicious ways* in the second, but those are only general paraphrases which come not home particularly to the notation of the word; and therefore the margent of our Books, confessing that other reading renders it *ver.* 2. *lascivious ways*, in the sence that now we contend for. This is farther explained (which convinces the discourse to belong to this matter) by the *sins of the old World*, verse 5. and of *Sodom* peculiarly *verse* 6. and Saint *Jude* verse 7. repeating the same thing, that Epistle indeed being directly parallel to that second of St. *Peter*, and looking all to this purpose) saith of the *Sodomites* that they did ὅμοιον τούτοις

τούτοις τρόπον ἐκπορνεύσαντες, *fornicate* juſt *as* theſe men do, *i. e.* go after other fleſh, which is a deſcription of theſe beſtial *ſins* of the *Gnoſticks*. Then by the ἀθέσμων ἐν ἀσελγείᾳ ἀναστροφὴ, *ver.* 7 the *converſation of thoſe that obſerved no Laws in their laſciviouſneſs*, ſuch as did ſo grieve *righteous Lot* in *Sodom*, by ἐπιθυμία μιασμοῦ *luſt of pollution* or *abominable* deſire *ver.* 10. by γεγεννημένα εἰς ἅλωσιν καὶ φθοράν, *ver.* 12. we render it [*born to be taken and deſtroyed*] but it ſignifies rather in the active ſence, that *are made ad prædandum, to prey*, (or catch and tear, ſo *Job* 24. 5. לטרף by the Greek rendred εἰς ἅλωσιν to catch, in the *Chaldee* paraphraſe *riſing up early to their prey*) *and to* [a] *corrupt*, i. e. good for nothing but to aſſault and debauch (as ravenous Beaſts do uſe to prey upon) all they meet with promiſcuouſly; and 'tis obſervable, that the word טרפה θηριάλωτα which properly ſignifies thoſe things which *are taken and torn with wild Beaſts*, (becauſe ſuch were not to be eaten [b] *Leviticus* 17. 15.) is by uſe enlarged to all *forbidden meats* among the *Rabbins* (if *the lungs of any thing have a hole in them*, they call it טרפה &c. ſaith [c] *Elias Levita*) and ſo by analogy is here made uſe of to denote thoſe *unclean* perſons debauched by the *Gnoſticks*, which are ſo to be accounted of among Chriſtians, as the *cibus vetitus* among the *Jews*, and therefore it follows, that thoſe that take pleaſure in that τρυφὴν, ſuch *riotous actions* as theſe, *ver.* 13. are call'd σπίλοι and μῶμοι from the Hebrew מום *macula*, *ſpots and blemiſhes*, (ſuch as among the *Jews* made the *ſacrifice unclean*) defilers and polluters of thoſe with whom they do συνευωχεῖσθαι *feaſt* or *revel*, in the end of that verſe. So 'tis again expreſt *ver.* 14. by *having eyes full of the adultereſs, and that ceaſe not from ſin, intangling unſtable* or unconfirmed *Souls*, i. e. new converted Chriſtians, having a heart γεγυμνασμένην πλεονεξίαις (in the ſence which before we gave of the word, and which belongs to it alſo *ver.* 3.) *exerciſed with thoſe inordinate luſts*, i. e. wholly imployed on them; which denominates them τέκνα κατάρας *children of a curſe*, i. e. *worthy* to have a curſe fall on them (as the *Son of perdition, worthy* to be *deſtroyed.*) And *verſe* 15. by the *way of Balaam* (who we know brought the Iſraelites to that ſin of uncleanneſs with the *Moabitiſh* women, and to the *curſe* by that means) by ὑπόδειγμα καταδίκης *verſe* 18. that *high pitch of vanity*, or falſe Idolatrous worſhip, as a ſnare to bring men to the ἐπιθυμίαις σαρκὸς, ἀσελγείαις, &c. *luſts of the fleſh, laſciviouſneſs*, &c. (with reference to the vitious Heathen [d] *converſation*) by a villanous *licentiouſneſs*, *verſe* 19. (ſtollen in under pretence of Chriſtian *liberty*, but being indeed the *baſeſt* [e] *ſubmiſſion*) and by μιάσματα τοῦ κόσμου, the *pollutions of the Heathen World*, i. e. of the *Nations, or Gentiles*, *verſe* 20. (which the knowledge of Chriſt was deſigned to turn out, but complying and mixing with it, was the vileſt, and moſt damning condition that could befal any, *verſe* 21, 22.) and at laſt by a κύλισμα βορβόρου the moſt *ſwiniſh wallowing in the mire* of all *uncleanneſs*. And if you would know who theſe *unclean hereticks* were, (which Chriſtianiz'd all the villanies of the old Idol-worſhips) referred to in this and other places of the *Epiſtles*, I ſhall not poſitively define, but leave it indifferently between the *Gnoſticks*, and the *Nicolaitans*, the *Gnoſticks* covertly [f] named 1 *Tim.* 6. 21. (it ſeems they were then a *creeping* in at *Epheſus*) and profeſtly diſclaimed at, *Tit.* 1. under the title of the *Cretian evil beaſts*, and *ſlow bellies*, verſe 12. and μεμιασμένοι *polluted* perſons *verſe* 15. and βδελυκτοὶ *abominable*, and ſuch as by their *works deny the faith*, verſe 16. and by the beginning of that 1 *Tim.* 6. as thoſe that taught doctrines againſt *Dominion*, and ſo are here alſo expreſt both 2 *Pet.* 2. 10. and *Jude* verſe 8.

For, that theſe (being called to ἁγιασμὸς *purification*, and not *to uncleanneſs*, i e. being by their converſion to Chriſtianity obliged to forſake thoſe *carnal luſts*) did *abuſe the Grace of God* (*i. e.* the light and mercies of the Goſpel) *to wantonneſs*, εἰς ἀσέλγειαν, *Jude*, verſe 4. (which that it belongs to this matter in hand will appear by the parallel aſſigned them *verſe* 7. and ſo almoſt all the following verſes of that Epiſtle) *i. e.* uſed it as an *occaſion* to commit, or *protection* to continue in ſuch ſins, that they were guilty of ſtrange prodigies of filthineſs, and retained in their *Sacraments* ſome *Symbola* of them, I had rather ſhould be learnt from *Epiphanius*, than from this paper. Of them this is ſufficiently known, that perſwading themſelves, that they were the *Children of God*, they thought they might wallow in all filthineſs, and be no *more polluted by it than the Sun-beams by the Dunghill* on which they fall; And againſt that Doctrine of theirs it is that ſome interpret that of Saint *John* [*that he which is born of God, cannot ſin becauſe he is born of God*] i. e. cannot ſin upon that head or ſcore, to ſignifie that their *being born of God* can be no patent or ſecurity for their ſinning.

As for the *Nicolaitans* which had their name from *Nicolas* the *Deacon* in the *Acts*, and their *ſenſual* practices from his example (as might appear by the vile paſſages that Saint *Jerome* and others relate of him) I ſhall not need to ſay more than what we find mentioned of them, *Apoc.* 2. as firſt, that *their works were odious to God*, ver. 6. then ſecondly, that it was *a ſect of Doctrine among Chriſtians* (as odious as it was) *ver.* 15. and 'twill not be unſeaſonable to pray, that God will keep all *Sectaries* from the like. Thirdly, that it was the ſame Doctrine that *Balaam* taught *Balaak to bring the Iſraelites to a curſe*, when nothing elſe could do it, *ver.* 14. and that Fourthly, not only ſpecified in the ſtory to be *whoredom with the daughters of Moab*, Num. 25. but in this place particularly mentioned φαγεῖν εἰδωλόθυτα, καὶ πορνεῦσαι, *eating things offered to Idols, and fornication*; it ſeems the former of thoſe, the *Idol-feaſts*, was wont to be previous and preparatory to the latter, (and Saint *Hieromes* relation of *Nicolas* witneſſeth the truth of the parallel) and therefore of the ſeven *precepts* of the *Sons of Noah*, mentioned in the *Apoſtles* Councel in the *Acts*, (required of all *Proſelytes*, that came in to *Judaiſm*, and ſo by way of *compliance* at that time, preſcribed to all the *Gentiles* that became *Chriſtians*) the two firſt were thoſe of *abſtinence from meats offered to Idols*, and *from Fornication*, *Acts* 15. 29. and the former of them, *ver.* 20. called ἀλισγήματα τῶν εἰδώλων, the *pollutions or abominable villanies in thoſe Idol-worſhips*, as in *Heſychius* ἀλισγήματα is expreſt by μεταλήψεις τῶν μιαρῶν θυσιῶν, *participation of their abominable* (or as he renders, μιαρῶν, ἀκαθάρτων) *unclean ſacrifices*, and the ſecond πορνεία *fornication*, being all one with the עֶרְוַת נִגְלוֹ עֲרָיוֹת *de detectione nuditatum*, all uncleanneſs in general, contains *adultery, inceſt*, and all *unlawful luſts*. And that will give an account why thoſe εἰδωλόθυτα ſhould be ſo forbidden in the *Acts* (it ſeems from that danger of unclean ſins ſo commonly annext to the *Idol-feaſts*, as will appear, *Pſalm* 106. 28. and *Num.* 25. 1, 3.) and yet be counted of, as perfectly *indifferent things* by Saint *Paul*, 1 Cor. 8. *viz.* being ſeparated from all danger of that unclean appendage. Fifthly, of theſe *Nicolaitans* works it is there added, that unleſs they be *ſtraight reformed*, *God will come quickly upon that Church of Pergamus*, verſe 16. and that *coming* ſignifies a *fatal* blow, which was not only ob-

[a] So διαφθορὰ in *Ignatius* his Epiſtle to the *Epheſians* is by the tranſlator rendred *maſculorum concubitores* (though the old literal rehearſer hath *domus corruptores*) & *Heſychius* in a more general gloſs διαφθορὰ, μοιχεία and ſo *Phavorinus* alſo; all clearly referring φθορὰ *corruption*, to this carnal ſin or villany, which in the Epiſtle of *Barnabas* [*Edit. Voſſ.* p. 230.] (who will beſt notify the ſence of the word in the New Teſtament) is expreſſed by παιδοφθορεῖσθαι according to the vulgar uſe of that word in other Authors.

[b] *Vid. excerpta Gemaræ tr. Sanhedr. c.* 1. *Sect.* 7.

[c] *in Thisbi.* p. 139.

[d] Τὰς ἐν πλάνῃ ἀναστρεφομένας *Vid. Rom.* 6. 10.

[e] Ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως. *Sect.* 33.

Irenæus.

Sect. 34.

 ſervable

ſervable to have faln upon the *ſeven Nations*, on *Sodom*, on moſt of the great *Monarchies* of the World, for the revenge of this provoking ſin, (*Idolatry* thus heightned with this addition of *villany*) but even more than one of thoſe ſeven *Chriſtian Churches* may be thought to have been involved in that *guilt*, and *ruine*; even this of *Pergamus*, and the next of *Thyatira* verſe 20. which ſin being deſcribed by *Jezebel* making her ſelf a Propheteſs, and *teaching and ſeducing Chriſtians*, πορνεῦσαι καὶ εἰδωλόθυτα φαγεῖν, *to commit uncleanneſs, and to eat things offered to Idols*, (in the ſence before-mentioned) and by βάθη Σατανᾶ, *depths of Satan*, verſe 24. ſhe is ſaid to have *time* given her for the reformation of this villany *verſe* 21. and not making uſe of it, to have *been delivered up to deſtruction*, verſe 22. And more might be added from the ſtories of the Church and practices of after times to this purpoſe, particularly that of the *Illiberitane* Council *Can.* 2. *Flamines qui poſt fidem lavacri & regenerationis ſacrificaverunt, eo quod geminaverint ſcelera accedente homicidio, vel triplicaverint facinus cohærente mœchia, placuit* —— where it ſeems thoſe heathen Sacrificers or Chriſtians that after baptiſm undertook the office of *Flamen*, lay under a treble guilt, beſide that of ſacrificing, were guilty of the *bloud-ſhed* (in the *Gladiators* prizes, which were alſo joined ordinarily with the heathen Sacrifices) and of thoſe uncleanneſſes alſo which were joined with them. But no more of this.

Sect. 35. And this I have ſaid, and might add much more, to clear this truth, that there were ſuch *Idols* for *new converts* to take heed of, in thoſe days, ſuch *carnal Goſpellers*, that retained that part of the Heathen *Idolatries*, which fleſh and bloud was moſt apt to be taken with, when the worſhipping of *Images* was caſt out. And if that villainous piece of *Heatheniſm*, which (by Gods deſertion, and that thick long darkneſs, wherein they lived) lay, before the coming of Chriſt, as an hideous ſin at once and judgment on thoſe barbarous times, cannot yet (by 1600 years of full light, and by all Chriſt's precepts for all kind of *purity* of the very *heart*) be exorcized or mortified among us, and if ſtill our Ears are open to every ſect of hypocritical profeſſors, though never ſo wild and ignorant, that brings any liberty, or proffer of carnality along with it, then ſure is the title of *Chriſtian* but ill beſtowed on us, we are ſtill the groſſeſt *Idolaters* in the World; and ſo are in all reaſon to expect the moſt exemplary puniſhments, which fell on them, be it the portion of *Sodom*, a judgment rained down immediately, a kind of *fire* and *brimſtone* from Heaven, (ſuch are our ſtrange, *groundleſs*, *irrational* deſtructions wrought upon one another at this time, which no man living can tell from whence they came; which is a ſure argument that there is ſomewhat of the θεῖον in it, either as that ſignifies the *divine* hand of *God*, viſible in the judgment, or as θεῖον ſignifies alſo that * *brimſtone-fire* that comes with *thunder*) or be it the judgment that fell upon the † Nations for thoſe *villanies*, a πανωλεθρία, or *final deſtruction* of a prophane polluted people.

* Θεὸς ἔλιπτο, τὸ κεραυνίω πυρὶ. ὁμοίως δὲ ἔχει ὁ κεραυνὸς τὸ θεῖον. *Heſych.* † So in the *Sibyl. Orac.* l. 3. where that mention is premiſed of the unnatural ſins of the *Romans*, p. 231. it follows in the next words, ᾗ ἔσται ἅμασι κοίτοις Θλῖψις ἐν ἀνθρώποις μεγάλη, ᾗ πάντα ταράξει, Πάντα δὲ συγχύσει ——

Sect. 36. Having gone thus far in our inqueſt on occaſion of the *origination* and *uſe* of the word *Idolatry*, eſpecially in the *Old* and *New Teſtament*, and found ſomewhat meant by it in the *New*, which is not ſo vulgarly taken notice of, I ſhall deſire to prevent a miſtake, and do therefore profeſs not to have deſigned theſe obſervations to that end, that the ſin of *Idolatry* ſo declaimed at in the Scripture, ſhould be thought to ſignifie nothing elſe, but thoſe acts of *villany* in the *Heathen myſteries*, or becauſe the *worſhipping of Images* is not ſo frequently ſpoken of in the *New Teſtament*, and therefore it ſhould be no ſin now under the Goſpel. That it is a groſs and provoking ſin in them that are guilty of it, there is no queſtion, and the affirmation of Text is clear, that there is no *communication, or reconcileableneſs betwixt the Temple of God and Idols*, 2 Cor. 6. 16. and that the guilt of that ſin among the Nations, worſhipping thoſe ſenſleſs Deities, was ſo great, that it provoked God by way of juſt puniſhment *to deliver them up to thoſe infamous vile affections*, Rom. 1.

Sect. 37. I ſhall now therefore proceed from the more *critical* to the *real material* part of the Diſcourſe, and enquire into the nature of that ſin, meerly as 'tis a *worſhip of Idols, or Images*. In which matter you may firſt obſerve ſome conſiderable difference between the two ſorts of *reſemblances*, which have been uſual among men. Some *exſtantes*, *corporeal* figures, *ſtanding out*, γλυπτὰ, ſtatues, *graven images*; others only *repreſentations*, or *pictures*, *painted* on Windows, Tables, Chalices, *&c.* The former of theſe were moſt uſed by (becauſe fitteſt for the turns of) the *Heathens*, being by them (through the commodiouſneſs and advantage of their *bodily* ſhapes) conceived to be more capable of *animation* by thoſe Gods of which they were the reſemblances. Thus is it the known divinity of * *Triſmegiſtus* (or ſome body in his diſguiſe) that *Statues* or *Simulachra were the bodies of their Gods*, who by ſome magical ceremonies of conſecration (whence it ſeems to be that *Gal.* 5. *Apoc.* 11. 8. and 22. 15. φαρμακοὶ *ſorceries* are joined with *idolatries*) were forced to † join themſelves to them, to *animate* them, to aſſume, and inhabit thoſe earthen bodies as it were. To which phancy perhaps the *Apoſtle* may relate, when he tells the *Chriſtians* that their *bodies are the Temples of the Holy Ghoſt*, that God is powerfully in them, though not in thoſe dumb Images. || *Proclus* relates it as their opinion generally, that *the Gods were by their favour and help preſent in their images*, and thereon is grounded the old relation of the *Tyrians*, who on a fear that *Apollo* would forſake them, *bound* his Image faſt with *golden Chains*, and that other of the *Athenians* who *clipt the wings of the image of Victory* that ſhe might not fly away from them. And ſo the *Sicilians in* * *Cicero* complaining that they had no Gods in their *Iſle*, give this reaſon for it, that *Verres* had taken away all their *Statues*. And ſo the *Idol* thus raiſed above its natural pitch by bringing down ſome *æthereal ſpirit* into it, (*viz.* the *God* whoſe *Image* it was) became a *God* in their opinion, and that was thought able to hear, ſee, ſpeak, help, do any thing that belonged to a Deity. Thus doth *Nero* in *Suetonius* pretend to know things to come by the inſtruction of ſuch an *icuncula* or *little image*. So *Triſmegiſtus* tells us of ſpeaking Images, and *Hiſtorians* the like of *Memnon*'s *Statues*, and ſo *Laban*'s *Teraphim*, being ſuppoſed to have had a ſpirit included in them, went for *Laban's Gods*. And 'tis not improbable by the Text that the *Iſraelites* Calf was by them thus counted of, as an *Image*, which upon *Aarons* conſecration was thus animated by God, and ſo fit *to go before them*, to be their Conductor in *Moſes* abſence, whom they knew to be moved and directed by God.

* Aug. de civ. dei, l. 8. c. 23. † Neque æra neque auri argentiq; materias quibus ſigna conficiunt, eſſe Deos decernimus, ſed eos ipſos in his colimus, quos dedicatio infert ſacra, & fabrilibus efficit inhabitare ſimulachris. *Arnob. cont. Gent.* l. 6. Iſti impuri ſpiritus ſub ſtatuis & imaginibus conſecratis deliteſcunt. *Minut.* rapiunt ad ſe dæmonia & omnem ſpiritum immundum per conſecrationis obligamentum. || De ſacrif. & Mag. * Divinat. in Q. Cæcil.

'Tis

'Tis clear this *Calf*, these *Gods* as they call them, were by them desired to supply *Moses place*, and though the conjecture be not improbable, that the figure of it was the same with the figure of a *Cherub* (which God after appointed to be in the *Tabernacle*, *Exod.* 25. 18. and of which 'tis possible *Aaron* might then have some intimation) as may appear by comparing *Ezec.* 1. 10. with *c.* 10. 14. where that which is the *face of an Oxe*, or Calf in one place, is the *face of a Cherub* in the other, and the ground of this resemblance in reference to *Joseph*'s providing for the *Ægyptians*, and also for his father and brethren in the famine (whereupon his *scutcheon* is said to be an *Oxe*, agreeable to that prophecy of him, *Deut.* 33. 17. his *glory is like the firstling of a bullock*, as *Minutius* for his care of feeding the Souldiers in a dearth was honoured by the *Romans* with a golden Oxe, *Liv. l.* 4. and as *Suidas* relates of *King Apis* that he fed the *Alexandrians* in a famine, and therefore was honoured * after death with a *Temple* and an *Ox* in it) yet was this *image worship'd* by them (as appears by their *sacrifical* feast and celebration) and so used just as the *Ægyptian Idols*, which were accounted as so many Gods. And therefore the question which is ordinarily made, [whether the Israelites *worship'd this Calf*, or only *God in this Calf*] may well enough be superseded, and the resolution be sufficiently clear, that they worship'd not *God* only, but the *Idol-calf* also, (and so I am sure their successors have conceived, which talk so much of *a grain of the Calf* in every judgment they have suffered ever since) and so doted upon the specious *Idol*, and were transported with their sensual way of worshipping it, that God was quickly almost lost, and forgotten amongst them, *their heart going back into Ægypt*, where such like Images had been in fashion, and werewont to be worshipped. *Sect.* 38.

* τελειότητικόν τι αὐτῷ νεῖον ἀνέστησαν ἐν ᾧ βοῦς εἰδώλιον σύμβολον φέρων τῆς γεωργῆς.

What is now said of this will belong also to the erection of *Jeroboams Calves*; of which though it may not be improbable, that they also were the imitation of the *Images of the Cherubim*, in the *Temple*, and so the sin of setting them up in *Dan* and *Bethel*, an act of *Schism*, designed on purpose by *Jeroboam* to keep open the great division in the State, 1 *Kings* 12. 26. yet was it not the guilt of *Schism* alone, to which it was lyable, (as † *Moncæus* hath laboured to perswade) but having an addition of *sacrificing to those Calves* also, *ver.* 32. and the Proclamation of [*Behold thy God, O Israel, which brought thee out of the Land of Ægypt*] *ver.* 28. (which intimates them to be set out by him to the people for so many *animated inspirited images*) and the words of *Tobit* being plain τῷ βάαλ τῇ Σαμάλει (as the more correct Editions read it, (not τῷ βάαλ τῇ Σαμάλει) and as St. *Jeromes* paraphrase [*ad vitulos aureos quos Jeroboam*] confirms the antiquity of that reading) *they sacrificed to the Calf* or *Heifer Baal*, i. e. to *Baal*, who had taken upon him that shape and name, or to that *Calf* now inspirited with the inhabitation, and so called by the name of a God or Baal; there is no question, but the guilt of *Idolatry* belonged to it, and that the divine censure, and character of *Jeroboams* sin (that stuck so close to his posterity) importeth also. *Sect.* 39.

† *Aaron purgatus.*

The other *pictures* which are called *dimissa*, *depressa*, a *plain painting* on a table, *&c.* without any *protuberancy*, or *bunching* out, were not by the *Gentiles* thought so capable of receiving that *animation*. The distinction is *Maimons*; The first he calleth הצורה בולטת the *protuberant Image*, the other משוקעת the *depresse*, either drawn on a table in *colours*, saith he, or weaved in *hangings*. The former of these and not the latter, was it which was so strictly forbidden the *Jews* (and accounted as a *neutheion* of *polytheism*, a token of the *worshipping* of many *Gods* (a *discriminative* note between the worshippers of the *one* true, and the *many false* Deities) because of that *Heathen* opinion, that such statues, or *protuberant* pictures were by *magick made capable* of these *æthereal spirits*; an abuse, of which the *depress pictures* were not so capable. And hence it is (not without reason) that learned men that conceive the second Commandment to prohibit none but the former (peculiarly the *graven image*) and to that purpose read that which follows, by way of *explication*, not of *disjunction* [*graven image, the likeness*] *&c.* (as it is *Deut.* 5. 8. in the *Hebrew*, not [*or the likeness*] do extend it even to the *making*, or *having* any such, and not only to the *worshipping* of them. *Sect.* 40.

Thus, saith ‖ *Maimon*, it is forbidden to make *images*, though it be only לנוי *for ornament*; but then that, saith he, is to be understood of the *images*, that *bunch out*, or are *embossed*; but for the *painted* or *woven* אלו מיתרות they are not unlawful: and he specifies very nicely that a *Ring* that hath for a *seal* the figure of a Man, if it be *gibbous*, or swelling out, is not it self lawful to be *worn*, but yet 'tis *lawful to seal* with it, because the *impression*, in that case, is *hollow*, not swelling out; and on the other side if the seal be *depress*, or *hollow*, 'tis lawful to *wear*, but not to seal with it, *c.* 3. *Sect.* 13. 'Tis true this he restrains again, that none (in this matter only for *ornament*) is forbidden, but the figure of a *man*, but others in obedience to the words of the second Command, extend it to the prohibition of all living *creatures* also, (only the inanimate, such was the *Golden Vine* in the *Temple*, were excepted.) And truly it seemeth very probable, that to the *Jews* it was (whether by the force of the second *Commandment*, or by some *precept* elsewhere, or by the *Traditions of the Elders* I say not) conceived utterly unlawful to have any such *images*, especially in their *temples*, or *places* of worship (unless in case of Gods *particular* command, as the *Cherubim*, and the *brazen Serpent*) yea and to bow in their *presence in any place*; For this will *Maimons* stating the several cases convince to have been his opinion, and, as he conceived, the constant doctrine of the *Jews*. I am sure they are appointed to be *broken down*, Exod. 34. 13. and examples there are of the peoples practice that way, both in the story of *Herod*'s *trophaes*, and the *Eagle* set up by him over the gate of the Temple, and in many other particulars. And the *Greek Church* at this day, though it hath *pictures* good store, yet I think it hath none of these *embossed Statues* allowed in it, (which yet the *Lutherans* use promiscuously, yea and cloth and adorn them too, and conceive not themselves to sin against any Commandment of the Law, because they do not *worship* them. *Sect.* 41. ‖ *Cap.* 3. 12.

The *reason* of this prohibition to the *Jews*, is by *Maimonides* again cleared to be, not for any *natural* primitive sinfulness in an *image* of a man, *&c.* but only for *caution*, and therefore *within the veil* whither the eyes of the people were not permitted to enter, God himself appoints the *Cherubims* to be set up, and *Solomon* graved *Cherubims* upon the walls of the *greater house*, 2 Chron. 3. 7. (*i. e.* in the *body* of the *Temple* I conceive, because none but the *Priests* did come in thither, *Luke* 1. 8, 9.) to *hedge* and keep them from all *danger* of falling into the *Heathen worships*, and upon the obligation of the words of that *Text*, Exod. 34. 12. *beware*, &c. *lest it be a snare unto thee.* *Sect.* 42.

Sect. 43. And therefore 'tis farther reſolved, that all thoſe Images were unlawful to them, (and perhaps none but thoſe,) which *Idolaters uſed* in their *worſhip*; and ſo the ſpecifying of the three ſorts in the *Commandment* may argue, [*the things in Heaven, in Earth, in the Waters*] from each of which the ſeveral follies of men had fetcht their Deities. To inſtance only in the *laſt* and loweſt of them, that the *Crocodiles* in the the River were ſo accounted of among the *Egyptians* is clear (among many other) by one notable relation in *Max. Tyr.* διαλ. λθ.: There was a woman, ſaith he, in *Ægypt* that nurſt up a young *Crocodile*, and was counted a mighty happy perſon ὡς τιθηνησαμένη θεὸν, *as one that had brought her God to hand*, and kept it tame by her; this woman, ſaith he, had a Son ἡλικιώτην θεοῦ, *of the age of the God*, and when they grew up to ſome bigneſs, the *Crocodile* killed and devoured the child, ἥδε δύσηνος ἐμακάριζε τὸν υἱὸν τῷ θανάτῳ, ὡς γενόμενον δῶρον ἐφετὸν θεῷ, *ſhe in her mourning for her Son pronounced him bleſt, in his death, that he was thus offered a preſent to her domeſtick God.* And they which could worſhip ſuch *wild* vulture *Gods* could not much be blamed, if they *defiled* every *Onion* in the *Garden*, much more every ſtar in the Sky, which ſure deſerved their acknowledgment much better than the *vulture* of the *ſea* the *Crocodile had done.*

Sect. 44. Agreeable to this interdict of *Caution* among the *Jews* (extended only to thoſe Images which were ſo abuſed by the *Heathens*) is the deſign of thoſe *Homilies* in our Book, concerning the *peril of Idolatry*,

* P. 20. l. 1. † P. 27. near the end. which though they acknowledge that * *images be of themſelves things indifferent*, and that † *men are not ſo ready to worſhip a picture on a wall, or in a window, as an emboſſed and guilt image ſet with pearl and ſtone*, and profeſs (in the beginning of the third part of the Homily) that *all which is ſaid, is thus meant*, [*in that we be ſtirred and provoked by images to worſhip them, and not as though they were ſimply forbidden by the New Teſtament, without ſuch occaſion and danger*] *and count it a piece of Superſtition and ſcrupuloſity to abhor all pictures, or images of Princes*, &c. *which*, ſaith that Homily, *Chriſt ſaw on the Roman Coins and reprehended them not, nor condemned the art of painting and image making as wicked of themſelves*, *p.* 44. yet, in reſpect of the *frequency* of that ſin in thoſe times, of the ſo imminent *danger* that *images* in Churches would be *worſhipped*, and all poſſible means would not be probable to ſecure the *uſe* of them againſt that *danger*, they do with great earneſtneſs exhort the not ſetting them up, eſpecially in *Countrey Churches*, where the number of the ignorant may much enhaunſe that danger; and it may be obſerved that in the *Articles* of our Church we make acknowledgment of that whole Book of *Homilies*, that they were *uſeful* and *profitable for thoſe times*, wherein (being ſo lately gotten out of Popery where *image worſhip* was ſo ordinary) the danger was ſo great of falling back, upon every temptation, to that ſin. And though the *Homilies* be wary and careful to prevent another contrary danger, *leſt any private perſons under colour of deſtroying images ſhould make any ſtir or diſturbance in*

‖ P. 18. l. 2. *the Common-wealth*, and therefore addeth ‖ *that it muſt always be remembred that the redreſs of ſuch publick enormities pertaineth to the Magiſtrate, and ſuch as be in authority only, and not to private perſons*, yet to thoſe whoſe duty it is to take care for the people that they be *Godly as well as quietly governed*, the exhortation is very inſtantly preſſed, that (after the pattern of *Hezekiah*, &c.) they perform this part of their duty, *viz.* that as *Hezekiah* did in the caſe of the *brazen Serpent*, ſo the *Magiſtrate* whenſoever he ſees Images to be abuſed, or the people apt to worſhip them, think himſelf obliged in conſcience to appoint them to be removed in care of the honour of God, and the peoples good. And this is certainly very good, and wholeſom *doctrine*, and nothing more reaſonable, than that he which is Defender of the *Faith*, ſhould take care to defend the impotent ſeducible weakling (I mean not the rayler at *images*, who ſure is of all others the ſafeſt from that danger of *worſhipping them*, and conſequently diſclaims any want of that fatherly *caution*) from ſuch *imminent peril* (when any ſuch there is) of this *image-worſhip*. And that this is the Supreme *Magiſtrates charge*, and belongs not to any inferiour, farther than to execute what he commands, might be evidenced from the Doctrine and *cenſures* of the Church, in the caſe of the *iconoclaſtæ*, if it were now pertinent. To this I ſhall only add (that which I conceive other mens experience of themſelves, will incline them to believe) that the *worſhip of Images* or of any thing but *God*, is not a thing to which *Engliſh Proteſtants* for theſe late years (eſpecially the *Catechiz'd* and knowing) have generally had any ſtrong *temptations*, at leaſt not ſuch in any compariſon, as immediately after the *reformation*, the minds of men (before uſed to ſuch *ignorant vanities*) were ſubject to. And I doubt not but many men that have frequented *Churches* and places where *pictures* have been, can ſincerely upon examination of their memories, ſay with me, that they are not conſcious to themſelves, that they ever found themſelves under any *inclination* or danger of falling into any act of *image-worſhip*. Which conſideration, if it be true, (as I cannot but perſwade my ſelf it is) will take off much from the neceſſity of continuing thoſe ſtrict cautions (of not permitting any kind of *Image* in any *Church*, and the like) which ſome other *times* or *inclinations* of men might make more neceſſary, and conſequently take off much from the *odium* which the way of *adorning ſome Churches* with *imagery* hath lately lain under.

Sect. 25. What was ſaid of having emboſſed *Images* among the *Jews* may be enlarged alſo to bodily *geſtures*, whether *religious* to God, or *civil* to our ſuperiours, in any place where Images are; for both theſe ſeem to have been interdicted the *Jews*, at leaſt by them to have been accounted unlawful (as will at large appear by *Maimonides* in the Book forecited) though the heart were never ſo far from *worſhipping the Images*. But then though the *Jews* were under that ſtrict reſtraint, yet *aliens*, *proſelytes*, of other Nations, were not bound to that ſtrictneſs; but *Naaman* is permitted by the Prophet to *go with his* Heathen *Maſter into the houſe of Rimmon*, and (when the Maſter *worſhips there, and leans upon his hand*) *to bow himſelf in the houſe of Rimmon*, 2 Kings 5. 18. upon this ground, firſt, that he never went into the *Idol-temple*, but to wait upon his Maſter in the office which he had. Secondly, that he profeſt himſelf to all, (even to that Heathen Maſter and thoſe that were in his Court) to be a worſhipper of none, but of the true God, and to that end carried two Mule-loads of earth out of *Paleſtine* with him, *ver.* 17. in honour of him whoſe *name was great there*, and to build an *Altar*, according to the preſcript *Exod.* 20. 24. by which it was ſufficiently clear to the beholders, (as by an interpretative proteſtation) that, when his *Maſter worſhipt*, he only *bowed*, and then his *bowing* was only *civil* to his *Maſter the King*, not *religious* to *Rimmon* or *Saturn*, or his Image there; And therefore to his queſtion whether God will be offended with him in *that matter*, the *Prophet* anſwers him with a [*go in peace*,]

peace,] I cannot think ſo irreverently of the *Prophet*, as that he ſhould make that anſwer *ironically* to his new *convert* (any more than I can believe *Naamans* ſcruple belonged only to the former part of his life (reading it in the preter ſence) for ſure that had been guilty of the *worſhipping the Idol*, and not only *bowing in the houſe of Rimmon*) but that he meant in earneſt, what alone the words import, that in thus doing, and no more, he need not fear that he ſhould be a breaker of that Law, which in this particular was not given to him, or any, but thoſe of that Nation, or people of the *Jews*; For, it is an ordinary obſervation, that *Gentiles*, or Aliens were received in among the *Jews* under a double capacity, either as *Proſelytes of Juſtice*, to ſubmit to the whole *Judaical* Law, to every *rite*, and *poſitive precept* of it; or elſe only as *Proſelytes of the Gates* (and ſuch was *Naaman*) to ſubmit to the ſeven *precepts of the Sons of Adam and Noah* (and no more) among which the עבירה זרה *of the ſtrange worſhip, or Idolatry* was one, and ſo a neceſſity impoſed on them of caſting off the *Idol-worſhip*, but not of not *bowing to the King in the preſence of an Idol*, unleſs the caſe were of ſuch a geſture that in that *Nation* were performed to none but the *deity* in *worſhip* (the reaſon that the *Grecians* refuſed once to bow to the *Perſian* King, becauſe that reverence was there performed to none but God: and ſo that ſpeech of *Mordecai*, Eſth. 13. 14. making the cauſe of his not bowing to *Haman* to be becauſe he was not to bow to any but God, is thought by learned men to have been delivered by way of complyance and reference to the *Gentile* cuſtoms which allowed not thoſe bowings which were performed to their Gods, to be communicated to any elſe; for among the *Jews* the moſt ſubmiſs geſture was performed to Kings and inferiour perſons, as well as unto God) which was not the manner then in *Syria*, but veneration and even proſtration paid to the King as well as to *God*. Thus much I have ſaid on occaſion of the firſt ſort of *Images*, the *emboſſed* and *protuberant* among the *Jews*, and ſhall not need to deſcend to a more particular ſurvey of the ſecond ſort, it being already manifeſt that the reaſon that prevailed to prohibit the very *having* the former among the *Jews*, did not even in their opinion extend unto the latter. And for *worſhipping*, though the latter were not among them ſo likely to occaſion that ſin, yet if any *Jew* ſhould have been ſo mad to worſhip any ſuch image, the *ſin*, it is acknowledged, would have been as great, as that which was committed with the *groſſer corporeous* object, and ſo will it hold infallibly among all others.

Thus far I have gone on the antient old Teſtament notion of an *Idol*, and the *Idolatry* forbidden there. It may now be fit to proceed one ſtep farther, and to enquire whether there may not poſſibly be in the *Chriſtian Church* ſuch a ſin as *Idolatry*, *i. e.* whether he that acknowledges the *Chriſtians* God, and worſhips no Heathen *Deity*, much leſs *Image* of ſuch, may not yet poſſibly fall into that ſin of *Idolatry*, as that ſignifies *worſhipping* ſomewhat elſe beſide the *inviſible God*, be it an *image of God*, or elſe a *Saint*, or *Angel*, or ſomewhat elſe clothed in ſome reſpect or relation to *God*. *Sect.* 46.

And here will be no neceſſity or uſe of drawing a formal charge (in this matter) againſt any particular man or Church, or poſſibility of defining (from *Books* eſpecially) which (or whether any whole) Church or ſort of Chriſtians at this day are guilty of this ſin, becauſe it is to be expected that the *writings* of *prudent* men will be ſo cautious, as not to accuſe themſelves in this matter; as even now I gave you an example from *Maximus Tyrius* a *Platonick* Heathen, in the deſcription of it among the *Gentiles*. Yet becauſe * ſome number of ſober men which have lived in the *Roman* Communion have given me occaſion, I ſhall interpoſe my wiſh, that the care which by their Writers is taken for excuſe of the *doctrine* of the Learned, were uſed for the directing and examining of the *practices* of the ignorant alſo. *Sect.* 47.

* Divos, diváſq; non aliter venerantur quàm Deum ipſum, &c. *Lud. Viv.* in *Aug. de civ.* l. 8. c. ult. vid. *Caſſandr.* conſult. de imag. *Polyd. Virgil.* de rerum invent. l. 6. c. 13.

I ſhall therefore ſet down in *theſi* what may, according to the grounds laid in the former part of this Diſcourſe, conclude a *Chriſtian* guilty of *Idolatry*, and leave every man's own conſcience (and among all others the *Romaniſts*) to examine, and as occaſion ſhall be, to accuſe himſelf, and ever *Chriſtian* to *adviſe* and *exhort* (but withal to abſtain as much as is poſſible from *judging*) other men. *Sect.* 48.

And firſt, I conceive that he that (by Doctrine, and action) attributes to any *creature*, particularly to an *Angel*, thoſe things which belong peculiarly to *God*, though he acknowledge *the true God*, is yet guilty of that ſin, as truly as thoſe Heathens that worſhip'd the creature παρὰ τὸ κτίσαντα, *beſide the Creator*, Rom. 1. *i. e. worſhipt God*, but not *God* only. Thus the *Arians* were condemned of *Idolatry*, that affirming *Chriſt* to be *a creature* and not *God incarnate*, they did yet beſtow divine honour on him, and ſo *Neſtorius* in like manner, and his followers, ſtiled ἀνθρωπολάτρας *man-worſhippers*, and both theſe ſentences confirmed by the *ſecond Council of Nice*, which is thought ſo favourable to *Images*.) As for example. *Sect.* 49. *Athanaſ. con. Arr.* or 1. *Eph. Concil. c.* 67.

To attribute to the *Angels omniſcience*, *omnipotence*, &c. *i. e.* that the *Angels* can *freely* underſtand all mens prayers, and as *freely* grant them their wants, is, I conceive, a piece of *Idolatry*. [*Freely*] I ſay, and I mean by the word [*Freely*] their doing it by their own *original* power, and not only by God's *revealing* the one to them, or by *giving them power* to do the other. As for him, that ſuppoſes the *Angels* to know all things which God pleaſes to *reveal* to them, by looking upon God as on a *voluntary glaſs* (as *Biel* ſets it) and withal believes, that God *reveals* all things to them ſo, and that thereupon they know by that means whatſoever any man ſaith to them at any diſtance; Or again, for him that conceives them to ſee all things in the World by ſeeing God's face, and looking on it as in a natural Glaſs, that reveals all that God knows without any choice, or act of his Will (as ſome others ſet it,) theſe may be very erroneous, yea and (if they *teach* them for *doctrines*) be guilty of ſin, in that (but ſpeculative) miſtaking, namely the ſin of *dogmatizing*, of affirming for matter of *Faith*, that for which they have no ground of Scripture, or evidence (which I conceive to be the fault charged on ſuch, *Coloſſ.* 2. in the phraſe ἃ μὴ ἑώρακεν ἐμβατεύων, *undertaking to penetrate, or know what men know nothing of*, εἰκῇ φυσιούμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ νοὸς τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ, *vainly puff'd up with the thoughts of their own fleſh*, their own *reaſon*, or *phanſie*, fictions of men, (*Gnoſticks*, &c.) without any *revelation* from God.) Yet can I not ſay, that theſe are *Idolaters* by ſo conceiving, or thinking, or affirming, by imagining theſe *vain* or *falſe* things, if they go no farther: (as they that came into the εἰδωλεῖον, into the *preſence* of *Images*, but *worſhip'd* them not.) But then if they add *practice* to *conceit*, *worſhipping* thoſe whom they *Sect.* 50.

have

have elevated to that pitch, *build Altars*, make *offices*, *pray to them*, especially in the house (or in the time of the service) of God, they do by this action, add a greater aggravation to the *speculative* sin, and, for ought I know, fall into a kind of *Idol-worship*, phansying *Angels* to be what they are not, and then paying them that *adoration* which is due only to *God*; at least they fall into a prohibited act, by neglecting the only *Christian* course of making our addresses only by *Christ* to *God*, which I conceive is the meaning of μὴ τις καταβραβευέτω ὑμᾶς, *Col* 2. 18. *Let no man deprive you of that Christian bravium, or prize*,] the peculiarity of the priviledge of coming unto *God* by *Christ* only. The same will be said of *offering sacrifice*, *incense*, or the like unto them (acts of worship and so peculiar to God) making *vows* or *swearing* by them, asking *grace*, *pardon* of sins, or *salvation* of them.

Sect. 51. As for the * *Angelici* in the Primitive *Church* who conceived that nothing was to be asked of God but what was by the Petitioner committed first to one *Angel*, then from him to another, and so by those many degrees brought to *God*, this may be thought a first rise of the sin of *Angel-worship*, somewhat parallel to that, which we gave you from *Maimonides* of the Heathen Idolatry.

* Vid. Concil. Laod. can. 35. p. 352. & Zonar in can. istum, & Justel. in Cod. Eccl. univers. p. 261.

Sect. 52. What hath now been said, must be taken with some *caution*, and 'tis this, that to *bow to an Angel* appearing to any man, (which civility we pay to any *superiour*) would not come under this *censure*. A consideration which hath made some wise men think that the *Angels* refusing of worship at Saint *Johns* hands in the Revelation, *cap.* 19. 10. was not the rejecting it as an act of *Idolatry* (or any kind of sin if it had been accepted) but as an evidence of the Angel's acknowledging himself *Johns fellow-servant* (the reason which is there rendred in the Text) and so not superiour to him in that office. But to this it may be said, that the Angels admonition [*worship God*] that follows, may possibly argue that *John* took the *Angel* for *God* appearing, and accordingly worship'd him, and therefore I shall not define. But then still for any other reverence or bowing, but that of divine *adoration*, there is no question but it may be performed to a *man*, when we meet him, and then much more unto an *Angel*; And that any *gestnre of reverence* shall pass for *divine adoration*, will, I conceive, be only in the power of *God*, and each mans own soul to define, the same *outward act* being (without any danger) performable both to *Man* and *God*, and nothing but the intention of the person making the difference. Much less will the *worshipping* of *God*, when an *Angel* appears to us, (as supposing God to be peculiarly present where those his *Satellites* or *Courtiers* appear) come under that charge,, nor consequently doing it in the Church (peculiarly at the first † entrance into that *holy place*) where the *Angels* are supposed to be present (the *Angels singing with us*, saith *Chrysostom*, and *Angelus Orationis*, saith *Tertullian*, and the presence of whom in the *Church* is used by Saint *Paul*, as an argument for the *decent* behaviour of *Women* in that place) as *Jacob* at the appearing of the *Angels* both *put off his shoes from his feet*, and resolved that *God was in that place*; and that it was *no other but the house of God, or gate of Heaven*, Gen. 28. 17. and *Moses* in like manner *put off his shoes from his feet*, Exod. 3. 5.

† Vid. View of the New Directory.

Sect. 53. Nor will it be the sin of Idolatry to beseech that Angel, (in case he appear to me) to join with me, or help me, or to commend my wants to God in his Prayers, any more than it will be, to request the like favour of any *fellow-Christian* upon Earth. The *Idolatry* is either in the heart, the giving him a *free unlimited* power, or in the actions *praying* to him, as supposing he had such power, and not the bare observing (and reverencing accordingly) his *created power* or dignity, held from *God* by way of *dignation*, or desiring him, (when he comes within my reach) to discharge any office of charity to me.

Sect. 54. The same may be said again of the *Saints in Heaven*, that the *beseeching* them to bestow mercies upon me, the putting up those Petitions to the *blessed Virgin*, &c. which are *terminated* in her self (as many *Forms*, if not her whole Office may appear to be) are, over and above the errour of thinking her able to relieve when she is not, acts parallel to that old *Idolatry* also; And the thinking them to come to the knowledge of our *prayers* in *speculo* again, is a presumption in a matter of which *Scripture* hath told us nothing, and so may fall under the forementioned *accusation*.

Sect. 55. Yet so again, that if it were sure to any, that any *Saint* doth *hear* his demands, it were certainly no fault to *beg* that favour of him, which were in his *free* power to bestow, and which we ordinarily demand of one another, *i. e.* the joining with, or for us, *assisting* and reinforcing our *prayers* to God. And supposing that they do not *hear* or *understand* what he saith, yet what guilt shall lye on him that thinks they do, and speaks accordingly to them, I omit now to define, because it is not to my present purpose, which was only to enquire what is *Idolatry*, not *Folly*, what *Worshipping* or *praying* for help, to that which is not *God*, not speaking to them to *pray* for us which *cannot hear*.

Sect 56. Next for *images* either of *God*, or *Christ*, or *Angels*, or *Saints*, many particulars may be resolved and avowed from the principles of discourse already laid, 1. That to conceive them able to *hear* and *help* by virtue of him, whose *image* they are, is a spice of that *heathen doctrine* of [*Images being the bodies of the Gods*] (of their being animated by those whose images they were) which had among them its foundation in sorcery, and then was the ground of idol-worship; and it were happy if some * ignorant *Christians* in some places, were not either willingly betrayed to, or uncharitably kept in this *barbarous rudeness*. So again will it be, 2. *to pray* to, or to bestow any act of *divine worship* on any such *Image* in any respect; For that supposes, and is built on the former conceit, and so a *worshipping* of that which is not *God*; and what is that but *Idolatry?* I say in any *respect*, and I mean with any distinction of *mediante imagine*, or *relativè*, &c. For first it is an unreasonable thing for them, to whom the Law is given, to make a *distinction* by which it may in some sence be lawful not to keep it, such *distinctions* must be made by the *law-giver*, or else they are not safe. 2. Although it be to *God* also, *mediante imagine*, *i. e.* first fastning my act of worship upon the *Image*, as the next or immediate object, and then *mediately* on *God*, this is clearly to *worship* the *Image*, though not the *Image*, alone, and that must be *Image-worship*, or 2. Though it be *only relativè* to the *Image* in *relation* to *God*, whose *Image* it is, this is again *worshipping that Image*, though not that *Image only*, and that will not rescue the *worshipping* of an *Image* from the *censure* of *image-worship*, any more than the affirming *Faith* to justifie *instrumentaliter relativè*, is not the affirming it to *justifie*.

* Non video in multis quod discrimen sit inter eorum opinionem de sanctis & id quod Gentiles putabant de diis suis. *Lud. Vives* in *Aug. de civ.* l. 8. c. ult.

As

As for the difference betwixt *Image-worſhip*, and *Idolatry*, or *Idol-worſhip*, if any ſuch be pretended from the difference between *imago* and *idolum*, it will not be worth our pains to examine it, becauſe the *worſhipping* of any thing which is not *God*, be it Image or *Idol*, *Chriſtian* or *heathen ſimilitude*, or any thing elſe, will fall under the guilt which now we ſpeak of. *Sect.* 57.

But then thirdly on the other ſide to *worſhip God* (and none but *God*) in a *Church* where *Images* are (without ſo much as fixing the Eye on them in the act of *adoration*) to uſe an *Image* only for ornament (in a Kingdom where *Image-work-hangings* and *Pictures* do paſs for the nobleſt way of *adorning* thoſe places which we moſt prize) to *pray* or to bow down to God (and to him only) in a *Church* where ſuch repreſentations are ſet up (for *beauty*, or as an indifferent thing) without any the moſt inferiour degree of *worſhip* to them, (nay with a *proteſtation* of *renouncing* and *deteſting* it) cannot be affirmed *Idolatry*, without either affirming *God* to be an *Idol*, or elſe [not *worſhipping*] to be [*worſhipping*] nor indeed be liable to any guilt, unleſs it be in order to *ſcandal*, which how far it is to prevail, as we have already given an intimation, ſo the grounds of defining have ſufficiently been laid down in another diſcourſe. *Sect.* 58. Of Scandal.

And ſo for the *reverend* uſage of an *Image*, if it ſignify no more than the uſing it *civilly* for his ſake, or in remembrance of him whoſe ſuperſcription it bears, (as when * *Alexander* was wondered at by *Parmenio*, that meeting *Jaddus* the *Jewiſh* Prieſt καθάπερ τὶς ὑπηκόων πεσὼν προσκυνήσει, *as if he had been one of his ſubjects he fell down and worſhipt him*, his anſwer was fully ſatisfactory that he *worſhipt not the Prieſt but the God whom that Prieſt honour'd, who had appeared to Alexander, and promiſed him ſucceſs againſt the Perſians*) eſpecially if that be but a *privative reverence*, (a not uſing it vilely and contumeliouſly) or whatever may not come under the ſtile of a *poſitive* act of *adoration*, this is no part of *religious worſhip*, any more than the laying of a *Bible* on the *Table*, and not on the *ground*, &c. But if it be the actual beſtowing of *worſhip* on that inanimate thing, as on the next (though not laſt) object, I mean beſtowing that *adoration* on the *Image* (though in a lower degree) in one act, which in another is given to *God*, *worſhipping* the *Image* for *Gods* ſake (the *relative* worſhip) or *God mediante imagine*, ſo that the *Image* be either the *object*, or part of the *object* of any one act of *worſhip*, it will fall under the cenſure of *Image-worſhip*. *Sect.* 59. *Euſeb. Chron.* l. 1. *ex Dexipp.*

Thus doth the *Capitular* of *Charles* the *Great* charge it on the *Biſhop of Cyprus* in the *Second Council* of *Nice*, that he allows the *Image* the ſame *worſhip* which belongs unto the *Trinity*; (and ſome learned *Papiſts*, *Aquinas*, and *Bellarmine*, &c. have done little leſs.) But he that will ſurvey the *Greek* acts of that *Council*, will find the *Capitular* miſtaken. For when the *Greek* reads τὸν καὶ λατρείαν προσκύνησιν μονῇ τῇ τελείᾳ ἀναπέμπω, *I perform that adoration of worſhip to none but the Trinity*, (and ſaith of the *images* only δεχόμενος καὶ ἀσπαζόμενος τιμητικῶς εἰκόνας, &c. *I receive and embrace them reverently*) the *Capitular* reads it in a quite contrary ſence, for having ſaid, *Servitium adorationis quod Trinitati debetur, ei ſe redditurum garrierit* (which though it hath no great hurt in it, becauſe the word [*Ei*] that follows, may apply it to *Trinitati*, and cannot refer to *imagines*, yet by [*garrierit*] it appears the *Capitular* did not take it ſo) 'tis added, *Servitium ſoli debitum Creatori, exhibere ſe fatetur Creaturis*, &c. Which is a plain calumny to that *Biſhop*, and even contrary to the former part of the relation, (the *Latine* words cited from the *Council*) if the [*Ei*] be taken notice of. *Sect.* 60.

As for the very making of an *Image* of *God* the *Father*, who never was cloathed in *fleſh*, or *viſible* form, if it be on deſign ſo to repreſent him, or if (being made) it be received as a *reſemblance*, or *image* of him, this is a moſt irrational *folly* or miſtake, for which there is no excuſe; and though it be not *idolatry*, unleſs being thus made it be *worſhipt* alſo, yet is it a direct contradiction to one great end of Gods prohibiting *Images*, viz. that all men be admoniſht that he is *inviſible*; and 'tis worth obſerving, that the *ancienter* of the *Heathens* themſelves have reſolved *God* to be ſo far from any *viſible* ſhape, that they would not allow the making any *image* or *picture* of him. Thus *Empedocles*, ὔτε γὰρ ἀνθρωπέη κεφαλὴ, &c. *No mans head, or feet, or knees, or other limbs to be conceived in God.* Ἀλλα φρὴν ἱερὴ καὶ ἀθέσφατος, &c. *but a ſacred ineffable mind*; ſo ſaith *Plutarch* in *Numa*, that *Pythagoras* ἀόρατον καὶ ἀκήρατον καὶ νοητὸν ὑπελάμβανεν εἶδος τὸ πρῶτον, *conceived God* (under the title of *the firſt*) *to be inviſible*, &c. and that on thoſe grounds *Numa forbad the Romans*, ἀνθρωποειδῆ καὶ ζωομορφὸν εἰκόνα θεῶν νομίζειν, *to conceive God to have the ſhape of any creature, or to have* πλαστὸν εἶδος τοῦ θεοῦ, *any formed Image of God.* Which ſaith he, *continued for one hundred and ſeventy years after the building of Rome*, no ἄγαλμα ἔμμορφον, *image of any form to be ſeen in their Temples.* So ſaith *Gerſon*, I remember, of the *Temple of Peace in Rome*, *which it ſeems was of that firſt erection*, *ſine ſimulachro, ſine imaginibus, it had no reſemblance or image in it.* So *Antiphanes* of *God*; that he *is not known by an image, nor likened to any thing*, διὸτερ αὐτὸν οὐδεὶς ἐκμαθεῖν ἐξ εἰκόνος δύναται, *and therefore no man can learn him by the help of an image.* And *Philoponus* in his *Preface* to *Ariſtotle de Anima* conceives it very neceſſary to a pious man that would conceive, or pray to God, as he ought, to ſtudy the *Mathematicks*, by the help of which he may be able to *abſtract* and *ſeparate* ἀφ' ὕλης, *from matter* and ſo have a right notion of the *deity*. So agreeable to the general notion of wiſe Heathens (till a cuſtom of ſin had beſotted them) was that of God himſelf to *Moſes*, *Thou haſt not ſeen any ſimilitude at any time*, *Deut.* 4. 12. 15. On which the making any *Image* of him is prohibited. All which notwithſtanding, if in the *repreſentation* of a ſacred ſtory, there be ſet down any *form*, particularly an *eye*, a *ray*, a *glory*, &c. not to expreſs the perſon of *God* the *Father*, but to *ſtand* for him, not to *ſignify* any ſuppoſed likeneſs of him (which is impoſſible) but only to *preſent* him to the mind of the beholder, a doing ſome action of his (which is in effect to do the very ſame thing in a *Table*, which the word *Jehovah* or *God* would do in a *Book*) I conceive not what *charge* could be laid on it, at leaſt what degree or ſpice of *Idolatry*, unleſs I muſt be thought to *worſhip* the Name of *God*, becauſe I write or read it. *Sect.* 61.

As for the *reſemblance* of the man *Chriſt Jeſus*, the bare *expreſſing* and not *worſhipping* that form, that was ſo long *viſible* on this earth, as this pretends no more to the *painting* of *divinity*, than the *lines* of a *body* can be thought to undertake to expreſs the *ſoul*, (and ſo cannot be accuſed of that *impoſture*) ſo will it not be liable to any other charge with any that hath not reſolved all *pictures* even of his own parents unlawful, (unleſs it be perhaps in order to the *danger* of being *worſhipt* by others, which conſequently ought very prudently to be weighed and conſidered, before any ſuch be ſet up in any place, as before was touched.) *Sect.* 62.

And the ſame may be ſaid of the *pictures* of holy men, the diſcourſe wholly abſtracting from *worſhip*, or deſign, or thought of *worſhip*, as here it doth in our preſent conſideration; To which purpoſe it is obſervable, that *Calvin* himſelf is by Doctor *Reynolds* produced, and avouched (againſt *Bellarmines* contrary ſlaunder) to affirm the *Images* of *Chriſt* and the *Saints*, *non eſſe prohibitas ſimpliciter, not to be ſimply prohibited*; and ſo in like manner, *Luther*, the *Zuinglians*, *Melanchthon*, and the *Magdeburgians*, all deteſting the worſhip of *Images*, but not the *Images* themſelves. And ſo *Illyricus* and *Peter Martyr* alſo, who thinks the *worſhip of images* to be a prime part of *Popiſh Antichriſtianiſm*, doth yet reſolve, *Chriſti & Sanctorum imagines haberi rectè poſſe, modo ne colantur atque adorentur, that the images of Chriſt and the Saints may lawfully be had, ſo they be not worſhipt.* *Sect.* 63.

Once more, to *worſhip* the *bread in the Sacrament*, muſt (whereſoever 'tis to be met with) certainly be *Idolatry* too, in the literal notion of the word, *i. e.* the *worſhipping* that which is not *God*. And for thoſe that do this on any the ſubtileſt ground, that by any *errour* or *miſtake* (be it never ſo *pioully* taken up) do actually *worſhip* this *bread*, that firſt conceive it to be turned into the very *body of Chriſt*, and the *elements* after *conſecration* to be no longer *bread* and *wine*, but very *Chriſt incarnate*, and thereupon do *worſhip* it. Theſe I ſay, in caſe they be *miſtaken*, and thoſe *elements* be not ſo turned and *tranſubſtantiated into Chriſt*, though they are not guilty of the ſin of *Idolatry* in all the aggravations that belonged to it among the *Heathen*; being not guilty of their πολυθεότης, the *acknowledgment of the many Gods*, of which their *Image-worſhip* was an appendage; yet can I not free them from the charge of *worſhipping an Idol*, i. e. ſomewhat which is not *God*, *viz.* a piece of *conſecrated bread*, &c. *Sect.* 64.

He that conceives this too ſuddain or ſevere a *cenſure*, may know that the *Papiſt-Doctors* are very ready to make confeſſion of it themſelves. *If the Elements be not ſo changed*, ſaith *Coſtenus of Tranſubſtantiation*, *we Papiſts are the meaneſt vileſt kind of Idolaters* in the World, *worſe* (as I remember he adds) *than the Laplanders that worſhipped a red Cloth.* And there is no denying it upon that ſuppoſition, becauſe 'tis part of the *ſuppoſition*, that what is ſo worſhip'd for God, is not *God*, and that is אֱלִיל an *Idol* in the *Scripture-ſence*, which is all that I have now ſaid. *Sect.* 65.

And if it be replyed that they *worſhip* nothing, but what they conceive to be *Chriſt*, and conſequently that the *ignorance* and contrary perſwaſions which may be pretended for ſuch acts in ſome men, particularly the *Romaniſts*, may plead much for them in *Gods* Court, (as we read that the *times of Ignorance God winked at in ſome Heathens*; that was an *idolatrous ignorance*, ſo far at leaſt as not to deprive them, and their poſterity of all means of recalling them,) I ſhall then anſwer, that ſo I ſhall hope *Sect.* 66.

hope (and pray) that it may do in this matter alſo, move *God*'s mercy ſo far at leaſt, as (if not to *pardon* the ſin without *repentance*, yet) to *give grace* to work a *ſight* and a *change* in ſuch ſeduced *ignorants*.

Sect. 67. And then putting the Caſe anew, whether, If the *bread* in the *Euchariſt* be not *tranſubſtantiate* (as, according to ſome other principles of the *Papiſts*, I conceive it near demonſtrable that it is not, that I mention not the direct *contradictions* which are affirmed or implyed in that Doctrine) and yet *Coſterus* and his friends think it is, ſuppoſing them to come *honeſtly* and *blameleſly* to theſe errours. If, I ſay, it be demanded, whether in this Caſe [that their *ignorance* or *errour* be grounded on *miſunderſtanding* of *Scripture*] This ſo *ſimple* and not *groſs ignorance* may ſerve for a ſufficient *antidote* to allay the *poyſon* of ſuch a *ſin* (of *material*, though perhaps in them not *formal Idolatry*, becauſe if they were not verily perſwaded, that it were *God*, they profeſs they would never think of *worſhipping* it) I ſhall then anſwer, that of this matter I had only temptation to make, and ſet the *queſtion* (as before I had of *prayer* to *Saints*, ſuppoſing the Petitioner to believe that they could hear him) but have now no neceſſity to define and ſatisfie it, being only to conſider what *idolatry* is, not how *excuſable ignorance* or miſtake can make it. Yet ſomething it will not be amiſs to add to direct our *Charity*.

Sect. 68. That this *ignorance*, or falſe opinion will not make the *worſhipping* of *bread* (remaining *bread*) to be the *worſhipping* of none but *God*, I conceive 'tis plain; Or if it would, it would make the Heathens *worſhipping* of an *image* to be the *worſhipping* of none but that *God*, whoſe image it was, for they ſure believed as much that that *image was* by *conſecration* become the *body of God*, and animated by it, as any *Papiſt* believes *tranſubſtantiation*. But whether this their errour was as capable of *Apology* or *pardon*, being infuſed into them by their falſe Teachers (which yet they thought to be true ones, (and pretended to *Revelation* for it (ſaith *Maimonides*) as this which is taken up upon the words of *Scripture* (though in a miſtaken and (as I conceive) *impoſſible*, becauſe *contradictory*, ſence) I ſhall now define no farther, than by ſaying theſe two things.

Sect. 69. Firſt, that the *Heathen Idolatry* was the *worſhipping* of the *many* falſe *Gods* firſt, and then of the *images* of them, (the former of which theſe men are not ſaid, or thought to be guilty of) ſecondly, that the more the Conſcience *believes* this *errour* to be a truth of *God*'s, and the more innocently it comes to that *belief*, the *eaſier* in all probability will the *ſentence* be another day; That *ignorance* or miſtake which *ſincerely* and *honeſtly* (without mixture of *carnal* principle, or deſign, *prejudice*, or *paſſion*, &c.) founds it ſelf in the word of *God* miſtaken, (and would be laid aſide, if ſufficient inſtruction were offered) being very juſtly the object of our *pity* and our *prayers*, and neither of our *cenſure*, nor *Scorn*; And if it were meerly a *ſpeculative* errour, and had not the unhappineſs of ſome *impious practice* attending it, I ſhould make the leſs doubt of its obtaining *pardon* at God's hands; And howſoever I will hope, it may ſtill (at that gracious Tribunal) be far from being *irremiſſible* to him, who hath reformed his other *known* ſins, and for all *known* and *unknown* is truly *humbled*.

Sect. 70. This manner of ſtating of this difficulty, may in reaſon perſwade them that are concerned in it, to be willing to ſee and *reform* their *errour*, if it be poſſible, or if *prepoſſeſſion* have made it otherwiſe to them, yet in all *juſtice* not to expect of us, (who *profeſs* to *believe* that the Elements are not tranſubſtantiate, and that the humane nature of Chriſt is received and *contained* in, and confined to *Heaven*, *till the day of reſtitution of all things*; and this withal upon the ſame grounds, (I mean of *literal* affirmation of *Scripture*) on which they profeſs to believe that this *is Chriſts body*, and this neither contradicted by any other *Scripture*, nor implying any thing like a *contradiction* in reaſon, nor a *ſavageneſs*, or a *ſin*, as, Saint *Auguſtin* ſaith, eating of Chriſts fleſh doth, and that therefore it muſt not be *literally* interpreted) to *worſhip* that which we think a *creature*, or ſomewhat which is not *God*, or *anathematize* us and ſeparate from our communion for not doing ſo.

Sect. 71. As for our *Church*, which only *adores Chriſt* in the *Sacrament* (as that ſignifies the *Action*; in which certainly *Chriſt* is) and not the *Elements* themſelves, nor *Chriſt*'s body locally preſent under the ſhape of thoſe *Elements*, (as certainly it cannot be, without either *being* no longer in *Heaven* or being in *more places* than one at once) which hath ſet the doctrine of that *Sacrament* in a moſt exquiſite temper to ſatisfie all rational *Chriſtian* pretenders, in that moſt excellent *Catechiſm* in the *Liturgy*, and in her practice allows the *Elements* no more than a *reverent uſage* proportionable to ſuch *inſtruments* of *Gods worſhip*, (which is both juſtified by * *Ameſius*, who aſſigns them a *ſingular reverence in time of the uſe* of them, and a *privative kind of reverence after it*) there can be no ſhew of charge againſt it for ſo doing, nor conſequently *for kneeling at the time of receiving the Sacrament* which is only a kneeling to *God* in prayer (which might be now farther enlarged on, but that it hath had its place in another † *diſcourſe*) unleſs it be a fault to *worſhip Chriſt*, or to chooſe that time or place to do it in the *lowlieſt* manner, when, and where he is eminently *repreſented* by the *Prieſt*, and offered by *God* to us.

* Caſe of Conſc. c. 31.

† View of the New Direct.

Sect. 72. As for the *Eaſt*, or *altar*, or *ſyllables* of the name of *Jeſus*, he that muſt think them *worſhip'd*, by thoſe who profeſs and proteſt to *worſhip God*, and none but *God*, (that way or on that occaſion) muſt either be of a very *ſhort diſcourſe*, (like them in *Athenæus*, that hearing men cry Ζεῦ σῶσον, *God help*, when the Neighbour *ſneezed*, thought the very thing which we call *ſneezing*, or elſe the *brain* from which it came, to be a *God* ſo *worſhip'd* by men) or elſe of a very *pettiſh ſpleen*, that can condemn the moſt blameleſs authoriz'd practices, not only of this *preſent particular*, but of the *antient univerſal Church* for the *worſhipping God* toward the *Eaſt* was moſt eminently ſuch) upon any the moſt irrational jealouſie, or diſlike.

Sect. 73. And ſo laſtly, for the *ſign of the Croſs*, uſed by our Church in *Baptiſm*, which hath been by ſome cryed down under the title of *Idolatry*, two things it will not be amiſs briefly to have obſerved, 1. That the ſame ground of *zeal* or paſſion that hath incited ſome men lately to charge it of a breach of the *ſecond Commandment*, hath long ſince moved * one of the ſame *ſpirit* to accuſe it as a ſin againſt the *other nine*, and to entitle his ſeveral Chapters, of the *Swearing*, *Sabbath-breaking*, *Murther*, *Adultery*, *Stealing*, *Falſe witneſs*, &c. and at laſt of the *concupiſcence of the Croſs*, as well as the *Idolatry* of it, the reaſons being much alike for the whole charge. 2. That the *ſigning* with the ſign of the *Croſs* in that *Sacrament*, is ſomewhat diſtant from that which the *Papiſts* uſe, and an act of departure from them in *King Edward's ſecond Liturgy*, more than had been in the *firſt Reformation*. The former cuſtom was to croſs the Child at the *Church door*, when it was brought to *Baptiſm*, but this of ours as a mark of *initiation* or *reception into Chriſts flock*, immediately follow my *Baptiſm*, and a kind of *teſſera*, or *military ſign* that the perſon thus *conſigned* into *Chriſts Militia*, ſhall for ever after think himſelf obliged *manfully to fight*, &c. A change made meerly out of compliance with them which were jealous of too great an inclination to *Popery*, and yet now charged with the *guilt* of that which it was on purpoſe deſigned to *decline*.

* *Parker* of the Croſs.

Sect. 74. I ſhould not I conceive be thought in earneſt, if I ſhould go about to vindicate the uſe of the *Liturgy*, and of all *ſet forms* of prayers from this charge of *Idolatry*; 'Tis true it hath been Printed, that *words in a book are Images, and conſequently that to pray before a book, or uſe a book in prayer, is Idolatry, or Image-worſhip*. But till this Argument be extended to all *words ſpoken*, as well as *written*, and ſo all vocal (though it be *extemporary*) *prayer*, condemned for *Idolatry* alſo, I ſhall not conceive that *Diſputer* to have believed himſelf, nor conſequently give him or my Reader the trouble of an *Anſwer*. Inſtead of extending this enquiry to the ſurvey and vindication of thoſe many other particulars, to which the phancies or furies of this laſt year have affixt this charge; all that I have now to add is only this, that I ſhall beſeech God to give ſuch *miſtakers underſtanding* firſt, and then *Charity*, to make uſe of it *to edification, and not to deſtruction*, to the *reforming* their own ſins, and not *condemning* or *reproaching* other mens *laudable*, at the leaſt *innocent* actions.

Judge not, that ye be not judged of the Lord.

OF

OF SINNES

Of {WEAKNESS, WILFULNESS.

And appendant to it, A *Paraphraſtical Explication* of two difficult Texts, *HEB.* 6. and *HEB.* 10.

AND

A ſtating of this Queſtion, [*Whether any ſin be of its Nature Venial?*] (which ſee before, in the Papers to Mr. *Ch. p.* 253.)

Συγγνώμλω ἐν τῷ ἁμαρτεῖν ἀνθρωπείως λήφονται. *Thucyd. l.* 3.

Of a Late; or, a Death-bed

REPENTANCE.

Brutus in Epiſt. ad Pergamen.
Οὐ δοτέον μετάνοιαν τοῖς ὑπὲρ τὸ παντελὲς καμεῖν μαρτανοῦσι.

OF FRATERNAL ADMONITION OR CORREPTION.

Melet. Alex. πε. τῆς τῦ Πάπα ἀρχῆς.
Φευκτέον ὑ τὰς ἐλέγχυς, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἐλέγχων ἄξια πεάτλειν τοῖς ὑφερῆσιν.

THE *ſecond Covenant* being that by which we are now all either *juſtified* or *condemned*, and the *condition* of that, in reſpect of the *facienda*, being *ſincere* not *exact obedience*, not the *not ſinning* at all, but the *not ſinning wilfully after our receiving the knowledge of the truth*, *Heb.* 10. 26. (which though it ſeem to damn all *irreverſibly* that *ſin wilfully* after *converſion*, yet ſure is to be underſtood according to the ἐπιείκεια of the Goſpel; unleſs he do *repent* and return *ſincerely* unto God again, for whoſoever doth ſo, there is certain *mercy* by other places made over to him in *Chriſt*, and what is the full *importance* of that place will anon be explicated) It will be an enquiry though of ſome *difficulty*, yet of as great *uſe* and *neceſſity* as any one other in all Divinity, to ſearch what ſins there are, for which *mercy* is to be had under the *Goſpel*, and for what not. For that ſome men are *damned*, and not all finally *ſaved*, there is no doubt; and yet as little there ought to be, that this is for *ſin* that one man is *guilty* of, and t'other *not*; from whence it follows, that ſeeing no man is *guiltleſs* of ſin, ſome *degrees* or ſorts there muſt be of that *guilt* in *one*, which are not in *another*, and according to thoſe *different degrees* (though every of them be of *it ſelf*, or *without Chriſt*, or by the *tenour* of the *firſt Covenant*, *damning*, yet) under the *Goſpel* or *ſecond Covenant*, the adjudging of men to *Heaven* or *Hell* is proportioned. *Sect.* 1.

From all which this reſults, that ſome *kinds*, or *ſorts*, or *degrees of ſinning*, or more plainly, ſome *ſtates of ſinners*, are under the Goſpel *damning*, ſome are *not*; ſome *reconcileable* with a *good* eſtate, ſome *not*; ſome for which there is *ſure mercy* in Chriſt, ſome for which there is as *certainly no mercy*; for though the *mercy* of God be *infinite*, and ſo unfathomable by our finite wits, yet when he hath in *Sect.* 2.

the *Goſpel* defin'd how far his *mercy* ſhall *extend*, and beyond what terms it ſhall not, 'twill be no inſolence to affirm, that God will not have mercy on any who are not *qualified* according to that *ſecond Covenant* of his, who are not ſuch perſons to whom *only* he hath promiſed *mercy*, at leaſt if they be ſuch as of whom he hath affirmed [*they ſhall not have mercy.*]

Sect. 3. Thus far to juſtifie the *fitneſs*, and *uſe*, and *neceſſity* of this ſearch. Now for progreſs in it; It will be eaſie to define in the *general*, 1. That all ſins in the world, be they never ſo great, of what *ſort* or *kind* ſoever, if they be *retracted* with true *repentance*, ſhall certainly be *forgiven*; (for that any *act* of ſin ſhould be *irremiſſible*, they that affirm, do it on this ground, that they that *commit* that act ſhall never truly *repent*, implying that if they did *repent*, it would be *remiſſible*) and in this the only difficulty will be, 1. What *true repentance* is: And 2. Whether that be *neceſſary* to the obtaining *pardon for every* ſin.

Sect. 4. To the firſt, I anſwer, that true *repentance* is a *change*, a *through change of mind*, (called in the *Scripture*, and the ordinary ſtyle of *Divines*, the *New creature*, being *regenerate*, *converſion*, *ſpiritual reſurrection*, *forſaking of ſin*, *mortification*, *habitual ſanctification*, *ſincere*, *faithful reſolution of new life*, *reformation*, *amendment*, μεταμέλεια, μετάθεσις τῆς νοῦ, μετασχημάτισμος) and whatever doth not amount to thus much, is not *true ſaving repentance*, to which the *promiſes* or mercies of *Chriſt* do appertain. And ſo conſequently many ſpecious pretenders to that Title are excluded. Such are bare ſorrow for ſin, ſuch the *votum pœnitentiæ*, the *wiſhing* they were penitent, ſuch a bare *warring* of the *Law of the mind againſt the Law of the members*, whilſt we are *carried captive to the Law of ſin*; and many the like.

Sect. 5. To the *ſecond*, I muſt anſwer by diſtinguiſhing the *equivocalneſs* of the queſtion. For the meaning of it may be, 1. Whether *amendment*, or *forſaking*, or *overcoming* every *particular* ſin be *neceſſary* to the obtaining of *pardon* for that *ſin*, whether it be of *infirmity* or otherwiſe: and if that be meant, I anſwer, No. For that ſome ſins are of that nature, that as long as we have this *mortal infirm fleſh* about us, we can never hope to be *rid* of them, to *get victory* over them: ſuch as for which the *ſacrifices* were appointed to be offered under the *Law*, that are ſaid to be committed ἀκουσίως and ἐν ἀγνοίᾳ, *unwillingly* and *in ignorance* (not as thoſe words ſignifie in the philoſophical or ſtrict ſence, but as they note a fault without any fraud or deceit) as when any thing is done through forgetfulneſs of the Law, *&c.* and for which *Chriſts ſacrifice* once offered is a perfect *expiation*; and theſe by the tenour of the *ſecond Covenant*, or through the *mercy* of God in *Chriſt* ſhall never be *imputed* to the *penitent ſinner*; I mean to him who hath *amended* all others, and *humbled* himſelf before *God*, and *beſought* his mercy in *Chriſt*, and by *faith laid* hold of it for theſe, which though he labour againſt them *ſincerely*, he cannot throughly *amend* or *overcome*.

Sect. 6. But if the meaning be, ſecondly, Whether the *actual amending* of all his known ſins, which conſequently may by the Chriſtian be amended, be required neceſſarily to make a man capable of the *pardon* even of his ſins which cannot be *amended*; I anſwer, that it is very probable to be ſo. Becauſe *Chriſts ſufferings* ſeem not to be *advantageous* (at all, not ſo much as to the waſhing away of *humane frailties*) to any but thoſe who *are in Chriſt*, i. e. *to new creatures*, who alone are ſo; however that will not be a material ſcruple, though it ſhould be left *diſputable*, as long as this other propoſition be taken for infallible (which is ſo) that *except we repent we ſhall all periſh*, *i. e.* that he that hath not forſaken all *wilful* ſins, ſhall (whether for his *wilful* ſins only, or his *wilful and frailties* both together, it matters not) be certainly *condemned*.

Sect. 7. By the anſwering of theſe two *queſtions* ſo much hath been gained, as that we may make another *general reſolution*, and define ſecondly, that ſome *ſins* are *reconcilable* with a true *penitent convert*, *regenerate eſtate*, others are *not*. And conſequently, ſome not *deſtructive* under the *ſecond Covenant*, though others are. What theſe are in *general* will alſo in the third place be eaſily defined. Sins of *infirmity* are *reconcilable*, *wilful ſins* are not.

Sect. 8. Under *infirmities* I contain all ſorts that are uſually reduced to that head, and which have been briefly mentioned in another diſcourſe; Whether thoſe that proceed from any not *culpable defect* of

Of conſcience. my *underſtanding*, as ſins of *ignorance*; or from ſome preſent *prevailing temptation*, which though I uſe all means in my power againſt it, I cannot *overcome*; or from ſome *advantage taken* by Satan, &c. in the aſſaulting me either on *the ſuddain*, when I have not *time* to uſe thoſe means which I might otherwiſe uſe, which we call *ſuddain ſurreption*; or from the *frequency* or *repetition*, or almoſt *continuedneſs* of the *temptation*, which when I have *repell'd* it never ſo often, *returns* again, ſo that if ever my *watch* be *intermitted* (which conſidering our *humane frailty* it is, though not *logically*, yet *morally*, *impoſſible*, but it ſhould ſometime or other) I ſhall infallibly fall, (which we uſe to call ſins of *daily incurſion*;) or from the levity and undiſcerniblenes of the matter, or from any other *Principle*, which by that meaſure of grace that God *affords* me, (or, if I be not *culpably wanting* to my ſelf in *neglecting* the uſe of the means preſcribed, he is *ready* to *afford* me) I am not able to reſiſt. Suppoſing all this while that 'tis not upon ſome former *wilful ſin* of mine that God by way of *puniſhment* withdraws this *grace neceſſary* to the *reſiſting* of it; for if it be ſo, then though it may truly be ſaid, I cannot now *reſiſt* that *ſin* for want of that *grace* ſo *withdrawn* by God, yet will not this paſs for a ſin of *infirmity*.

Sect. 9. On the other ſide, under the name of *wilful ſins* I mean not all *willingly* committed, or *voluntary* ſins, (for all ſin as far as it is *ſin* is *voluntary*, and therefore ſins of *infirmity* are *voluntary*) but all that are not excuſable by any of thoſe former titles of *infirmity*, or all that are not included under ſome of thoſe heads.

Sect. 10. Thus far in the way of general defining there is no great *difficulty*. That begins to ſhew it ſelf when we come to the καθέκαστον or particular, to mention what ſins in *ſpecie*, or *individuo*, what *ſorts* of ſin or *acts* of thoſe ſorts, are ſins of *infirmity*, what not; and this is indeed an *inſuperable* difficulty, 1. Becauſe one man hath more *knowledge*, more *quickneſs* of underſtanding, and alſo more *grace* than another, and ſo that ſin in *ſpecie*, or *individuo*, that *ſort* or *particular act* of ſin, which he hath power to *reſiſt* and *overcome*, that other man that hath *leſs power*, hath not *power* to *overcome*; and if ſo, 'twill be an *infirmity* in him, though in t'other 'tis not. 2. Becauſe any *ſpecifical ſin* comes backed

backed with more *temptations* (and ſo makes a more forcible *impreſſion* upon the *will*) at *one* time than *another*; and conſequently though it were not above his *ſtrength* at *one* time, yet at *another* time it may. Yea, and *thirdly*, becauſe the ſame man is at one time more *able* to *reſiſt* and *overcome*, than he himſelf at ſome *other* time, as of a man in ſtate of *deſertion* it is clear, as alſo when either by *drunkenneſs* or any other *culpable extravagancy* (through *rage* or *luſt* not reſiſted in the firſt motion) the man is utterly debauched from his *natural* and *ſpiritual* ſtrength, and no way able to reſiſt *thoſe temptations*, which at another time he would ſcorn to be *captivated* with.

But theſe two cauſes will not be very pertinent to the buſineſs in hand: becauſe, as is ſuppoſed in them, that which brought this *weakneſs* upon the man, was ſome *culpable*, nay *wilful act*, (or *yielding* of his) committed then *againſt ſtrength*, (though now that *ſtrength* be not ſufficient againſt the conſequent aſſault) and ſo no way apt to *excuſe* the ſin, that it primarily *betrayed* him to. But if the caſe be ſet of ſome *innocent accident* which cauſes this *alteration*, then it will be pertinent to the thing which I now affirm, (to wit the evidencing the *difficulty* of ſuch particular defining καθόλου) as we know a man in time of *ſadneſs* will be able to reject ſome *jolly* propoſals, which yet in time of *mirth* (ſuppoſing that *moderate* and *harmleſs*, and as perfectly *ſinleſs* in it ſelf, as that contrary *ſadneſs*) he will not perhaps be *able*, nay, as *Hippocrates* affirms in his tract περὶ ὕδ. ἀερ. καὶ τόπων, one *ayr* or *place* may ſtrongly *incline* a man to one whether *vertue* or *ſin*, which another doth not, and where the *inclinations* are *ſtronger* or *weaker*, there we know the *ſtrength* being in degree ſuppoſed the *ſame* muſt prove unproportionable to the one though not the other, and ſufficient to *reſiſt* the *weaker*, though unſufficient to ſubdue the *ſtronger inclination*. Sect. 11.

To come yet more clearly to that which is of every days experience. Suppoſe a man a little *drowzy* at one hour (which *drowzineſs* at that time particularly, is not a *ſin*, but a *natural* deſire of *ſleep*, which is *natures* due *debt*) and ſuppoſe him throughly *awaked*, and out of that fit of *drowzineſs* at another time; and then ſuppoſe that the ſame *propoſal* be made to him at both thoſe times, it may very probably be *received* at *one* time, and *rejected* at *another*; nay if the *propoſal* be an undertaking *deſtructive* of his preſent *deſire* of *ſleep*, it may eaſily be affirmed that in that *drowzy* fit he hath no *ſtrength* to *reſiſt* it, though at *another* time he hath. The reaſon is, becauſe *ſleep* being a *ligation* of the faculties, *drowzineſs* likewiſe is ſo in ſome *degree*, and the *want* of that *degree* may diſable the *underſtanding* or *upper ſoul* from *repreſenting* ſtrongly enough at that time, that which at another time it ſhall be able to *repreſent* ſo ſtrongly, that the contrary *propoſals* of the ſenſe ſhall not dare to appear before it. From whence I conceive it follows, that if the *propoſal*, ſuppoſed in this cauſe, be a *ſinful propoſal*, that ſin committed by that *drowzy* man will be a ſin of *infirmity*, which if it were committed by the ſame man broad awake, would be a ſin againſt *ſtrength*, and ſo a *wilful* ſin. From whence yet the man ſo *deceived* once or twice ought to receive *admonition*, that hereafter, if any *weighty* matter, wherein his *duty* be concerned, be *repreſented* to him in the like *poſture*, he will before he *conſents* or *refuſes*, *diſcutere ſomnum*, *ſhake off ſleep*, that he may not be ſo unfit a *judge*, or if he find his own *weakneſs* ſuch that he cannot, he will appoint ſome body elſe to awaken him throughly, that he be not thus conſtantly *impotent*; For if he do not uſe theſe means to recover his *ſtrength*, when he is *aware* of them, it may ceaſe to be an *infirmity*. Sect. 12.

From all which as we have evidenced the *difficulty* of the probleme applyed to *particular individual* ſins or perſons, ſo we conceive our diſcourſe to have given ſome *hints* which will be uſeful towards this *diſcovery*. Eſpecially this, that any ſin committed by him that hath at that time *ſtrength* or *grace* to reſiſt it, or whoſe wilful fault it hath been, that he hath not that *ſufficient* ſtrength (as if either ſome former *waſting ſin* of his, whether *act* or *habit*, have *grieved the holy Spirit of God*, and provoked *God* to *withdraw* it from him, which he would not otherwiſe have done, or if by the uſe of ſome means beforehand he might have prevented the ſtrength of that *impreſſion*, or better fortified himſelf, or by *uſe* of ſome other *means*, as of *prayer*, &c. at the preſent he might yet get *ſtrength*, or *remove* the *tempter*, and he make *uſe* of none of theſe *means* through *ſenſuality* or *ſluggiſhneſs*) is a *wilful* ſin, (not a ſin of infirmity) to that man at that time. Sect. 13.

And ſo though we have no other *particular* way of *defining*, yet this we have, that will ſtand any man in as good ſtead for the examining *himſelf*, and his own guilts, or any *confeſſor* (that hath received of his *confitent* an exact account not only of the *action*, but the circumſtances of the *action*, his *qualifications* at that *time*, and the particular *vigor of the aſſault*) as particular definitions concerning this, or that ſin *univerſim* would. Sect. 14.

As *for example*, if I would know whether any *act* of my own, or (being a *confeſſor*) of my *pœnitent*, be a *wilful* ſin or no, I muſt firſt inquire, whether in that *point* of time, when being *tempted* I *committed* it, my *underſtanding* or *upper ſoul*, and the *ſpirit of God* in me did move me more, or as *ſtrongly* not to do it, as the *fleſh* did to the *commiſſion*, allowing farther ſomewhat of *grace* to *incline* the will, or of the *underſtanding* to *move* it as much in proportion as the *will* ſince the fall is naturally *inclined* to the *carnal appetite*, (as you know when one *Scale* is heavier *of it ſelf* than the other, or by ſome *default* in the *beam* one is more apt to *turn* than the other, you muſt, if you would even the ballances and make an *æquilibrium*, put *more weight* in the *Scale* that is apt to fly up.) Or if this be an *obſcure* operation, why then I muſt deſire thee to examine whether at that time thy *Spirit* or *Conſcience* told thee, this was not to be done, and that on pain not only of *Gods diſpleaſure*, but alſo of thy *eternal damnation*, (which muſt certainly be far greater motives of *determent* even to *fleſh* and *blood*, than any *pleaſure* the fleſh can repreſent, can be *allective* to the contrary) and if thou findeſt it did, and yet for all this thy *will* conſented to the *fleſh* in its propoſal, then this is a ſin againſt *ſtrength*, a *wilful ſin*, and not of *infirmity*. Sect. 15.

But if thy *conſcience*, or *ſpirit* or *upper ſoul*, at that time did not this, then 'tis to be reſolved on, that it failed to do the *duty* of a watchman, and if it did ſo, then my ſecond inquiry will be, From whence that *failing* of thy *ſpirit* aroſe? (for if it be *awake* and diſpoſed as it ſhould be, (and as even yet by *grace* it is prepared to be, if we make *uſe* of that *grace*) it will *ſpeak* and *admoniſh* us, and that not in *words* which are ſubject to *miſunderſtanding*, but in *ſence* which therefore we cannot but *conceive*) Whether, firſt, from Gods juſt *deſertion*, the *puniſhment* of ſome *former* ſin, or Sect. 16.

ſecondly, from ſome preſent *actual ſin* of mine upon me at that time, as *drunkenneſs*, *crapula*, &c. or thirdly, from ſome *habit* which I have, by former *acts* of the ſin which I am now tempted to, *contracted*, to the *blinding* of my *underſtanding*, or *grieving* of the *ſpirit*, or *glibbing* that ſin, that it ſhall be able to paſs down *inſenſibly* and eſcape the ſearch of my *underſtanding*; In all theſe caſes, the *original* of that failing being ſinful, the *failing* it ſelf will not yield any *excuſe* or compleat *apology*, but the ſin will ſtill remain a wilful ſin.

Sect. 17. If none of all theſe be found chargeable upon thee, as the *original* of that *failing* and *negative productive* of that ſin, then I can as yet think of but one inquiry more, Whether thirdly, thy *underſtanding* and the *grace* of God in it, being thus layed aſleep as it were, by ſome *natural*, *ſinleſs*, or at leaſt *invincible* and ſo *excuſable frailty*, or elſe (as in a *drowſie* fit) not perfectly awake, there be not ſome *means preſcribed* and preſented to thee by God, which if thou hadſt uſed, thou mighteſt have *wakened* thy *underſtanding*, or *fortified* thy *will*, or *weakened* the *temptation*: and if ſo, and thou haſt, through *negligence*, or *confidence*, ſpiritual *ſecurity* or *pride*, omitted to make *uſe* of them, then will this ſtill amount to a *wilful* ſin or a ſin againſt *ſtrength*; as when the *Lunatique* Son was *brought to the diſciples* of Chriſt, and the Text ſaith, *Mat.* 17. 21. *they could not caſt* the evil ſpirit *out*, and Chriſt gives the reaſon why they could not, *becauſe*, ſaith he, *this kind goeth not out, but by prayer and faſting*, Chriſt yet chargeth them with *infidelity* almoſt unſufferable, (*O faithleſs generation, how long ſhall I be with you? how long ſhall I ſuffer you?*) becauſe there being ſuch *means* to *enable* them to do the work, they *neglected* thoſe *means*, and ſo only by that *neglect* became *unable*. The ſtyle of *faithleſs* in that place gives us yet a more perfect notion of a *wilful ſin*, than hitherto we have arrived to, that it is not only that which is againſt *natural conſcience*, or *ſpiritual infuſions*, but alſo that which is particularly againſt *faith*, *i. e.* comes to be committed by neglecting the *uſe* of ſome *means*, which the *word of Chriſt*, or the *Scripture* offers and preſcribes to us, eſpecially if by our former *failings* we have diſcerned the *want* we have of ſuch *helps* or *anxiliaries*. For in this reſpect of directing to ſuch *means of victory*, *Faith* is ſaid to be the *overcoming the world*, 1 *John* 5. 4. as well as in preſenting us with the *promiſes* and terrors of the Goſpel.

Sect. 18. Farther yet in the fourth place, if at the time of commiſſion of the ſin thou canſt truly ſay, 'twas not in thy power to *reſiſt* it, becauſe of the *ſtrength* of the *temptation* ſo hurrying thee, as not to give thee *leiſure* to *judge* or *deliberate*, (which may ſeem to intitle that action to the title of *infirmity*) thou muſt then enquire, whether thy *yielding* (*voluntarily* from contemplation of the *pleaſure*, &c.) to ſome *entrances* and *beginnings* of that ſin, whether *moroſe thoughts*, or ſomewhat farther, be not that, that hath made the *temptation* ſo *ſtrong*, or *thee* ſo *weak*; which thou wilt diſcern by this enquiry, whether before thoſe *moroſe thoughts*, &c. were entertained, thou wert not *able* to make *reſiſtance* to the *actual ſin*, and then, if ſo thou wert *able*, nay actually didſt, and only the intervenience of thoſe *preparatory yieldings* did betray thee to this *impotence*, and it was in thy *power* (by *natural* or *ſupernatural ſtrength* already had, or *prayer*, either as it hath a promiſe of more *ſtrength*, or as it is an excellent means of *diverſion*) to have *reſiſted* thoſe *beginnings*, when thou didſt *yield*, then ſtill is this a *wilful ſin*, or *ſin againſt ſtrength*.

Sect. 19. As for other ſins more clearly and immediately againſt *natural conſcience*, againſt *Faith*, (or directions of the Scripture for the *overcoming the world*) againſt *ſupernatural ſtrength or grace*, as contumacious ſtubborn *preſumptuous* ſins, there will be little ſcruple to any man, or cauſe to keep him from *pronouncing* of, and charging on them the crime of *wilfulneſs*, and concluding (without real *change*) the certain *damningneſs* of them even under Chriſt. I ſay particularly, *preſumptuous ſins*, when (*preſuming* that *Gods* mercy in Chriſt is either *unlimited*, and may belong to any the moſt *unreformed*, or that it is *decreed abſolutely* to ſome *perſons*, without any reſpect to *qualifications* or demeanures, to *Saul* the *perſecutor*, as well as *Paul the Apoſtle*) the ſinner runs *comfortably* and *alacriouſly* on, without any *regret* of *conſcience*: the doing ſo is certainly no ſin of *infirmity*, becauſe though ſome *errour* may be pretended for his ſo doing, and that *errour* ſeem apt to lend him *excuſe*;

Sect. 20. Yet firſt, *errours*, that are not *ſimple errours*, but bring *vitious* life after them, are not *excuſable* (becauſe not *invincible*) *errours*, the rule of the *agenda* or *duties* of life being ſo *clear* in the *Scripture* and in the *heart*, that no man can be *invincibly ignorant of that*, *Rom.* 10. 8, 9. and *Deut.* 30. 14. The *word* that is now *commanded* is not hid or impoſſible, or like *fetching Chriſt from heavin*, or the *grave*, a thing quite out of our power, but it is nigh *thee*, *in thy mouth*, and in *thy heart*, *that thou mayſt do it*. And ſecondly, it will be apparent, that even thoſe *errours* on which that *preſumption* is built, being ſimply conſidered, are demonſtrable to be *errours* (*ſuppoſita fide*) or *to one that acknowledges the Scriptures*, becauſe there be ſo many places in the *Scripture* point-blank againſt them, particularly thoſe of the *conditional promiſes* every where ſcattered. Neither *circumciſion*, &c. *but the new creature*, *but faith conſummate by love*, *but keeping the Commandments of God*; *Without holineſs no man ſhall ſee the Lord*; *He that confeſſes and forſakes ſhall have mercy*; *He that hath this hope purifies*, &c. *And having therefore theſe promiſes, let us cleanſe*, &c.

Sect. 21. From what hath been ſaid, it will be more than probable, that all acts of *fornication*, *adultery*, &c. (which I ſhall ſuppoſe never to be actually committed without ſome ſpace of *deliberation*, or if they be, then I mean thoſe other wherein that *deliberation* interpoſes) are *wilful ſins*, and ſo alſo all acts of *drunkenneſs*, unleſs when through *ignorance* of the *ſtrength* of the *liquor*, or the *weakneſs* of the *brain*, the man ſuddainly fall into it by deſiring to *quench* his *thirſt*, or do ſomewhat which is *lawful*; wherein yet, if after *one* or more *trials* he miſcarry the *ſecond* or a *third time*, it will ſtill be a *wilful* ſin; So alſo *lying*, or ſpeaking that which we know to be *falſe*, to the *defrauding* and *wronging* of another, or for any *vain-glorious* deſign; So again, any ſin of *oppreſſion*, *injuſtice*, &c. or generally all thoſe where there is any *time* of *advice* and *deliberation*; For where-ever that liberty is, there is ſuppoſed an *ability* and *readineſs* in the *upper ſoul* of a *Chriſtian* to preſent *arguments* for obedience of God, ſtronger than any the *devil*, or the *world*, or *fleſh*, can offer for the contrary. As for *killing* a man, though the *Law* of the Land is wont to diſtinguiſh of *wilful* and *not wilful murther*, yet to any man in his *wits*, the *ſtabbing* his neighbour (or uſing any other ſuch *means* as may *probably* take away his *life*) would ſeem ſo *ſtrange*, that I cannot conceive but his *ſpirit* ſhould be able to

deter

deter him from it in that ſpace, which is required that any ſuch *weapon* may be *prepared*; for if it be ſaid, his *rage* doth *gag* or ſilence his *ſpirit*; I ſhall anſwer, that the *raiſing* of his *rage* to that pitch was not in a *minute*, but grew upon him by *degrees*, and then there was *time* and *means* to prevent that *growth*, which he that did not make uſe of, will hardly be able thereby to *excuſe* or *extenuate* the ſubſequent ſin.

For *ſwearing* alſo I know not how in ordinary diſcourſe or in any caſe (*extra caſus juramenti legitimas, where it is ſuppoſed perfectly lawful*) it can be made a ſin of *infirmity*; for *in communication* Chriſt's words are ſo plain [*But I ſay unto you, Swear not at all*, and particularly, *Let your communication be yea, yea*, &c. for *whatſoever is more*, is ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ, *from the evil one*] that it would amaze any man to ſee that it ſhould become an *ornament* or tolerable part of a *Chriſtians dialect*. And if it be in *rage*, then I dare ſay, that either that man hath formerly in ſome meaſure enured his tongue to ſwearing, or not ſo ſtrictly made *conſcience* of an *oath*, as *Chriſt's precept* obligeth him; for he that never ſwore, will not in *impatience* probably fall out into thoſe forms of ſpeech that he never *uſed*, (but always *vowed* and reſolved againſt) but into ſome other which he hath been more *uſed* to, or which he could hear in others with leſs *horrour* and *deteſtation*, or which were a more natural *remedy* for that *paſſion*. And if you mark it, that which *rage* doth, is principally to *blind* the *underſtanding*, (and ſo to *ſteal* out any *proper* and genuine *effects* of *rage*, as *preſuming* of their *impunity*, or not *conſidering* the contrary *danger*) but not to *hurry* us to the commiſſion of any or *every* other ſin *indifferently*, and at a venture. And why a *rage* ſhould caſt one upon uſing *Gods Name* in *oaths*, (which before he had never *phanſied* for any uſe but in his prayers) any more than on many other unheard of ſins, I am ſo far from conceiving any reaſon, that I muſt conclude it impoſſible, unleſs it proceed from the being *uſed* in ſome meaſure to that ſin; or having a more *favourable* eaſie opinion of it. And yet after all this, that *rage* it ſelf being ſo *Un-Chriſtian* a thing, which we are ſo *obliged* to *prevent*, (and if in time it be not *prevented*, will not *always* paſs for an *infirmity* in a Chriſtian) will be unable to *patronize* or *excuſe* any ſuch one *oath*, which that puts into our mouths; but on the other ſide, the obſerving that my *rage* hath made me ſwear, muſt in any reaſon give me ſo *ſtrict* a *watch* over my ſelf in time of *provocation*, as never to let looſe into a *rage*, which proves ſo inconvenient and ſo *complicated* a ſin unto me; as he that finds himſelf *quarrelſome* in his *drink*, hath the greateſt obligation to *temperance*. As for any other *means* that bring on *ſwearing*, *cuſtom*, *pride*, *oſtentation*, ἀναπλήρωσις λόγου, *filling up the diſcourſe*, none of theſe will *excuſe* it from a *wilful* ſin; eſpecially conſidering the *natural intrinſecal untemptingneſs* of that ſin, that were it not for ſome accidental or extrinſecal advantage, *evil example*, (which if it had been a *good one*, we could eaſily enough have *rejected* and *not imitated*) or *cuſtom local* or *perſonal*, or that other of the *company* we are uſed to, ſcarce any man that hears *ſwearing* forbidden by Chriſt, will *diſcern* himſelf to have any *carnal invitation* to ſwear, no not in time of *rage*. *Sect.* 22.

The ſame I think may be defined of all the groſs *outward acts* of ſin, or *ſins in the members*; becauſe for the *acting* of them, over and above the *conſent* of the *will*, ſome *ſpace* is neceſſarily required wherein the *ſpirit* or upper ſoul, if it be about us, will be able and ready to *interpoſe*, if it may be hearkned to, (which me thinks is intimated by the *Turks* in a cuſtom of theirs, who when they mean to give themſelves liberty to be *drunk*, uſe to make a great *noiſe*, which they ſay is a *warning* to their *ſoul* to retire into ſome *extream part of the body*, that it may not be *ſpectator* or *Cenſor* of this their *beſtiality*.) And if it be thus *driven* away, *gagg'd*, or not *hearkened* to, then that is a ſin againſt *ſtrength*, a *wilful ſin*. Which perhaps was St. *James* his obſervation, when he ſaid, *Sin being perfected bringeth forth death*. For the *conception of luſt* precedent ſignifies certainly the *conſent* or conjunction of the *will* with the *carnal appetite*, when in the *wooing* (or *canvaſs* for that *conſent*) of the *upper ſoul* on one ſide, and of the *lower ſoul* or *carnal* part on t'other, the *will* which is thus courted by both, yields to the *ſecond*, and ſo they joyn in *mutual embraces*, from whence, ſaith the Apoſtle, *ſin is brought forth*, that very *conſent* of the *will* to the *ſenſual faculty*, being *formally* ſin without, or before the *acting* of it; but this perhaps a *ſin of infirmity*, as the caſe may be (for *univerſim* or *always* it is not; but very often *wilful* and *damning*, though it never come to *act*) whereas of this ſin (of *infirmity* while it was only in the *conception*, i. e. *conſent* of the *will*) come to *birth* (i. e. *actual commiſſion*) or *perfection*, and fitneſs for *birth*, (which requires ſome ſpace, and time) it may juſtly be ſaid a ſin againſt *ſtrength*, and ſo in the very *Covenant of grace* a fatal *mortiferous* ſin. *Sect.* 23.

And therefore though before we ſaid that the ſame ſin in *ſpecie*, might be but an *infirmity* in one, and yet a *wilful* ſin in another, yet this *affirmation* will need this caution to interpret it, that the meaning of it be only this, that a ſin that is *only* an *infirmity* in one, may by ſome means of *aggravation* become *wilful* in another, but not *è contra*, that that which, upon ſome grounds or ſuppoſition of *ſtrength* common to all men, may be *in univerſum* defined a *wilful ſin*, can by any means be *extenuated* into an *infirmity*. That which I now ſay, I mean of any groſs *outward* act, or *habit* of ſin, becauſe in theſe I conceive there is ſome *mora* or *ſtay*, wherein the *ſpirit* may be *adviſed* with; and then that being ſuppoſed in good *health* or *regenerate* ſtate will not fail to ſuggeſt ſufficient arguments againſt that ſin, and ſo be a means to *retract* that *ſudden* ſtollen *conſent*, before it come to *act*, at leaſt to *habit*; Or if it be not it ſelf without *auxiliaries* able to combat with the *temptation*, yet it will out of the *word of God* be able to direct us to ſome *aid*, which being called in, will either improve us to a competent *ſtrength*, or help to *diſarm* and *weaken* the *temptation*, which we ſhall find by *trying*, and making *uſe* of thoſe means; be they our *prayers* either for *grace* in time of need, or as I ſaid *prayer* as a means of *divertiſement*, or be they *faſting*, *vigilance*, &c. or be it but a *tempting* to do our beſt, for this is very ordinary to obſerve in our ſelves, that (when we put our ſelves to it, and *do our beſt*) we prove able to do far more, than ever we dreamt, we had been able. And this is very remarkable, whether you conſider it, as a truth in *morality*, wherein it hath been obſerved that *neceſſity* or *extream* danger enables men to do *miracles*, which when they are *paſt* they are *amazed* to ſee them done by them, (as *Hierocles* excellently ſhews on that *golden Pythagorean* ἀμιςίχιον, Δύναμις δὲ ἀνάγκης ἴσχυσε ναίει) or as a *truth of Scripture*, wherein there be many *promiſes* that God will *aid* when we *fight*, cooperate when we work, *aſſiſt* when we endeavour, and not be *wanting* to them which are not firſt *culpably wanting* to themſelves. *Sect.* 24.

Having

Sect. 25. Having ſaid thus much of *wilful ſins* (for the *diſabuſing* of thoſe who are over-apt to flatter themſelves that their ſins are *infirmities* and no more, and therefore ſure of their *pardon* in *Chriſt*, though *continued* in, or not retracted by *particular repentance*) I ſhall not think this diſcourſe chargeable or accuſable of any dangerous or hurtful *ſeverity*, by being apt to drive men to *deſpair*. 1. Becauſe it is known in Scripture and acknowledged by all, and now confeſt by this Paper, that there is a *tabula poſt naufragium*, *a plank after ſhipwrack*, *repentance*, as it implies *forſaking*, and *change of mind*; and the *working* of that in every ſuch ſinner, is the thing that all this while I intend, and there is no way poſſible for the *working* it, but this, by repreſenting the *danger*, if it be not wrought, which he, that takes all his ſins for *infirmities*, will never be *convinc'd* of, while he ſo thinks. And 2. becauſe the *deſpair* that is *dangerous*, is that which is contrary to the *purifying hope*, to that *hope* that ſets upon *amendment*, by aſſuring that there is mercy to be had on *ſuch terms*; And as any other *hope* is but *groundleſs confidence*, ſo any other *deſpair* but that which makes us *give over* amending, is in ſome reſpects a very *uſeful*, at leaſt not very *noxious*, *deſpair*: *uſeful*, if it ſets us on *mending*, when without it we would not; as in caſe of *deſpair* or diſtruſt only of *our preſent condition*, in reſpect of our *preſent ſins*, but not of the *future*, becauſe there is yet place for *repentance*: or *not noxious*, I mean not ſo far, as to *damn*, or do any thing but *deprive* us of ſome comfortable *aſſurance* here, (the *want* of which, if we *want* nothing elſe, will never *prejudice* any mans *ſalvation*, whatever they think that take this *aſſurance* to be *Faith*) as in caſe of *dying* without all *hope* of Heaven, when that no *hope* proceeds only from an *amazing ſight* of former ſins, which though we have *ſincerely* forſaken, yet none but God infallibly ſees that we have, and our ſelves out of an *humble lowly conceit* of all our own actions, (our *repentance* particularly *undervalued* by us) think and *reſolve* we have not. For ſure if God ſee we have *changed ſincerely*, and ſo there be *aſſurance reſpectu objecti*, in *reſpect* of the *object*, 'tis an *errour* in us to think we have not, (from whence proceeds the *non-aſſurance* of the *Subject*;) and this error if it be only in the *underſtanding*, and produce no *evil* life, will ſure *damn* none that ſhould not otherwiſe be *damned*.

Sect. 26. For whereas it may be *objected*, that he may ſeem to want that *affiance* in Chriſt for ſalvation, which is a *ſaving neceſſary grace*, I anſwer, that that *affiance* (that is ſo) is the *rolling my ſelf on Chriſt for ſalvation*, and *if I periſh*, *I periſh*, the *denying* and *renouncing* all *truſt* in my ſelf in my own *righteouſneſs*, *faith*, *repentance*, my own any thing, but only *Chriſt*, and God's *mercy in him*; not the believing my *perſonal election*, or that I ſhall be ſaved what ever my ſins be, and how *unreformed* ſoever. For beſides that this in an *unreformed* ſinner (ſpeaking of *wilful* ſins) were the believing *of a Lye*, becauſe there is really no mercy or *Salvation* for ſuch; beſides this I ſay, there is no obligation or command in Scripture, which can be thought to make it *duty* or *neceſſary* for any to believe himſelf a true *pœnitentiary* even when he is ſo. 'Tis true we are *commanded* to *prove* our *work*, &c. *Gal.* 6.4. *i. e.* to ponder and ballance every *action* we take in hand whether it will bear the δοκιμὴ *tryal* of the *teſt* or no, and this we are *incouraged* by that which follows, that we ſhall have καύχημα μόνον εἰς ἑαυτὸν, *boaſting only in our ſelves*. But then, firſt, this *precept of trying* is not *a precept of knowing or believing*. Secondly, this *trying his own* work, ſignifies the direct act of conſcience, the doing each *action* with a good *conſcience*, but belongs not to the *reflexive act of conſcience* upon the *whole life paſt*, or if it do, requires not, that every man ſhould at every minute of his life *believe or know infallibly* that his *ſtate* is *good*, and ſhall be ſo to the *end*. Thirdly, the *boaſting* there is ſet only in oppoſition to *boaſting over another* (as appeareth by that which follows *verſ.* 5. *for every man ſhall bear his own burthen*, *i. e. another* mans being *worſe* than you will do you no good) to judging well of our ſelves by that deceitful way of *comparing* our ſelves with thoſe that are worſe than we: and therefore, fourthly, 'tis obſervable that it is not ſaid by way of *promiſe* ἕξει καύχημα εἰς ἑαυτὸν, *he ſhall have matter of boaſting in himſelf*, (for ſure the beſt man living hath little of that) but εἰς ἑαυτὸν μόνον, *only in himſelf*, all the *boaſting* or *comfort* that he hath ſhall be in himſelf and in the uprightneſs of his own *conſcience*, as that is oppoſed to comparing or comforting himſelf (as the *Phariſee* with the *Publican*) becauſe others are worſe than he. And ſo ſtill the *want* of this *aſſurance* being the utmoſt *inconvenience* that this doctrine can poſſibly at the worſt view of it bring upon him, this will amount no higher than ſome preſent *diſcomfort*, which will be recompenced abundantly by the *gains* it brings with it of being *diſdeceived* and brought timely and happily to repentance.

Sect. 27. The ſhort is, let theſe ſins which thou ſeeſt *improved*, perhaps beyond thine expectation, into *wilful ſins*, be *ſincerely reſolved* and *laboured* againſt, and all means *uſed* for the *performing* that *reſolution*, and then if by any unſuperable weakneſs of thine thou faileſt in *performing* it or *overcoming* them, perhaps I ſhall *retract* my doctrine in ſome part as it is appliable to thee; or if I do not, be *confident* I have done thee no conſiderable *injury*, though I ſhould have deceived thee in ſome particular; I am ſure I am not guilty to my ſelf of any *deſign* to do ſo, and therefore I hope my *error* ſhall not be a culpable one, becauſe *error amoris*, *an error of kindneſs*, or *care*, or *love*, in that I deſired to make Heaven as ſure to thee as I could, though not to make thee *overſure* of *Heaven*.

Sect. 28. Somewhat being thus ſet down by way of *character* to know *wilful* ſins by, we ſhall ſuppoſe that that will alſo be *helpful* to the *defining* what *ſins of infirmity are*. For of that no ſcruple will be made to affirm, that whatever ſin is not *wilful* in any of the former deſcriptions of it, muſt be reſolved to be of *infirmity*; there being no *middle* or third betwixt thoſe two in the *ſecond-covenant-account* of ſins. By the rule therefore of *contraries* we ſhall beſt proceed, 1. In general, to define a *ſin of infirmity*, that which is not againſt *ſtrength* or *grace*, or that which (though we *labour* and *endeavour ſincerely* againſt *all ſin*, and uſe what *means* we are *convinc'd* will tend to the *overcoming* of ſin) we yet fall into, either through *humane frailty* alone, or through *Satans cunning*, taking advantage of that our *frailty*.

Sect. 29. As firſt, when (as at firſt we gave hints of reſolution) any *invincible* and ſo *excuſable ignorance* of Gods will in ſome particulars *betray* me to ſome ſin, (for then my *underſtanding* or *ſpirit* is not of *ſtrength* ſufficient to adviſe me) then the ſin is of *weakneſs*, and therefore *Rom.* 14. they that are called the *weak*, *v.* 1. are explained to be they that *lack knowledge*, for that is it that made others apt to deſpiſe or ſet them at nought, *v.* 3. and *v.* 10. which all they that *have* are called *the ſtrong* through that *Chapter*.

Or

Or ſecondly, when the *ſuddainneſs* of *the aſſault* gives not my *ſpirit* leiſure to repreſent thoſe *perſwaſions* and *determents* which it would do if it were not ſo *ſurprized*; and ſo for want of thoſe *repreſentations* on that ſide, the preſent *promiſes* of the *temptation* do *preponderate* and *prevail* againſt all that is offered to the *contrary*; for as a man that hath *time* to ſet himſelf upon his *guard* will be able to *reſiſt* and *vanquiſh* that enemy which by ſurpriſal *takes*, and binds and *conquers* him with eaſe, ſo is the will of a man in caſe of *ſuddain ſurpriſal*; It hath no *leiſure* to make *uſe* of thoſe *ſuccours that reaſon could afford*, if it had *time* to *muſter* them up. And ſo being more *weak* at ſuch times than at other, the ſins that at ſuch time it *yields* to, but would not at another, are *ſins of infirmity*. *Sect.* 30.

For 'tis to be obſerved that the *upper ſoul* moves the *will* not as a *natural* but *rational* agent, uſes *ſyllogiſms* and *arguments* to *perſwade*, hath not that *deſpotical* power to have it at its *beck* or *nod*, 'tis not by a *Go and it goeth, and come and it cometh*, (*as Ariſtotle's Philoſophy* ſeems to ſet it) that what the *underſtanding preſcribes* to be done, the *will muſt* do; but the courſe is of ſome more *length*. The *underſtanding* muſt *diſpute* and *canvaſs* it againſt the *carnal appetite*, *anſwer* the *motives* brought by that, and then give *more perſwaſive* ones for the contrary; and then perhaps the underſtanding is otherwiſe *buſie* at that minute when the *temptations* come, and the *popular carnal argument* that it hath uſed, hath *prevailed* and gotten *conſent* before the *underſtanding* was aware of it, either through preſent *buſineſs* and inability to *attend* more things at once, or for want of an ἀγχίνοια *ſuddenneſs of mind* to repreſent preſently the arguments it hath on its ſide, or to find out the *Sophiſms* on t'other. Or however, To *diſpute* it *throughly* and *clear* all *difficulties*, and indeed (if it be but) to make this one *Syllogiſm*, [the *terrours* of the *Lord* belong to him that commits ſuch a ſin as thou art now *tempted* to, but that man is *mad* that will upon any carnal *motives* venture upon the *terrours of the Lord*, therefore that man is *mad* that will adventure on that ſin,] and then to prove and make good againſt the contrary *fallacious* ſuggeſtions of the *fleſh*, *&c.* every part of that *Syllogiſm*, and moreover to bring it home particularly to thee at that time, will require ſome *ſpace*, and that (by the *ſuddenneſs* and *no warning* of the *temptation*) being not afforded, the *ſpirit* in this caſe is not able to do its *duty*, and ſo the ſin will be committed for want of *ſtrength*. For the *want* of *ſtrength* that eſpecially denominates the ſin of *infirmity*, is not any want of *bodily ſtrength* (for whatever is committed for want only of that is a kind of *rape*, no *voluntary* action, nor conſequently any ſin *ſo much* as of *infirmity*, an *act* or *defect* of the *body*, not of the *will*, and ſo not chargeable upon the *man* which is primarily his *ſoul*, ὁ ψυχὴ σύ, thy ſoul is thou) but of *ſpiritual* or inward *ſtrength*, *i. e.* of *grace*, and of *motives* and *ſuaſories* to obedience, more *effectual*, or *operative*, or powerful, than any the *world*, or *fleſh*, or *devil* hath to the contrary. And ſeeing theſe arguments are perpetually to be had from every *regenerate Chriſtian's ſpirit*, and the only want is the *non-repreſenting* or *non-producing* of them in time of *need*, if the caſe ſtands ſo, that by reaſon of the *ſudden ſurpriſal*, or (which is ſomewhat different) *clancular ſurreption* (when from ſome *indifferent* acts a *ſin* ſteals on us, (as by drinking *one glaſs* of *wine* I am prepared to a readineſs to *drink* a *ſecond*, and perhaps by that ſending up ſome *cloud* to the *underſtanding*, or *warning*, and ſo *emboldning* me, I may be much induced to a *third*, and ſo every *ſtep* make me more unable *not to proceed*) they *cannot* be thus *produced*, this ſin thus *conſented* to muſt needs be a ſin of *infirmity* in him that meerly through *ignorance* of the power of *wine* is ſo *betrayed*, though to him that had one ſuch *warning*, and yet thus falls again, as before I ſaid, I cannot be ſo *favourable*. *Sect.* 31.

Or thirdly, when the *vigilance* and importunate *diligence* and indefatigable *ſiege* of the temptation is ſuch, as that if the man do not watch with as continued a diligence, the *will* will be taken *unfortified*, and ſo by that *diſadvantage* won to conſent, (as in caſe of *daily incurſion* of any one temptation, or of all ſins, ſome at one time, ſome at another, every minute almoſt ſome) then the ſin that is *committed* meerly thus, may paſs for a ſin of *infirmity*; becauſe though every *aſſault* particularly conſidered be ſuch as that the *ſpirit* might have been vigilant enough to *prevent* it, yet to be *ſo perpetually* upon the *guard* is *morally impoſſible*; and ſo ſometime to *nod*, and *ſlip*, or *fall* may paſs uncenſured for an *infirmity*. And therefore when to that which is ſaid truly of the *ſecond Covenant* (that the *condition* of it is *feaſable* becauſe there is now under the Goſpel no more required *ſub periculo animæ*, but to do what we are enabled to do, and no man can be unable to do that) 'tis wont to be *objected* that no man ever *did* all that he is *able* to do, and therefore though it be *Logically poſſible* to do ſo, and ſo to perform the condition of the *ſecond* (though not of the *firſt*) *Covenant*, yet 'tis *morally impoſſible*, *i. e.* 'tis not to be imagined that ever any man will do it, (and then that will be all one in effect with the condition of the *firſt Covenant*, which is acknowledged *utterly impoſſible*,) To this we anſwer, that therefore the *Goſpel* hath made *proviſion* even for theſe *moral impoſſibilities*, and not required the regenerate Chriſtian, *ſub periculo animæ*, to perform alway what ever he is *able* to perform, but indulged ſo much to *humane frailty*, that whatever is *morally conſequent* to that, ſhall be matter of excuſe to us, and ſo particularly to fall ſometimes through daily incurſion of temptation, only becauſe I do not (which it cannot be *expected* I ſhould) *watch always*, will be matter of excuſe alſo. *Sect.* 32.

Beſides theſe three heads of ſins of *infirmity*, ſome others there are, which will not ſo clearly be put under one or ſeveral heads, (ſuch as are thoſe that the levity of the matter and that *inadvertence* betrays us to, (ſuppoſing that that be not *groſs*, or *affected*, or cauſed by ſome *wilful ſin*) for ſome *degrees* of this there will be in the moſt *knowing* and moſt *vigilant* man, and ſome ſins will *drop* from us by this means, which wholly to avoid may be truly ſaid to be above *Humane power*. *Sect.* 33.

One head of theſe ſins of *infirmity* there is yet behind, containing many branches under it, of which 'twould be too long to treat *particularly*, and yet without a *particular* deſcending to *particulars*, hard to define whether they be *infirmities*, or no. Namely, ſins which *paſſion* betrays us to, meaning thereby ſuch *paſſions* which 'tis not in the *Chriſtians power* ſo to *quell*, but that they will be *apt* thus to betray him. Theſe ſins are either 1. *inordinacy* of theſe paſſions themſelves, which I think neither *Nature* nor *Grace* can ſo wholly *conquer* in this life, but that in ſome kind or other there will at ſome time appear ſome *inordinacy*, ſome act of either *immoderate anger*, or *fear*, or *love*, or *joy*, or *ſorrow*, at ſome time or other, and of theſe we may define in general, that he that firſt *ſtudies himſelf* ſo carefully as to diſcern which of theſe he is moſt *inclinable* to by his *temper*, and then *labours* *Sect.* 34.

ſincerely

ſincerely againſt all, but with moſt *induſtry* againſt that, to which he is moſt *inclinable*, (of which ſincerity he will be able to paſs ſome judgments by the daily *impairing* of the violence of thoſe *paſſions*, for ſure if he *labour ſincerely*, eſpecially by the uſe of *proper means*, he will be able to *advance* ſomewhat toward *victory*, though not abſolutely *arrive* to it) ſhall have the excuſe of *infirmities* for his ſome few acts of *immoderate paſſion*.

Sect. 35. Or 2. Theſe ſins are ſome other ſpecial *acts* of ſin which theſe *paſſions* betray men to, which though much *different* in *guilt* as well as *nature* from the *mother*-ſins, and many times very far from *infirmities*, (for ſure he that for *fear* would *ſacrifice* to *Idols*, through *anger kill*, &c. will hardly be thus *excuſed*) yet is it very *poſſible* that ſuch ſins that ſome *paſſions* may *betray* us to, may deſerve that title of *infirmities*. As when any *natural trembling* or other *paſſion* incident to the *fleſh*, being (without any *improvement* into an *inordinate paſſion*) an *incitation* of mind, makes me not diſcern or not weigh the ſinfulneſs of ſome *ſmall light* ſin, which offers it ſelf to rid me from my *fear*, &c. as if the venturing of ſome *leſſer ſin* ſhould promiſe me *reſcue* from *death*, which being otherwiſe repreſented to me as *unavoidable*, were withal very *formidable* to me.

Sect. 36. For although in this caſe the *leaſt ſin* be not in ſtrictneſs to be *admitted*, though it be for the *ſaving* of my *life*, and though the *deliberate reſolution* that in ſuch a caſe I will *venture* on ſuch a ſin, becauſe it is but a ſin of *Weakneſs* and ſo *excuſable*, do make it in that caſe to be *wilful* and *unexcuſable*; yet *abſtracting* it from this, and *conſidering* it not *before-hand*, but only *at the time of ſudden ſurpriſal*, it may be ſaid, that the *temptation* of the *fear* being ſo *great* above the *proportion* and ſize that the *ſin* is at that time repreſented in, this may paſs for a ſin of *infirmity*.

Sect. 37. To come now to *ſpecifical* or *particular* ſins, and define *univerſim* that they are *ſins of infirmity* (as of ſome I did that they were *wilful*) I ſhall not *adventure*, becauſe as I ſaid, ſome *circumſtances* might *improve* ſome acts under thoſe *ſpecies* into *wilful ſins*, in *ſome* men at *ſome* time. All that I ſhall ſay is, that 1. *Evil thoughts* being *ſuddenly* (or aſſoon as they are *deprehended*) *rejected* with *indignation*; 2. *Wandering thoughts* in time of prayer, following us only out of *cuſtom* of thinking on ſome honeſt or *lawful* things (which yet I deſire, and in ſome *ejaculation* pray for *ſtrength* to caſt away from me, when I ſet about that *work*) and never *diſtinctly conſented to*, but *crouding* in upon a *confuſed imperfect conſent*, or *non-rejection*; 3. *Wicked motions unconſented to*, or if on the *ſudden conſented to*, yet preſently *retracted* again, (and not only *ſtrangled* or *fruſtrated* for *want* of *opportunity* of *acting* them) are moſt capable of that title of *infirmities*.

Sect. 38. For any more *particular knowledge* of them, every man will beſt be able to *adviſe* himſelf, when he hath tryed his actions by this *touchſtone*, that [Thoſe only are ſins of *infirmity*, when our *ſincere endeavour* and *induſtry*, and the uſe of *grace* given us, and *prayer* for more *grace*, and other *means* preſcribed us, are not able to free us from *ſome acts* of thoſe ſins, or when all our *failings* in *endeavour*, &c. are but conſequents of *humane frailty*, not *of wilful ſin*.

Of theſe that which I ſhall ſay for cloſe, will, I conceive, be matter of as much *comfort*, as the former part was of *diſcomfort* to any. To wit, that through the *mercy* of *Chriſt* under the *Second-Covenant*, *Infirmities unconquered*, *unforſaken*, *ſticking* to us till our very *deaths*, may be and ſhall be moſt certainly *pardoned* to them, that have nothing elſe to be charged on them: *i. e.* by whom all wilful ſins be *ſincerely forſaken* and for *infirmities*, 1. their ſouls *humbled* in *confeſſion*, and *contrition*, 2. *pardon* humbly *begg'd* in *Chriſt*'s name, and 3. *ſincere endeavour* uſed againſt them; they ſhall I ſay be *pardoned*, if not ſo far as not to be *puniſhed* in this life, yet ſo far as not to *ſeparate* from the *love* of *God* here, or viſion of *God* hereafter, though they be here never wholly *overcome*, or put off.

This I would make the interpretation of that *diſtinction* of a *general* and *particular repentance*, ſo ordinary among Divines, that the *particular repentance* ſhould not only deſcend to *particular wilful* ſins, eſpecially thoſe that are committed after the receiving *knowledge of the truth*, but alſo extend to the *actual forſaking* of them; but the *general repentance* belongs only to *ſins of infirmity*; and that 1. without *deſcending* to all particulars of that kind, 2. without *extending our ſorrow*, &c. for them to *actual forſaking*. For the *ſacrifices* of the law being appointed to be offer'd for theſe *ſins*, but not for *wilful*, argue that Chriſt typified by thoſe *ſacrifices*, *when we were weak*, *died for us*, and by his death hath obtained *pardon* (for all that *walk not after the fleſh*, *but after the ſpirit*) for all their ſins of *weakneſs*, on terms only of humiliation, *particular*, or, where that cannot be, *general confeſſion*, *prayer for pardon*, and *affiance in Chriſt* for that pardon, without any *actual overcoming* or caſting off, or getting rid of them, (which in *wilful* ſins muſt be ſuperadded to the former) ſo, that he that at the time or minute of his *death* ſhould be guilty of one of them, it would not hinder his *ſalvation*, any more than the ſame would be inconſiſtent with a *regenerate juſtified eſtate* in time of life.

So that the concluſion may be ſafe and clear. A true Chriſtian may ſafely live and dy with *ſins of infirmitity* about him, but live or continue in any *wilful* ſin, much leſs dy he cannot, or if he do, he ceaſeth to be ſuch. *He that is born of God ſinneth not*, and *he that doth ſin is the ſervant of ſin*. Some *ſpots* there are which are not the *ſpots of ſons*, *Deut.* 32. 5. and they that are guilty of them, may be *reſolved*, either never to have right unto, or if they had, to have *forfeited* all their *priviledges* of *Saintſhip here*, (ſuch are *juſtification*, &c.) and *hopes* and *benefits* of it *hereafter*.

A PARAPHRASTICAL EXPLICATION

Of Heb. vi.

FOR *this cauſe* (or becauſe it is an evidence of children and *babes* to be *always* fed with *milk*, ſtill taught nothing but the *elements of the beginning of the Oracles of God*, *c.* 5.12. and to know nothing of that *higher doctrine of righteouſneſs*, *i. e.* of our *juſtification* and *ſanctification*, *v.* 13. which depends extremely on the doctrine of *Chriſts Melchizedekian Prieſthood*, *v.* 10. to which *being conſecrated*, *v.* 9. he [*became the author of eternal ſalvation to all thoſe that obey him*,] which words are the *compendium* of the Doctrine of our *Juſtification* and *Sanctification*:) Let *us proceed to* this higher and more *perfect doctrine*, or ſuch as is proportionable to an upper form of Chriſtians, *leaving* or paſſing over theſe *doctrines that Chriſt began with*, (ſuch was that of *repentance and faith*, *Mark* 1.15. the firſt words of his preaching) and not beginning at the very elements of Chriſtianity, again, thoſe fundamental doctrines that the raweſt Chriſtians are taught; as by name thoſe, Firſt, of *repentance* and turning *from our unregenerate works*. Secondly, of *Faith* or belief on God. Thirdly, of *Baptizing*, as that contains both the Baptiſm of *Repentance* and of *Faith* Precedent, both *John*'s Baptiſm, the *Baptiſm of repentance*, and Chriſt's Baptiſm adminiſtred by the *Apoſtles*, the Baptiſm of *Faith* in the *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghoſt*. Fourthly, of *laying* on *of hands*, whether that which is anſwerable to our *Confirmation*, oft mentioned of thoſe that *had* been *baptized*, or that in *Abſolution*, or a third, that *on the diſeaſed*, the ceremony of curing them, (of which there is ſo frequent mention in the Goſpels, *Mat.* 9. 18. *Mark* 5. 23. and 6. 5. and 7. 32. and 8. 23, 25. and 16. 18. *Luke* 4. 40. and 13. 13. and many times in the *Acts* in the deſcription of miraculous cures.) Fifthly, *of the reſurrection of* the dead. Sixthly, *of eternal judgment* or μισθαποδοσία, adjudging of men to eternal life and eternal death. *And by the help of God*, this *we purpoſe to do*, *i.e.* to proceed to thoſe ſublimer doctrines of Chriſt's *Melchizedekian* Prieſthood, forementioned, *c.* 5. and reſumed *v.* 20. of this Chapter. Only for thoſe that are ſuch *non-proficients* in Chriſtianity, that after ſo long profeſſion of that doctrine need ſtill to be taught the principles again, even that of *repentance from dead works*, being themſelves turned back or in danger ſo to turn to their former *Un-chriſtian* unregenerate *courſes*, let them know this important truth, for which I cannot but go out of my way a little, and tell them in a *parentheſis*; That it is *impoſſible*, that thoſe who have been *once regenerated* (for this is the reſult of that which is expreſſed by many phraſes) that have once been *baptized or enlightned*, the word ſignifies both, becauſe *adulti* were not *baptized*, till they had been *catechiſed*, and ſufficiently *inſtructed* in the faith. 2. That have had a *guſt or taſte of the celeſtial gift*, whether of *Chriſt*, that *Tit.* 2. is called σωτήριος χάρις, *ſalvifical ſaving grace*, or whether the *grace of Chriſt*, in the pardon of ſin, and the conſequent of that, peace of conſcience. 3. That have been *partakers of the Holy Ghoſt*, of thoſe gifts and graces which that worketh in the heart by the preaching of the word, or inviſible overſhadowing: and yet further, the extraordinary gifts of tongues, or propheſying, *&c.* in the Church. 4. That have had a *guſt of the good word*, or *Goſpel* (εὐαγγέλιον & καλὸν ῥῆμα, being all one) of Chriſt, and of *the powers*, whether *of the Kingdom of grace*, the ſtate of *Chriſtianity*, (for that is called μέλλων αἰών, the age to come, by the LXXII. *Iſa.* 9. 6. where it is ſet as the title of *Chriſt*, that he is πατὴρ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος, *the father of the age to come*, as oppoſite to that *Judaical* ſtate) or whether of the Kingdom *of Heaven*; and fall *from that ſtate of regeneration*, and thoſe *priviledges* of Gods Spirit that attend it, (for the παραπεσόντας is of equal latitude with all the former particulars, and is the *falling from*, or *forfeiting* of them all) ſhould *renew* or *recover* in an *intranſitive* ſence, or in an *active reciprocal*, *renew or recover themſelves to repentance*, (or once more, being applied to St. *Paul*'s diſcourſe of *repentance*, *that St.* Paul's *preaching* (taken by it ſelf without * *ſuperordinary*) meaſure of *grace*) ſhould *renew* ſuch in a plain *active* ſence) being by ſuch ſins of theirs *guilty of a kind* of ‖ *re-crucifying of Chriſt*, *and putting him to a ſhameful death*: for *Chriſt* who was once *crucified* and ſlain, is as it were *revived* in the *regenerate* Chriſtian's heart, *lives* and *rules* and *reigns* in him *by faith*; and when that man *falls* to his old *unregenerate* courſe again, he doth as it were believe Chriſt an impoſtor, and ſo with the *Jews crucifies Chriſt anew*, *and puts him* to a *contumelious death*.

V. 1. Διὸ (λόγου δικαιοσύνης) ὅπῃ τὸν τελειότητα φερώμεθα, ἀφέντες τὴν τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ λόγον. μετανοίας ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἔργων, καὶ πίστεως, βαπτισμῶν διδαχὴν τε χειρῶν ἐπιθέσεώς τε ἀναστάσεώς τε νεκρῶν, καὶ κρίματος αἰωνίου. 3. καὶ τοῦτο ποιήσομεν, ἐὰν ἐπιτρέπῃ ὁ Θεός. 4. Ἀδύνατον γὰρ τοὺς ἅπαξ φωτισθέντας, γευσαμένους τε δωρεᾶς τῆς ἐπουρανίου, καὶ μετόχους γενηθέντας πνεύματος ἁγίου, 5. καὶ καλὸν γευσαμένους θεοῦ ῥῆμα, δυνάμεις τε μέλλοντος αἰῶνος, 6. καὶ παραπεσόντας ἀνακαινίζειν εἰς μετάνοιαν,

* So when *Wiſd.* 12. 10. 'tis ſaid of the *Amorites*, &c. that *miſchief was bred in them* (*i. e.* was derived to them from *Cham* their Progenitor) *and that their cogitation* καὶ μὴ ἀλλαγῇ εἰς τὸ ἀιῶνα, *would never be changed* in them, 'tis not to be ſo underſtood, that they could not be mended (for the example of *Rahab* and the *Gibeonites* prove the contrary) but that they could not without thoſe ſad puniſhments of which the Author there ſpeaks. ‖ ἀνασταυροῦντας ἑαυτοῖς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ παραδειγματίζοντας.

The clear underſtanding of theſe 3 verſes 4, 5, 6. depends upon theſe ſix *Goſpel-truths* put together, Firſt, that without Gods *Spirit or ſpecial grace* no man can *convert*, *repent*, *renew* himſelf, much leſs *recover* after a *defection*. Secondly, that by this *grace* and ſtrength of God, man may *convert* and *repent*, and being a regenerate convert, *do all things through Chriſt that ſtrengthens him*, *work out his own ſalvation*; and when he *falls*, if God do not *with-draw* that grace, according to the words of our Article, *he may by the grace of God riſe again*. Thirdly, that if in caſe of fall,

God doth ſo *with-draw* his grace, then the man cannot ſo *renew* himſelf, or *recover* to repentance, nor can the *ordinary* power of the *miniſtry* work upon him. Fourthly, that God hath in the Goſpel *threatned* upon our not making *uſe* of this grace, to *with-draw* it or *take* it away from us, as appears by the *parable* of the *talents*, where 'tis ſaid, [*To him that hath, ſhall be given, and from him that hath not, ſhall be taken away even that which he hath*] *i. e.* To him that makes *uſe* of the *grace* given him, to the end for which 'twas given, the *reſiſting* of ſins, *denying of luſts*, and *living ſoberly, and juſtly*, and *godly in this preſent World*, Tit. 2. 12. to him ſhall more *grace be given*; but *from him* that makes not this *uſe* of it, (is an unprofitable *ſteward* of *grace*, hath *grace* but doth not thus *reſiſt* ſins by the help of it, *from him*) *ſhall be taken away even that which he hath.* Fifthly, that God doth not upon every *ſin* committed by a *regenerate man*, no not upon every ſin committed againſt *knowledge*, *againſt grace* (if it be but ſome ſingle act) preſently *with-draw* his *grace*, for this ſin may be preſently *retracted* by repentance, not indulged or ſtaid in, and then to ſuch *humble* ſinners *God gives grace*, doth not *take it away* from them. The caſe that ſuch acts of ſin bring regenerate men to, hath from the Scripture been explained in another diſcourſe, which I deſire may be there conſidered, and not repeated here. And though it be a ſad one, even God's *delivering up to Satan*, yet doth not that infer the *with-drawing* of his *Grace*, or *forſaking*, but rather the *giving* or continuing *ſufficient grace*, 2 *Cor.* 29. 9. *paſſage out*, and *power of bearing it*, 1 *Cor.* 10. 13. But then ſixthly, that upon the *regenerate* man's *walking* after the *fleſh*, *relapſing* into the ſins of his former unregenerate life, *like a dog to the vomit*, &c. or into a new ſet of other ſins, *ſpiritual pride*, *faction* (able to denominate a man *carnal*, 1 *Cor.* 3. 3.) and the like filthineſs of the ſpirit, then doth God *with-draw* his *ſpirit* from that man, and therefore ſuch ſins as theſe are called *peccata vaſtantia conſcientiam, & triſtantia ſpiritum*, *grieving* and *quenching* of the *Spirit of* God; which though it *ſtrives* with ſinners, yet *ſhall* it *not always ſtrive*, *Gen.* 6. 3. *when unrighteouſneſs cometh in*, *i. e.* any old or new *vicious habit*, then the *holy ſpirit of diſcipline will not abide*, *Wiſd.* 1. 5. And therefore 'tis ſaid, 2 *Pet.* 2. 21. That they that *after they have known, turn from the holy Commandment, or the way of righteouſneſs, and are again entangled in the pollutions of the World, which they had once eſcaped*, verſ. 20. *fall into a worſe eſtate than they were in before their regeneration*; which muſt needs be by the *total with-drawing of grace* from them. To which purpoſe is that of St. *James* out of *Solomon*, that *God reſiſteth the proud*, where *reſiſting* is oppoſed to *giving* of grace, and ſo notes *taking it away*, and the *proud* oppoſed to the *humble*, or as in *Virgil* to the *ſubjecti*, are the proud impenitent obdurate ſinners, (So *Deut.* 17. 12. ὁ ἀνθρωπος ὃς ἂν ποιήσῃ ἐν ὑπερηφανίᾳ ὥστε μὴ ἀκοῦσαι) or they that go on in any impenitent courſe againſt *knowledge* or *conſcience*. All which being premiſed, 'tis clear that they that are thus fallen from a *regenerate ſtate* to their *old unregenerate courſe of ſin*, &c. and ſo by Gods *juſt puniſhment deprived* of his grace, without which they were able to do nothing, are not now *poſſibly* able to *recover* or *renew themſelves to repentance*. As they that are only *ſlipt* or *fallen*, but not *layn down* in their mire of ſin, might by the grace which they yet have, and by the preaching of the word, be able to do.

Of Conſcien. p.

παραπεσόντες.

That this is the meaning of the place, may yet farther appear by the *ſimilitude* following, *v.* 7, 8. brought on purpoſe to explain it. For the *ground* that hath the *benefit* of the *rain* to *moiſten* its natural *drineſs*, and ſo to make it *able* to *bear fruit*, and that hath ſuckt in that *rain*, and been *actually moiſtned* by it, (which is the lively expreſſion of the premiſed *regenerate* man) if *it do bring forth fruit to the husbandman*, *perform* that which is *enabled* (and is *expected* from it) to *perform*, (which is an expreſſion of him that makes good *uſe of grace*, lives like *a regenerate* man, this [*he that hath*] in the parable of the *talent*) *it ſhall receive bleſſing from God* (the *more grace* in the parable.) But that ſame *moiſtned* and *manured ground* (the ſame *regenerate* man) *which bringeth forth nothing but thorns and briars*, (the ſervant that proves evil and faithleſs, that makes not *uſe* of *grace* to its due end of *reſiſting luſts*, and *overcoming the world*, but falls into his *unregenerate* ſins, lives as if no *culture* had been beſtowed upon him) is *rejected* (*deprived* of that reward which t'other had) for ſo ἀδόκιμος, an *agoniſtical* word, ſignifies generally in this book, as 1 *Cor.* 9. 27. one that *miſſes the prize*, *the reward*, the *bleſſing* of *more grace*: And contrariwiſe is *nigh to curſing*, that puniſhment of withdrawing of grace due to it, and the *end of it* is to be burnt, or to burning, which whether it be ſet to note *eternal perdition*, or elſe an *extraordinary* kind of *husbandry*, which we call *Devonſhiring*, cutting off the turf, and *Sæpe etiam ſteriles incendere profuit agros, Atque leves ſtipulas crepitantibus urere flammis*, *burning* it upon the ground, to make that bear which *ordinary culture* would do no good on, I ſhall not define. Only from that latter interpretation, which I ſuppoſe will be rejected, I ſhall take the hint to ſay that which though the interpretation be not admitted, will yet be without contradiction true, that how *impoſſible* ſoever it be for ſuch an one to *recover himſelf*, or for the ordinary means to work upon him, yet 'tis ſtill *poſſible*, that God may by ſome *extraordinary* means of *ſpiritual husbandry recover* and *reduce* that man. An image of this you may ſee among the *Iſraelites*; When the power was put by God in the *Sanhedrim*, and a courſe provided for the choice of them anew as they failed; as long as this courſe was obſerved, the government was held up. Nay when by their careleſneſs and omiſſions, thoſe elections failed, and ſo the body of the government was diſſolved, as it were, *no King*, no Government in *Iſrael*, nor courſe imaginable to recover any again, then God ſtirred up extraordinary men, *Schofetim*, *Judges*, Dictators, and they did the ſame thing that the Ariſtocracy had done before, *v. Grot. in Jud.* 1. All that is here affirmed is only this, that there is no promiſe that he will, and the thing is only in the *hands*, the *free hands of God*, not ſo much as *conſtrained* by a *promiſe*, and ſo no ground either of *depending* upon it for my ſelf that God will do it for me, or *prejudging* others that for them he will not do it.

7. Γῆ γὰρ ἡ πιοῦσα τὸν ἐπ' αὐτῆς πολλάκις ἐρχόμενον ὑετὸν, καὶ τίκτουσα βοτάνην εὔθετον ἐκείνοις δι' οὓς καὶ γεωργεῖται, μεταλαμβάνει εὐλογίας ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ.
8. ἐκφέρουσα δὲ ἀκάνθας καὶ τριβόλους, ἀδόκιμος, καὶ κατάρας ἐγγύς, ἧς τὸ τέλος εἰς καῦσιν.

I can foreſee but one objection now producible againſt the *probability* of this interpretation, and it is this, that this *impoſſibility* of doing any good by our own *natural ſtrength* without Grace is ſo *univerſal* a truth, that it cannot be here appropriated to this one caſe of *apoſtaſie* or *recidivation* of the *regenerate*. For the *regenerate*, *remaining* ſo, can do no *good* thing without it, and thoſe that are not yet *regenerate* are as unable to *convert* themſelves, as theſe are to *recover* or *renew*. To

which

which though I might anſwer, that the inſtancing in this *particular*, is moſt (and only) proper to the *Apoſtles* preſent purpoſe, who ſpeaks to *converts*, who were either thus *fallen* or in danger thus to *fall*, (and therefore though the *Aphoriſm* might be extended to thoſe others, yet we have no reaſon to expect, that the *Apoſtle* ſhould ſo far *recede* from his buſineſs in hand as to do it, and ſo the *objection* will be of no force) yet will the *anſwer* be more *clear* and *ſatisfactory*, if I add, that indeed that which is here ſaid, is *proper* only to this *kind* of ſinners, the relapſt regenerate. For of the *regenerate* not ſo faln, it is moſt certain and agreeable to Scripture-doctrine to affirm, that by the *ſpirit of Chriſt he can do all things*, that he hath *ſufficient grace*, and by that *ſufficient ſtrength* to do what God in the *Goſpel requires* of him, and therefore 'tis affirmed of *him*, *i. e.* his *perſon* thus enabled, that he is thus able; and conſequently he is every where *exhorted* to do accordingly, to *work out his ſalvation*, *to ſtand*, to *quit himſelf like a man*, to *purifie himſelf*, and a hundred the like, which (every one) ſuppoſe him to have *grace* by which to do it.

And for *unregenerate*, though indeed he having no *grace*, can as yet do nothing, yet ſome *promiſes* there are in the *new Covenant* of giving of grace to him, (mention of giving Chriſt *for every man*, (that Chriſt being the σωτήριος χάρις, *the ſalvifical grace that appears to all*, *teaching them*, &c.) and in *Chriſt* ſtriking a *Covenant* with thoſe to whom he is *given*, and part of the effect of that *Covenant*, δῦναι λατρεύειν, *to give ſtrength to ſerve him*; and again, mention of the *talents* diſpens'd among the *ſervants*, to *all ſome*, and upon the good *uſe* of the *leaſt*, *more* beſtowed. From whence ſure it may be concluded, that 'tis by ſome *default* of our own, whoſoever have not *ſufficient grace* given us, (eſpecially the *promiſe* being ſo *punctual*, that *God will give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him of God by importunate unwearied prayer:*) Whereas in caſe of the forementioned *relapſe*, there is no ſuch *promiſe* of *Grace*, to give us ſuch a *claim* to it, nor conſequently the ſame degree of *poſſibility* to *renew*, that the other hath to *convert*, Gods *promiſe* of giving *grace* to them, which do not *reſiſt* it, adding much to that poſſibility; and his *no promiſe* to the other, being *ſufficient proof* of the *impoſſibility* of the other, according to the importance of *Aquinas* his note out of *Ariſtotle*, *l.* 3. *Eth.* that thoſe things are ſaid to be poſſible to us which we can do by the *help* of our *friends*, (which we can do by a *derived power*, though of our ſelves *originally* we cannot) and God being a *friend* (I mean no enemy, but lover and helper beyond all friends) to *unregenerate* men, ſo far as to *give Chriſt to dye* for them, and his *holy ſpirit* to *deſcend to them*, being ſuch *enemies*, to *love* them and give them the effects of *love*, whereas to them that have *rebelled* and *vexed* his *Spirit*, he is not ſuch a *friend*, but an *enemy to fight againſt them*, *Iſa.* 63. 10. And ſo no ſuch *ſecundary derived* way of *poſſibility* competible to them, becauſe no ſuch aſſurance of any friend to aid them in it, there being none other *imaginable* but *God*, and he being to ſuch an one an *enemy* rather. Parallel to this place thus interpreted is that in the ſame *Epiſt. c.* 10.

For thoſe that after the accepting of the knowledge of the truth, after the embracing the *Goſpel*, or *Chriſtianity*, being *regenerate* and *born anew of water* and the *Holy Ghoſt*, do fall *willingly* into their *old* (or other *new*) *courſes* of ſin (for ſo ἁμαρτάνειν ſignifies, not the ſingle *act*, but the *habit* of ſin, 1 *Joh.* 3. 6. and 5. 18. *Rom.* 2. 12. *Heb.* 3. 17. and ἑκουσίως added thereto notes it to be a *voluntary* wilful trade of ſin, which is ſuppoſed by having *received knowledge of the truth*; whereas 'tis poſſible to continue *ignorantly*, and ſo by infirmity, in ſuch *habit*, and then that will not be capable of ſuch *aggravations* as there do follow, nor withal pertinent to this caſe) by this means fall into a condition, for which the *Goſpel* hath not provided any ordinary *remedy*. Which is the meaning of [*there remains not now a ſacrifice for ſins.*] And that ſence ariſeth thus. For them that had *ſinned ignorantly* under the *law*, there was *place* for *ſacrifice*, the *Prieſt* was to offer a *ſin offering* for them (called ordinarily in the 72. περὶ ἁμαρτίας) and they were not to be farther *puniſhed* or proceeded againſt *in foro*: but he that did *wilfully* or *deſpightfully* break the law, was upon *ſufficient* proof of it by *witneſſes*, put to death in *capital*, or otherwiſe puniſhed in other *crimes*, without *mercy* or *pity* to him, (which is the ſum of the 28. *verſ.*) and as *Joſeph.* 2. *contr. Ap.* ſaith ἀδύνατος ἡ τῆς κολάσεως παραίτησις, there was *no poſſible eſcaping of puniſhment*, no place for any *ſacrifice*, and therefore when *David* ſpeaks of his ſins of adultery and murther, *Pſal.* 51. he tells God, *verſ.* 16. לא־תחפץ זבח ואתנה עולה לא תרצה *thou wouldſt not have ſacrifice*, *and if I had* (or *ſhould have*) *given thee burnt-offerings*, *thou wouldſt not be pleaſed*, or *accept* them, *i. e.* my crimes are ſuch as for which there is no *ſacrifice* in the Law: And ſo in like manner proportionably to thoſe types, he that hath ſinned through *ignorance*, or *ignorantly* lived, and gone on in *ſin*, (and ſuch the ſins of the *unregenerate* life are counted to be, done *ignorantly in unbelief*, as St. *Paul* ſaith of himſelf, and the ſame will hold of the ſins of thoſe that are *Chriſtians* in *profeſſion*, *baptized*, &c. and yet have not amended their *lives* or forſaken their *ſins*, for they are ſtill in an *unregenerate ſtate*, not capable of that deſcription, *c.* 6. 4, 5.) *there is mercy* to be had for him (as St. *Paul* ſaith of himſelf, 1 *Tim.* 1. 13.) *Chriſt* hath *died*, offered himſelf a *ſacrifice* for ſin, and ſo delivered men from the *danger* of ſuch ſins, upon condition that they do *repent* of them, and *amend*; nay by this *ſacrifice* of his he hath purchaſed *grace* for ſuch, *ſufficient* to bring them out of that *darkneſs* to *light*, from that ſtate of *unregeneration* to *repentance*, ſo that for that man conſidered in that ſtate, though he be a ſinner, yet (as St. *John* ſaith, 1 *Epiſt.* 2. 1.) Chriſt is an *advocate* and a *propitiation*, and here there *remaineth a ſacrifice*, a means of *pardon* and a means of *converting*, Chriſt *giving himſelf*, both that he might *redeem* and *purifie*, *Tit.* 2. 14. *juſtifie* and *ſanctifie*. Yea farther, when this man being regenerate falls into any *ſingle act of ſin*, if it be through *ignorance* or *weakneſs* (as ſtill there remain ſome *reliques* of them in the *regenerate*, the ſtate in this *nonage* of ours, being but an imperfect ſtate) then ἔτι *yet* or *ſtill* this *ſacrifice* remains, and pardon is had by it to the *regenerate diſciple* upon *acknowledgment* and *petition*; nay if it be not capable of the excuſe of *ignorance* or *weakneſs*, yet if it be not *continued* in, but *retracted* preſently by *repentance*, this ſacrifice ἔτι *ſtill remains* in force for him, as in the Law when the *leproſie* doth *not ſpread*, *Lev.* 13. 23. or is *healed* in the *Leper.* 14. 3. then though the *Prieſt ſhut him up again ſeven days*, &c. anſwerable to *excommunication* or *delivering up to Satan*, yet ſtill *v.* 4. the *Prieſt* ſhall *offer ſacrifice* for his cleanſing; and ſo here though the *ſin* be *leproſie*, an *unclean ſpot* in the ſoul, yet being not *ſpreading* but preſently *retracted* by repentance, it may bring ſome *inconveniences* upon him, ſuch as have been mentioned

26. Ἑκουσίως γὰρ ἁμαρτανόντων ἡμῶν μετὰ τὸ λαβεῖν τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τῆς ἀληθείας,

οὐκ ἔτι περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν ἀπολείπεται θυσία.

28. Ἀθετήσας τις νόμον Μωσέως, χωρὶς οἰκτιρμῶν ἐπὶ δυσὶν ἢ τρισὶ μάρτυσιν ἀποθνήσκει.

elſewhere in the caſe of *delivering up to Satan*; but yet it may paſs for a *ſpot of ſons*, at leaſt ſuch as ſhall now not hinder from being a ſon; and this *ſacrifice* here, or 1 *Joh.* 1. 7. the *blood of Chriſt* parallel to it, *cleanſeth from ſuch ſins* as theſe, continues *pardon* and *grace* as yet to ſuch, obtains of God that he *with-draw* neither. But if any man, after the *embracing* of Chriſt, *receiving* the *truth* and *grace*, *i. e.* being thus *regenerate*, ſhall return to his *old pollutions* again, (or ſome new in exchange for them, the *filthineſs of the ſpirit* inſtead of that *of the fleſh*) to a *courſe* and *trade* of *ſin*, having not now the excuſes or alleviations, of which before he was capable, ſhewing himſelf to *contemn* both the *mercy* and *grace* of God, to *deſpiſe* that *pardon*, and (to make no uſe of, but contrariwiſe) to *reſiſt* that *grace*; there is no *direction* for any *offering* for ſuch; this very *ſacrifice* of Chriſt belongs not to him ſo far as by *Covenant* to obtain continuance of *pardon* for him, or continuance of *grace*; God may juſtly withdraw both, and *Chriſt's blood* ſay nothing to the contrary; nay, God hath told us that in this *caſe* he will *with draw* both in the places forementioned; and the ſame may be collected from this place from the aggravations here ſet upon the ſin, that it is the *treading upon the Son of God*, *profaning the blood of the Covenant*, *i. e.* making the blood of Chriſt *uneffectual* to his *pardon*, and contumeliouſly uſing the *ſpirit of grace*, and ſo *grieving* and *quenching that ſpirit*. And ſo *v.* 27. all that remains behind in *juſtice*, or by tenour of the *ſecond Covenant*, *expectable* from God, is that he ſhould proceed to *judge* ſuch a ſinner, and his *zeal* or *wrath burn* like fire, to conſume all ſuch *gainſayers* or *adverſaries* that walk thus contrary to all his methods of mercy, of grace; and from hence all that can toward *comfort* of ſuch be concluded, is, that 'tis not here ſaid, that God cannot or never *will* give *grace* again to ſuch, or uſe *means* for the *recalling* them, becauſe of God this is not here affirmed. From which negative argument, though the *poſſibility* of ſuch *recovery* may be concluded, yet there are little grounds to *conclude* it *probable*, or reaſonable for any man (that ſhould by that be encouraged to ſpiritual ſecurity) to *depend* or *hope* in it, for if the weight of one *paſſage* be obſerved (*how much worſe puniſhment ſhall he be thought worthy of*, or *adjudged to? i. e. worſe* than that under *Moſes law*, when the *offender*, *v.* 28. was *put to death without mercy*) we ſhall rather have *reaſon* to *fear* God will puniſh ſuch with *exciſion* or *cutting* off, without giving any new ſtock of *grace* to *recal* them again: For the word ἀξιοῦσθαι in this book doth not ſo often import *being thought worthy*, (which might conſiſt with *contrary mercy*) *as meeting* with that reward, *actual receiving* of it. So ἀξιοῦσθαι δόξης, *Heb.* 3. 3. is to have *honour beſtowed* upon him, (and ἀξιοῦσθαι τιμῆς, 1 *Tim.* 5. 17.) and not only to be *thought worthy* of it. In proportion to which if the words ſhould be interpreted and taken without *exception* or *diſpenſation*, [ἀξιωθήσεται, &c. *he ſhall be puniſhed in a worſe manner*] there will be little place of *comfort* for ſuch to depend on, and from thence to fall into ſuch dangerous *ſnares*; and yet becauſe after all this, 'tis poſſible that though ἀξιωθήσεται in the *good* ſenſe ſignifie *actual giving*, yet it may not in the *ill*, *actual puniſhing*, becauſe to *think worthy* and to *reward*, ſtill go together in *God*, in *retribution* of *good*, but not ſo in *evil*, his *pardoning mercy* oft interceeding; and again, becauſe thoſe words may well paſs not for any *law ſet to God*, (but only as a *means* to keep us from ſo *falling*, when we *ſtand*, by ſetting ſuch a *direful character* upon it, ſhewing us how *promiſeleſs* and *dangerous* ſuch our ſtate is,) it will therefore be no temptation to any who is in this *ſad* eſtate to be *hopeleſs*, or give over *labouring* to get out again, but rather a *Summons* or *Proclamation* of *terrour*, ſtraight to *awaken* him out of that eſtate to *humiliation* and *prayers* to *God*, leſt it be *too late*. And in this the example of *David* will be *encouragement* to him who after a years *ſleep* or *lethargy* in thoſe ſins of *adultery* and *murther*, &c. (which were ſuch *falls* of a *regenerate man*, and by God's ordinary means never retracted all that while) was yet by God's grace, and miſſion of a Prophet extraordinary *recalled* and *reduced* again, though it coſt him afterwards many *flouds* of *tears* and penitential expreſſions to waſh out thoſe ſpots which he had thus contracted (and though even ſtill he lies under the reproach of that ſin, when he doth not of any other, becauſe that *only* was *indulged* in ſo *long*) 1 *Kings* 15. 5. And the ſame may perhaps be ſaid of *Solomon* alſo, who after ſuch heavy *falls*, which beyond all the children of God are ſadly recorded of him in Scripture, was (as his *Eccleſiaſtes* gives us ſome grounds of *hope*) by reſtoring of *Gods grace* unto him brought back to *repentance*; *God's mercy* being beyond all promiſe (I ſhall add, beyond all other *example*) to him in this behalf.

29. ὃ γὰρ υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ καταπατήσας, καὶ τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης κοινὸν ἡγησάμενος, ἐν ᾧ ἡγιάσθη, καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος ἐνυβρίσας.

30. φοβερὰ, ἢ τὶς ἐκδοχὴ, &c.

29. πόσῳ χείρονος ἀξιωθήσεται τιμωρίας;

And therefore the cloſe muſt be, that if we have *followed* them in their *ſins*, we muſt be ſure to *imitate* them alſo, not only in the repentance, and *ſincerity* of that, but in all the *degrees* and *demonſtrations* of their *repentance*, if we *hope* for the *mercy* which they met with. To *which* I ſhall add no more ſave only this, that the *product* of that which from theſe places hath been *concluded*, ſeems to be very agreeable with that famous caſe ſet by St. *Auguſt. l. de Perſever.* of two men ſuppoſed to be *converted* together, to live the life of *converts* in the ſame manner, to fall together, and ſo to continue ſome time, and then one of them *before death* to *recover* and *riſe* again, and the other to *dye* in his *ſtate* of relapſe; where he makes this an argument and example of God's making a *diſcrimination* betwixt men, ſuppoſing this laſt act of recovery in the one, to be an act of ſpiritual extraordinary grace to him, which was not given, nor by any obligation due unto the other; which is the moſt that from theſe two places thus paraphraſed hath been collected.

Sicut ſine minutis peccatis nemo unquam fuit, aut eſſe poterit; ita ſine capitalibus criminibus, dante & auxiliante Deo, omnimodis & poſſumus & debemus, Aug. Serm. 56. de Temp.

He that thinketh he ſtandeth, let him take heed leſt he fall. 1 Cor. 10. 12.

If any man be overtaken in a fault, you that are ſpiritual reſtore ſuch a man, conſidering thy ſelf leſt thou alſo be tempted. Gal. 6. 1.

Then ſaith the Devil, I will return to my houſe from whence I came out; and coming, he findeth it empty, ſwept, and garniſhed; then goeth he and taketh with him ſeven other ſpirits worſe than himſelf, and they go in and dwell there, and the end of that man is worſe than the beginning. So ſhall it be to this evil generation. Mat. 12. 42.

Behold thou art made clean, go, ſin no more, leſt a worſe thing happen unto thee, Joh. 5. 14.

Of a Late, or a Death-bed
REPENTANCE

CONCERNING a *late* or *Death-bed repentance*, (which I conceive much fitter for a *ſad ſecret conſideration* in the preſence only of God, and the Scripture, and ones own ſoul; than for a *diſpute* or *debate*, wherein either each party may be unwilling to *yield*, or willing to *retain* their own prepoſſeſſions, or elſe that perſon that hath *long depended* on the benefit of a *late repentance*, may think it great *raſhneſs* to *reſign* up that *hold* upon *ſlight* grounds, and ſuch will any ſeem to be at a ſuddain tranſient repreſentation;) It muſt firſt be acknowledged, that one of theſe two things is ordinarily underſtood by it, either the *perfecting our accounts with God* at that time, *reinforcing all our former good reſolutions*, and *ſhutting up* that buſineſs of our ſouls, which in time of health had been ſincerely *begun*, but not *perfected*; or elſe the *Beginning* of that work of *Repentance* at that time. Sect. 1.

For the firſt of theſe it is acknowledged, that the *Cloſe* of *our lives*, whether it be *old age*, or *ſick-bed*, is very proper and uſeful to that purpoſe. For the perſon that hath before that, ſincerely converted to God with unfeigned *ſorrow* and *confeſſion* of all former ſins, and firm *reſolution* of amendment, (which is the *leaſt* that *true repentance* can conſiſt of) may then, when he ſees himſelf drawing toward a *period of a life*, mixt with *infirmities*, and *ſins*, lay his full *load* on his own ſhoulders, and ſo with *true ſorrow* and *compunction*, *come heavy laden to his Saviour*, lay down that burthen before God by particular *confeſſion*, and *beſeech* his *pardon* through the *ſufferings* and *ſatisfaction* of Chriſt for every of theſe; which *pardon* the true ſincere *penitent* hath on thoſe terms promiſe to *receive* from Heaven. Nay, he that had before made many good *reſolutions*, and yet through *cuſtom* of the place, through ſtrength of *natural conſtitution*, and ſuch like *temptations*, hath hitherto not been ſo faithful to his *reſolutions*, as he ought, may now at laſt upon God's *viſitation*, and by help of this *diſcipline of Heaven*, *radicate* and *ſettle ſuch reſolutions* ſo deep, that they would be conſtant, and perſevering, if he ſhould again recover; and ſo this *diſcipline* may in that caſe be thought to have been deſigned by God to this *wholeſome* end, and the working of ſuch an *effect* will no doubt be *acceptable* in his ſight. Sect. 2.

But for the ſecond, the *beginning*, I ſay the *beginning* the *work of repentance at that time*, I deſire theſe particulars may ſeriouſly be laid to heart. 1. In a general view of it, whether it be not *reproachful* and contumelious thus to offer God the *refuſe* and vileſt of our *age* and *parts*, like that offering to *Ceres Phygalienſis* in *Pauſanias*; none of the honey of their *bees*, but only *the wax*, or juiceleſs part of their labour; and of their wool, thoſe fleeces which *were not fit for uſe*, *but full of the daglocks*, *the courſeſt and fouleſt part of it*. That kind of wool, if a late *Critick*'s bold conjecture might be heeded, was it in which the *ſponge* of *vinegar* was put, when 'twas given *Chriſt* on the *Croſs*. The *Criticiſm* I ſhall confeſs very *inſolent*, but the obſervation on that *ſuppoſition*, *true* and *obvious* enough, that it was the greateſt *contumely* that could have been offered unto Chriſt. Sect. 3.

μαλισθὸν τὰ κηρία. τὰ μὲν εἰς ἱερασίαν τῶν ἥκοντα· ἀλλ' ἔτ' ἀνδαλέα τῷ ὀσύπῳ. ὀσύπῳ, non ὑσσώπῳ mendose. *Heinſ. in Ariſt.*

2. Whether a perſon that now in time of *youth* or *health*, *depends* in any meaſure upon that *repentance* of *old age*, or *diſeaſe*, that *defers the forſaking of wilful ſins*, or *labouring* to overcome *paſſions* or *vanities* for the preſent, in contemplation of the poſſibility of doing all this at the laſt, and of the conceived *benefits* or uſefulneſs of ſuch *repentance*, do not, for the preſent, *grieve* and *reſiſt*, and *refuſe* the *holy Spirit* of *God*, which at that time importunes to be *heard* and *obeyed*.

3. Whether he do not promiſe himſelf, that though Gods ſpirit be thus *grieved* and *reſiſted*, yet he will never be *wearied out*, but will be as bountiful and conſtant in giving of grace, after *ſuch reſiſtance*, as before. Sect. 4.

4. Whether to *hope* this, be not *contrary*, as to that of the *Prophet*, *Iſa.* 63. 10. *They rebelled and vexed his holy ſpirit*, *therefore he was turned to be their enemy*, *and he fought againſt them*; ſo alſo to the *method* of God in diſpenſing his *Grace* deſcribed in the *Goſpel*, eſpecially in the *parable* of the *Talents*, which goes upon this rule, that he that makes *uſe* of, and improves that meaſure of *Grace* which *God* affords, *ſhall have more*, but he that doth not, that *which he hath ſhall be taken away from him*; As *Gen.* 6. 3. where we read, *my ſpirit ſhall not always ſtrive with fleſh*; the *Greek hath* οὐ καταμενῶ, *ſhall not abide* or *dwell* with him; and the *Hebrew* is thought to have a peculiar notion (יָדוֹן from נרן a ſheath) *my ſpirit*, or the ſpirit which I have given to man, *ſhall not be* thus unprofitably laid up, and *ſheathed in him*, the *talent* that lies ſo long idle ſhall at length be *taken away*, and the *floud be ſent* to *awake* or *drown* ſuch *unprofitable ſpirited men*. It is the phanſie of a very learned man, that theſe were the τὰ ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύματα, 1 *Pet.* 3. 19. *the ſpirits* (*in priſon* ſay we) of whom God ſo complains that they *were ſheathed*, lay idly and unprofitable in mankind, in *Noah's days who went and preacht to them*. Which if it be rightly conjectured by him, will conclude them, and all ſuch others in the number of the ἀπειθήσαντες, *v.* 20. *diſobedient*, whoſe *repentance* and amendment God's patience (ἅπαξ ἐξεδέχετο) *once expected*, and at length gave over *expecting*; the very ſame provoking condition (expreſt by the ſame word, ἀπειθήσασι) that *Heb.* 3. 18. is put under that direful *Oath* of God, that *they ſhould not enter into his reſt*. Thus the preaching of the Goſpel, the means of working grace being allowed in an eminent manner to Gods people the Jews, and after the death of Chriſt, yet farther continued to them for ſome time, upon their *reſiſting of thoſe means*, *is taken* away from them, *Matth.* 21. 43. To which purpoſe that *terrible* paſſage ſo oft repeated and ſo little underſtood (*Matth.* 13. 13. *Mark* 4. 12. *Luke* 8. 10. *Joh.* 12. 40. *Acts* 28. 26. *Rom.* 11. 8. all Sect. 5.

taken

taken out of *Iſa.* 6. 9.) is very obſervable, being in the place of the *Acts* peculiarly applied to this matter, the removing of the *means of Grace* from the *Jews* to the *Gentiles*, ver. 28. of all which ſeveral repetitions of the ſame words, this is the plain conſtant ſence, that *becauſe* they had firſt *reſiſted* that *powerful* means of *grace*, ſo long vouchſafed unto them, therefore they were by God's juſt puniſhment deprived of thoſe means (that ſpoken to them *obſcurely* in *parables*, which was to others *plainly*, as the places in the Goſpel ſpecifie) and ſo delivered up to *hardneſs* of *heart*. For this reaſon or cauſe (ſo γὰρ denotes) *becauſe their heart was* (in the preter tenſe, *was before*, not *is*, in the preſent) *waxen groſs*, and *their ears were dull of hearing*, βαρέως ἤκουσαν in the *aoriſt*, they *had* for ſome indefinite time *been* ſo *ſlow* and *dull* in hearing, καὶ ἐκάμμυσαν, *their eyes had they cloſed*, *leſt they ſhould at any time ſee, or hear, or underſtand, or convert, and ſo God ſhould heal them.* That this is the meaning of that hard place (a proclaiming of *conſequent deſertion* from *God* upon their precedent *obdurating* their hearts againſt *Gods* means, and not any *abſolute*, *antecedent*, *unprovoked* act of God's *hardning* of them) the manner of ſetting down the place both in Saint *Matthew*, and in the *Acts*, and the rendring it as a *reaſon* of *Chriſt's ſpeaking to them in parables*, in three other places, will inforce; as might be more largely here manifeſted, if it were ſeaſonable. And indeed (to return from this ſhort digreſſion) the *promiſes* of the Goſpel go generally on this ground, aſſurance of *grace to the humble*, that is, to thoſe that being *ſenſible* of their *danger* through ſin, do obey Gods *call*, and reſign themſelves up as *Subjects* to *Chriſt*, but withal that threat adjoined of *reſiſting the proud* or diſobedient, *Ja.* 4. 6.

Sect. 6. And though it may be ſaid that God doth not always *withdraw* his *Grace*, and his *calls*, the *means* of *grace*, upon every ſuch *reſiſtance* of ours, and therefore I may ſtill hope that he will continue them to me to the *hour of my death*, and then I may make uſe of them; yet the *anſwer* will be pregnant enough.

Sect. 7. 1. That although God upon every act of our *reſiſtance* doth not wholly withdraw *all grace*, yet we have reaſon to think that the oftner we *refuſe*, and reſiſt, the more apt God is to *forſake* and deſert us, and perhaps the *weaker* are his *after-calls*; As the *Angel of God* which he promiſed to *ſend* as a guardian *before Iſrael*, *Exod.* 23. 20. indued with the *power of God*, v. 21. was, ſay the learned *Jews*, upon their *worſhipping the Calf*, taken away from them, and an inferiour weaker *Angel* given in his ſtead, with no more than meer *Angelical* power; and this they ground on *Exod.* 33. 3. where God, that *v.* 2. ſaith, *he had promiſed to ſend his Angel before them*, now tells them, *he will not go up in the midſt of them for they are a ſtiff-necked people.* And then ſure this will be able to inforce that *warning* of Gods concerning that Angel, *Exod.* 23. 21. *Beware of him, and obey his voice, provoke him not*; as being ſure that any ſuch *provocation* will bring ſome *revenge* or puniſhment after it. A gleame of which truth it was, that the Heathens conceived that their τοπικοὶ θεοὶ, the *Gods*, or *Angels* of *Cities* or *Nations*, did upon the *provocations* and *ſins* of the inhabiters ſolemnly forſake their Altars and Temples, reſign up their care and tuition of them. Secondly, that every *act* of our preſent *reſiſtance* adds to our future *obduration*, as the beating of an hammer on an anvil (ſuch is the νοῦς ἀντίτυπος in *Theod.* the ſoul that reverberates every ſtroke or call,) makes the anvil the *ſmoother*, and in effect the *harder*, I mean leſs capable of impreſſion; and then in the *ordinary diſpenſation of the ſpirit*, though God ſhould continue the *ſame degree of Grace*, after our frequent *reſiſtances*, which he gave before; yet we ſhould then be leſs likely to *receive it*, than we were before, when yet it appears we did not *receive it*. Whether by *one* or *both* of theſe means it comes to paſs, I know not; but ſure every ſuch *ſin* that is thus added to the *tale*, makes the *reduction* of any ſinner more *difficult* and *improbable* than before it was; and I ſhall appeal to the *conſcience* of every ſuch man that hath for any time *flattered* himſelf with the *hopes* of what a *Death-bed repentance* may do for him, whether he do not find that ever ſince he entertained thoſe *hopes*, he hath grown more *wretchleſs*, *prophane*, *Atheiſtical*, and ſo much farther from the end he *hopes for or depends on*, and every day in an eſtate more *deplorable*, and *deſperate*, than other.

Sect. 8. Thirdly, that we have no *reaſon* of *believing* or *hoping*, farther than we have grounds from the *word of God*, (the foundation of all belief and hope) and that either from ſome *promiſe*, or *example* there.

And therefore the next thing I deſire ſhould be conſidered, is,

1. How far thoſe *promiſes* and *examples* may be extended, and from thence that it be reſolved *unreaſonable* and *unſafe* to extend our *hopes* or *perſwaſions* of our ſelves any farther, than thoſe will make it *prudent* for us to extend them.

Sect. 9. For the *promiſes*, that which is moſt familiar with us, and on which 'tis moſt likely moſt men take up this hope, is that, wherewith our *Common-prayer-book* begins, *At what time ſoever a ſinner doth repent him of his ſins*, &c. of which (that we miſtake it not) theſe two things are obſervable.

1. That that place contains no *promiſe* of God's giving the *grace of repentance at all times*, which is the only thing which all this time we conſider; but only that *at all times* God is ready to *forgive* on ſuppoſition that we do *repent*.

2. That that place cannot ſo fitly or probably be applyed to a *death-bed repentance*, becauſe if we look into the margent of our books we ſhall ſee the place cited from *Ezech.* 18. 21, 22. and therefore is in juſtice no farther to be extended, as an *infallible promiſe of Scripture*, than that in *Ezech.* will bear; and that upon examination will yield no more than this, *that at what time ſoever a wicked man ſhall convert to God, turning from all his ſins, that he hath committed*, and on the contrary live, and perform the actions of a new life, *keep all Gods Statutes*, that is, perform (*though not perfect, yet*) *ſincere, univerſal, impartial* obedience, *and do that which is lawful and right, he ſhall ſurely live, he ſhall not die, his tranſgreſſions ſhall be forgiven, and in his righteouſneſs*, his renewed ſincere obedience, *he ſhall live.* Which *doing*, and *keeping*, and *righteouſneſs*, how it can be applyed to him which begins his work not till he ſees that he is juſt ready to *dye*, will hardly be imaginable.

Sect. 10. *Qui promiſit pœnitenti veniam, non promiſit peccanti pœnitentiam.*

But having ſaid thus much of this one Place, I remember the ſaying of an *ancient* (uncontradicted by any that I have heard of) that *though God promiſe pardon to all penitents at all times, yet he hath no where promiſed repentance to thoſe all at all times*, and that is all we now ſpeak of, and therefore ſhall

now

now ſuppoſe there are no ſuch places, and therefore ſeek no farther for them; and though without ſuch *promiſe* 'tis poſſible God may ſtill give that *grace* of *repentance*, yet that he ſhould do ſo;

1. It is *extraordinary*, and therefore he that deſpiſes his *preſent* offers, hath little *reaſon* to *hope* that thoſe *extraordinaries* ſhall be reſerv'd for him, and if ſtill he will *hope*, *Job* hath told him, *The hypocrites hope ſhall periſh*, and I ſhall be bold to add, that there is no greater degree of *Hypocriſie*, than this *want of ſincerity*, which appears now in him by his *not accepting of grace* for the *preſent*, by *refuſing* or *deferring* to do that which he is *enabled* and *ſolicited* to do.

Inſtead of ſeeking after more ſuch *promiſes* I ſhall add one terrible *threatning*, *Pſal.* 95. which *Sect.* 11. is repeated by Saint *Paul* in the *Epiſtle to the Hebrews*, and by our *Church* thought fit to begin our daily morning *ſervice*. Where after theſe words *To day if you will hear his voice harden not your hearts*, which ſigniñes the time *preſent*, or at fartheſt the time of Gods *calling to them* in his word *to hear his voice*, 'tis ſtraight added to all others. *I have ſworn* (and Gods *Oaths* are *irreverſible*) *in my wrath, that they ſhall not enter into my reſt*. To which theſe two other places may fitly be ſubjoyned, *Pro.* 1. 26. where, as the *puniſhment* of thoſe that have *refuſed* Gods call, 'tis added in God's name, *I will laugh at their Calamity, and mock when their fear cometh*. A terrible place to him that hath neglected Gods *ſeaſons* and *opportunities*, and at laſt comes to be ſurpriz'd with *Death*, and the *fears* that accompany it, and then begins to fly to God for *ſuccour*, and *grace*, and *pardon*, and God inſtead of *compaſſionating*, *ſcoffs*, and *laughs*, and *mocks* at him; The leaſt that this can import, will be that that time is a very *improbable* time for that moſt neceſſary work to be wrought by Chriſt in us. The other place is that admonition of the *author* to the *Hebrews* 12. 16, 17. that no man be *prophane as Eſau was, in ſelling his birth-right for a morſel of meat*, *i. e.* (at leaſt by way of accommodation) that precious *priviledge* and *birth-right* of *grace* here, and (conſequent to the *Chriſtian* uſe of that) his *eternal inheritance in Heaven*, for ſome *tranſitory pleaſure of* this *earth*, leſt it befall him *eternally*, what befell *Eſau* here in reſpect of his *father's bleſſing*, *he found no place of repentance*, could not get his father *Iſaac* to *repent*, or reverſe the donation from *Jacob* to him, though he *cryed bitterly* for it, *Haſt thou but one bleſſing, O my father? bleſs me, even me alſo, O my father*; and ſo, as it follows there, *ſought it carefully with tears*. The full importance of the place is, that they that are guilty of *Eſau's deſpight* and contempt, which is there called *prophaneneſs*, may have reaſon to apprehend that they may fall into the ſame *hazard* for their *ſpiritual* eſtate, that *Eſau* did for his *temporal*, be *irreverſibly* loſt, and find no place for *Repentance* in *God*, though they *ſeek* it with *ſorrow*, and *grief*, and *bitter compunction*, *carefully with tears*. To which purpoſe *Chriſt's* dealing with the people of the *Jews*, is matter of example, and admonition to every of us, *Luke* 19. 42. when *weeping over* Hieruſalem, *he ſaid, If thou hadſt known, or, O that thou, even thou didſt know, at leaſt in this thy day, the things which belong unto thy peace*; and as if that time were paſt, juſt as he was a ſpeaking, he adds, *But now they are hid from thine eyes. For the days ſhall come, &c.* It ſeems before the point of the *coming of thoſe days* of their ſurprizal, the *things belonging to their peace* were *hid from their eyes*, to wit, upon that critical fatal act of their crucifying Chriſt, adding that bloody *tranſcendent* impiety to their former *killing*, and *ſtoning* of the *Prophets*, on which, certain *irreverſible* deſtruction went out againſt them; In which caſe *though Noah, Daniel*, and *Job ſhould intercede*, they ſhould not be able to *reverſe it*.

To which purpoſe 'tis obſerved generally by *Divines* from theſe, and the like grounds, that there *Sect.* 12. is to every wicked man a time when the *meaſure of his iniquities are filled up*, and God's patience in waiting for him ſo wearied out, that he gives over *calling*, or *expecting*, or *waiting* his *repentance*. This was wont to be called by the *Jews the meaſure of judgment*, *i. e.* a pitch of ſin, upon which *judgment* infallibly followed, *deſtruction* of whole Kingdoms, and the like. This time is not to be *known* by any man of himſelf, (nor to be *diſcerned* by any *obſervation*, and *comparing* of himſelf with others) either by the *number of ſins*, or *calls of God*, or *years* ſpent in ſin contrary to thoſe *calls*, there being ſo much *variety* in theſe, and in God's dealing with men, that nothing but Gods *revelation* can give us any certain *knowledge* in this point; Only this may be ſaid of it, 1. That the *death* of an impenitent ſinner, *i. e.* Gods *plucking* him away in that ſtate, is, when it comes, a certain *indication* of it. 2. That it is *poſſible*, I ſay *poſſible*, that it may be before the time of death, *i. e.* that the man which is come to that *fulneſs of ſin* and ripeneſs for exciſion, may be *kept alive* by God beyond that time, and if that, which I ſay is *poſſible*, ever *actually* be, then is that man concluded under a *final* ſentence, an *irreverſible* eſtate in evil, even in this life, and conſequently 'tis *poſſible* ſome impenitent ſinner may in *this life* arrive to that eſtate. For as *Numb.* 16. 38. the *cenſers* and the *lives* of *Corah* and his בנפשתם company were *forfeited* to God together, (as that place ſhould be read, the *cenſers of theſe ſinners with their ſouls, or lives*, ver. 38. *are hallowed*, ver. 37. *i. e. conſecrated, forfeited to God*, their *goods* and their *lives* together) ſo is it with *grace*, the ſpecial *ſupellex* or *furniture* of the ſoul, that, and *life* are betray'd together, the ſame degree of *ſin*, the ſame pitch of *provocation* makes *forfeiture* of both, and then God may uſe his *power* and *dominion*, as he pleaſe, *take both* together, or take *one* and reprieve the other for ſome time, *withdraw grace*, and leave life, for ſome *ends* in his *wiſdom* ſeeming good to him; and as there the *cenſers* were not *deſtroyed* but *made into broad plates for the Altar*, uſed to the *ſervice* of *God*, when the *owners were ſwallowed up quick*, ſo no doubt on the other ſide, might the owners have been *kept* alive, and uſed by *God* ſome way to ſet out his *glory*, and yet the *cenſers* have been *deſtroyed*. It being free to God to take the forfeiture, when, and how far he pleaſe, and in caſe of ſuch *filling up their meaſure*, either to *withdraw grace* only, (which if it be *total* and *final* makes up the *irreverſible* eſtate) or elſe if he ſo pleaſe, to call for both the *depoſita* at once, take away *grace* and *life* together.

That I thus take confidence to conclude, is upon the *authority* of *Scripture*, which hath made it *Sect.* 13. clear to me that it was thus *actually* with *Pharaoh* at one time of his *life*, after the *ſixth judgment* peculiarly (but not before, through all, or any part of the ſpace of the former *calls*, much leſs at, or before his *birth*, or before Gods *meſſages* to him) when *God* is ſaid *to harden his heart*, and *to make him ſtand*, or *keep him alive*, (when otherwiſe he had *cut him off from the Earth*, but that he intended thus to *reprieve* him) *that he might ſhew in him his power*, Exod. 9. 14, 15. Which becauſe it is a *notable* (and as far as I have obſerved in Scripture, *a ſingular*) *example*, and becauſe by ſome miſtakes

in

in our translation and by other *prejudices* it is become somewhat *obscure*, I will here set down as it lies in the story.

Sect. 14. *Moses* and *Aaron* are sent to *Pharaoh* with that message from *God* concerning the *dismission* of the *Israelites*, and with *miracles* and *signs* to give authority to their *message*, and *Pharaoh* refused to *hearken* or obey, *but hardned his heart*, Exod. 7. 13. In which place our ordinary Translation hath mistaken, for it is not to be understood, as we read it, that *he*, i.e. *God* (as yet) *hardned* Pharaoh's *heart*, for the words do not bear that in the Hebrew, nor had any such thing by way of story at that time been intimated (only by way of prediction, and evidence of *Gods præscience*, Exod. 3. 19. and by way of *Decree* what God would do upon it, *c.* 4. 21. and 7. 3. which was *after* fulfilled, and not *yet*, and might therefore be referred to that *after-time*) but ויחזק לב פרעה *Pharaohs heart waxed strong, or hard, was hardned*, or by an ordinary *Hebraisme* of *Cal* for *Hithpael*, *Pharaohs heart hardened it self*; and so it follows, *v.* 14. *the Lord said to Moses, Pharaohs heart is waxen hard, he refuseth, &c.* and so the very same words are rendred by our *English*, *c.* 7. 22. and *c.* 8. 19. *was hardned*, in the *passive*, or *hardned it self*, in the *reciprocal*, not *actively*, *he hardned*. And so this denotes only an act of *stubbornness* in *Pharaoh*, an obstinate resistance or refusal against Gods *calls* and *miracles*, and not any act of *Gods* either *positive* or *privative* (by way of desertion) in *hardning* him, only the *Lord had said* that it would be so, (in the end of that verse) which refers to *Gods* prediction of his *stubbornness*, *c.* 3. 19. *I am sure that the King of Egypt will not let you go*; and that, I say, grounded only in Gods *præscience*, which hath no more to do with (no more *influence* on) the *effect*, nor degree of *causality* in the producing it, than my *seeing* of any *object*, hath on the *object*, being perfectly as *extrinsecal* and *accidental* to the effect, as my *sight* or my *knowledge* is to another mans *action*, and the thing *foreseen* no more necessitated to be by that means, than it would if God did not *foresee* it, it being common to God with us to work by his will, and not by his *præscience*, and the absurdity being as great, to affirm that he willeth by his *knowledge*, as that he *knoweth* by his *will*, or that I *see* with my *ear*, or *hear* with my *eye*, and such like: the truth of which *Calvin* it seems discerned by some hint in *Valla*'s writings, and from him *Beza* learn't and acknowledged it also. After this obduration of his against a *call* and a *wonder*, God proceeds to a judgment of *turning the water into blood*, *v.* 16, 17. and that it seems was a very sufficient means of conviction unto this *obdurate Pharaoh*, for so saith God, *Hitherto thou wouldst not hear*, but *in this thou shalt know that I am the Lord*; *behold I will smite, &c.* this visible judgment was able it seems to extort from him the *acknowledgment* of the *hand* that sent it, in *this thou shalt know*, and yet after this, it follows, that *Pharaoh's heart was hardned*, ver. 22. *neither did he set his heart to this also*, ver. 23. and the reason is given, because the *Magicians* did (in these two signs) *the same thing also by their inchantments*.

Vid. Instit. l. 3. *c.* 23. *numb.* 6. *præscientiâ solâ nullam necessitatem creaturis imponi libenter concesserò, tametsi non omnes assentiantur; sunt enim qui ipsam causam rerum esse volunt. Verùm acutiùs, & prudentiùs* Valla, *&c.*

Sect. 15. After this comes the *plague of frogs*, and that it seems came so near him (*on him*, *c.* 8. 4. and *into the Kings chamber*, saith the *Psalmist*) that, though the *Magicians* were able to do the like, yet being not able to deliver him from them again, he calls for *Moses*, and intreats his prayers for deliverance from this *plague*, and promises that he will *let the people go*, ver. 8. and *Moses*, to improve this mercy to him, that it may be a softning deliverance, that the *Frogs* and the *obdurate heart* may depart together, bids him chuse his time *when*, ver. 9. and it shall be done for him, *ver.* 10. *That thou mayst know that there is none like the Lord our God.* But it seems this had no effect on him neither, for when *he saw there was respite*, when the judgment was removed, (now God's *mercy* was his temptation, as before the *Magicians* inchantments) and when he saw it was so, *i, e.* not yet discerning God's purpose of vengeance upon him for his contumacy (as *Kimchi*, in קשח, saith that God hardens hearts by concealing his counsels of judgment from them, and instances in *Pharaoh* and *Sihon*) then again he *hardned his heart*, *and hearkned not*, ver. 15. And this was a third wilful act of his own obduration, agreeable to what God had foretold of him, *as the Lord had said*. Then comes the *plague of Lice*, verse 17. and in this the *Magicians* are posed, *ver.* 18. the Devil that before could *hurt*, but not *deliver*, that could do *destructive*, but not *saving Miracles*, is not now able to *destroy*, to do *mischief*, *confesses* and proclaims the *finger of God*, as he doth the *Messias* in the *Gospel*, when the *Pharisees* denied him, and yet for all this, this *testimony* and *Sermon* of the very *Devil* against him, it follows, *his heart was hardned*, ver. 19. and *he hearkned not*, *as the Lord had said*.

Θεῦ μαχεσθυμία ἀΐσια σκληροχαρδίας. *Basil. l.* εἰ Θεὸς ἀντ. κακῶ.

Sect. 16. After this comes the *swarm of flyes*, and that not only as a *plague* miraculously produced, but with a sign, *v.* 23. a *division* betwixt *Gods* people and *his*, *no flyes swarming* in *Goshen*, but in all *Egypt besides*, on purpose to make him sensible of his sin by the *particularity* of the *punishment*, *to the end that he might know*, ver. 22. on purpose to *teach him piety*. By this it seems *Pharaoh* is wrought on a little, first, to give *leave* that they shall *sacrifice* to God without *going out of the land*; then when that would not serve (because by so doing they should *sacrifice the abomination of the Egyptians to the Lord before their eyes*, ver. 26. *i. e.* those things which the *Egyptians* would detest to see so used, *Gen.* 43. 32. to wit in *Manetho's phrase*, τὰ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ δεμισευόμενα ζῶα, *cattel which were sacred among the Egyptians*, first by law forbidden to be *killed*, and after, though not then, received into the number of their *Gods*, for so was *Apis* (saith * *Tacitus*, a *bull*, and the especial God of the *Egyptians*) he proceeds farther and giveth way that they *may go into the wilderness*, *only you shall not go very far away*, verse 28. and upon this promise, *Moses* promises to *intreat* for him, verse 29. But now *Pharaoh* had already *hardned his heart four times*, and at one of those times he had over and above *dealt falsly*, promised fair, *c.* 8. 8. but brake his *promise*, and therefore now *Moses* after this fifth judgment, though he *promise* to *pray* upon his *promise* to *mend*, yet doth it with a particular *warning* more than at any time before, *but let not Pharaoh deal deceitfully any more*, verse 29. as ominating that if he did, now the danger would be greater than ever before, and yet *v.* 32. as soon as the judgment was removed, *Pharaoh hardned his heart*, בפעם הזות *hac vice*, this turn, *this time also*.

* *Caso Ariete in contumeliam Ammonis. Bos quoque immolatur quem Ægyptii Apim colunt.*

Sect. 17. Upon this, God sends that *plague of murrain* upon all the *Cattel of Egypt*, *c.* 9. 6. and the heart of *Pharaoh was hardned*, ver. 7. and so still all this while though *Pharaoh* was *obdurate*, yet this by no act of *God's*, but *Pharaoh hardens his own heart*, and *will not let Israel go*, *as the Lord commanded*. Upon this God sends another judgment, that of *boyls* and *blains*, ver. 10. and then 'tis said in a new stile ויחזק יהוה *the Lord hardned the heart of Pharaoh*, ver. 12. (which sure was the time at first referred

to

to by God by way of prediction to *Moses*, *c.* 4. 21. as our margent directs, and was the judgment before threatned implicitely in that *ſpecial caution* or *warning*, *c.* 8. 29. and this God never did till then; and therefore as after that *warning* 'tis ſaid that *Pharaoh hardned* his heart this time alſo, ſo 'tis here ſaid, *v.* 14. that בפעם הזות this *turn*, this *time*, *now*, though not *before*, *God* would *pour all his plagues upon his heart*, and thoſe *plagues on his heart* are ſure *effects* of Gods *obdurating*.

Upon which immediately follows the paſſage wherein the greateſt difficulty lies, *c.* 9. 14, 15. not as we read it [*for now I will ſtretch out my hand, that I may ſmite thee and thy people with peſtilence*, for the event proves there was no ſuch matter, *Pharaoh* was not *ſmitten by the peſtilence, nor cut off from the earth* by that means, but drowned *in the Red ſea* ſome time after. But thus ſhould the words be rendred, *And* (or *For*) *now I had ſent or ſtretcht out my hand, and I had ſmitten thee and thy people by the peſtilence, and thou hadſt been cut off from the earth.* It is שלחתי, in the preter tenſe, *ſent*, ſaith *Ainſworth*, or rather *had ſent*, (as 'tis ordinary in *Hebrew* for the *preter tenſe* to bear the ſence of the *pluperfect* tenſe) and *Paulus Fagius* from the *Chaldee Paraphraſe*, *nunc prope erat coram me ut dimiſiſſem*, *I was near ſtretching out my hand*, referring as 'tis probable to the plague of the *murrain*, in the beginning of the Chapter (called דבר both in this verſe, and that verſe 3.) which might have ſeized upon him and *his people*, as it did on *his cattel*, or elſe to thoſe *boyls*, verſe 11. which might be *plague-ſwellings*, and ſo proper enough to *have cut him off*; and ſo that which follows will be more clear, *But* (not And) *in very deed for this cauſe* העמרתיך *I have* (not [*raiſed thee up*] but) *made thee ſtand, kept thee alive, ſuſtentavi te*, ſaith the ancient *Latine*, ſuſtained thee, (for otherwiſe, had it not been for this, *I had ſmitten thee with the murrain or plague* before, *and thou hadſt* ſome time ſince *been cut off* utterly, but that I intended) *to ſhew*, or *make known*, or *make to be ſeen* (for ſo תראתך literally ſignifies) *my power* in thee, as in cutting up or anatomizing a man *alive*, which is condemned to death (ſaith *Chryſoſtome*) that others may be inſtructed and benefited by that diſſection. *Sect.* 18. *Tom.* 5. *p.* 781.

In this matter 'tis true Saint *Paul* reads εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο ἐξήγειρά σε, *for this very thing I raiſed thee up*, ſay we; but that muſt be underſtood and interpreted by what we have already found to be the meaning of the ſtory, and not on the other ſide this rendring of the paſſage in the ſtory (which the context inforceth, and *Paulus Fagius*, and out of him *Ainſworth*, acknowledge to be the importance of the Hebrew) brought to the ſound of our Engliſh phraſe in Saint *Paul*, for ἐξήγειρα muſt not needs refer to the time of *Pharaoh*'s birth, or to any *abſolute deſtination* of his *perſon*, (it would be hard to bring any *example* of ſuch a ſence of it in *Scripture*, or other Author) but may belong to ſome particular paſſage or part of his life, and ſo directly to this point of time, when God ſays he might have *ſlain* him with *plague* or *murrain*; and ſo be rendred *raiſing*, as that ſignifies a *raiſing* one out of danger, or ſickneſs, a *reſcuing* or *recovering* him, and ſo *keeping alive*, as 'tis ordinarily uſed in Scripture of *raiſing* from *ſickneſs* or *death*. The ſence certainly is, that God *continued him alive*, when he had *filled up* his *meaſure* of obduration, and ſo in ordinary courſe was to be *cut off* by death; in the ſame manner as the *author* of the book of *Wiſdom* ſaith of *Gods* dealing with the *Canaanites*, *cap.* 12. 20. *Thoſe who are due to death thou puniſhedſt with ſo much longanimity*, and 2 *Macc.* 6. 13, 14, 15. ſpeaking of the Nations, 'tis ſaid, that God patiently forbeareth to puniſh till they be come to the fulneſs of their ſins; and ſo it's intimated by that which follows, *Rom.* 9. 22. *God willing to ſhew his wrath, &c. endured with much long-ſuffering the veſſels of wrath fitted to deſtruction.* *Sect.* 19. Rom. 9.

And then when *Pharaohs heart* was thus *hardned by God* in this *extraordinary manner*, God *expoſtulates* with him, *v.* 17. (*in triumph* as it were over this ſinner that now is the *illuſtrious* object of his *judgments* of *obduration*, *plague of heart*, and a kind of hell on earth, for he was *reſerv'd*, beyond the ordinary period of life, *kept alive* for this remarkable judgment) as yet *exalteſt thou thy ſelf, &c?* and in reference peculiarly to that *expoſtulation* is that objection to be underſtood, *Rom.* 9. 19. διὰ τί ἔτι μέμφεται; *why doth he yet find fault? i.e.* God might indeed, ſaith the objector, with good reaſon *find fault* all the while of the former ſix judgments, when *Pharaoh hardned his own heart*; but now when *God hath hardned him*, and by a total deprivation of grace (without which he cannot chuſe but ſin) *ingulfed* him in an *irreverſible* ſtate, as much as if he were in *hell*, διὰ τί ἔτι, why *yet* or *ſtill* doth he *find fault*, or expoſtulate? *for who hath reſiſted his will?* then *God* might be ſaid to *will* his *obduration*, which he had *inflicted* by way of *puniſhment* (though before 'tis confeſt he could not) and *what* poſſible *reſiſting of his will* is there, that he ſhould *ſtill find fault?* The anſwer to this objection (firſt by way of ἔνστασις, not for any *exact determining* or *ſtating* any point of *controverſie* or *queſtion*, particularly of that immediate precedent, [*who hath reſiſted his will?*] but for the *puzling* and *ſilencing* of the Objector, *ver.* 20, 21. and then by ſpeaking *directly* to the matter in hand about *Pharaoh*, ver. 22.) might out of St. *Chryſoſtome* be fully cleared, if this were not already too large an over-grown παρέργον, and this part of it impertinent wholly to the matter in hand. *Sect.* 20. ὁ πρὸς ἀκοὴν ἔσεσθαι τῆς ζητήσεως, ἀλλὰ διὰ ἀσφάλειαν. *Chryſ.* 1. 5. *p.* 778. And again, πρὸς ἔνστασιν (*a figure of repelling the intention, or avoiding the beat of the objection*) ὁ πρὸς ἀκρίβειαν δόγματος.

The reſult of all that I have laboured to lay down concerning *Pharaoh* is this, that although his ſtate were a long time but *reverſibly ill*, as long as he *hardned his own heart*, yet when his own *obdurations* were come to the *fulneſs* of *meaſure*, and he *ripe* and dropping into *hell*, as after the *ſixth judgment* he was, then God *exchanged* the *firſt part* of that due puniſhment of his in another world, that was inſtantly to have commenced, for a *temporary cooler hell here*, *hardned his heart*, and obſtructed all poſſibility of *repentance* from him, and ſo concluded him in this life in an *irreverſible eſtate*. *Sect.* 21.

Having gone thus far, I ſhall now demand, whether an impenitent Chriſtian, that in the midſt of many means of grace, many calls of Chriſt for many years together afforded, doth repeat and reiterate his *reſiſtances*, and *hardens* ſo oft his *own heart againſt God*, be not as great a *provoker* as *Pharaoh* was? I am ſure, that that which *Joſephus* makes the character of *Pharaoh*, Ἀφροσύνη μετὰ πονηρίας καὶ κακίας, *Folly with wickedneſs and malignity*, is the juſt inſcription of ſuch for the moſt part. And if it be objected, that ſuch an one is not allowed thoſe ſigns and prodigies that he was, I anſwer, firſt, that 'tis but the greater *mercy* to him that he is not, thoſe being all *deſtructive miracles*; and if he complain for want of them, he may within a while (if he have not already) meet with ſome *rouzing* judgment, ſome ſharp diſeaſe of the *ſtone*, or *ſtrangury*, or *fever*, a *thunder* and *lightning* about his ears, which will be able to ſupply that place, and *aggravate* his guilt, perfectly as high as *Pharaoh*'s, if he be not reformed. Secondly, *Father Abraham*'s anſwer to *Dives* may be *conviction* to *Sect.* 22.

him, that he that *hath Moſes and the Prophets* in the *Chriſtian* ſence, the many *Methods* of the *Holy Ghoſt*, the many *calls of Chriſt* in the *Church*, and is not wrought on by them, *neither would that man repent*, though all *Pharaoh*'s miracles were ſhewed before him; ſome *Magician-inchanting*-deceit, (flattery of his own corrupt heart) or *comfortable hope*, which the removal of a puniſhment would be apt to infuſe into him, would be as ſure *divertiſements* to avoid the force of the moſt powerful work of *God* upon him, as the like were then unto *Pharaoh*.

Sect. 23. 'Tis true, there may be ſome diſparity (in regard of ſome circumſtances) betwixt that *Pharaoh* and the *Chriſtian impenitent*, and therefore there will be no certainty deducible from *Pharaoh's example*, that any man now a days doth come in this life to that *irreverſible eſtate*: This I am moſt willing to grant, and from thence to conclude, that '*twill be a great madneſs for any melancholy hypochondriack from this diſcourſe to take occaſion to phanſie himſelf actually in that eſtate, and from thence to give over all hope, and labour to get out again*; firſt, becauſe the doing ſo is the ſure way to *ingulf* him in it for the future, though he be not yet in it, which is one piece of *fury*, thus to *run* into that which I *fear*, when the *fear* ought in any reaſon to drive me from it. Secondly, becauſe this paper hath only laboured to prove that a man *may fall* into it, if he do not take heed, which if it be *believed* and made *uſe* of, he never ſhall fall into it; and to give over all *heed* is a *uſe* quite contrary to this *doctrine*. 3. Becauſe the only *reaſonable*, and the far more proper uſe of this doctrine will be, 1. To *haſten* our *Repentance*. 2. If it have been deferred too long, then to help to *repair* that defect by more zeal and *intention*, and *vehement deſire*, by more *humiliation* to *root* it deep, and by fruits (all that are poſſible) to *evidence* the *ſincerity* of it, and in all theſe reſpects to *loſe* no time in impious or *melancholy* thoughts, but by a ſpeedy change to confute our fears, and ſhew that we are not loſt irreverſibly. 4. Becauſe whoſoever is ſuppoſed to be ſubject to theſe diſcouraging thoughts, and ſo in danger to be hurt by this doctrine, is ſuppoſed for the preſent to be deſirous to repent and amend, and then by a *principle* laid in another *diſcourſe*, we muſt ſuppoſe his preſent eſtate, though it be ill, yet not to be *irreverſible*, this care and deſire to get out being a character and *indicium* of that ſtate of *ſin*, which is ſtiled *ſin not unto death*, for which the prayers of others, *viz.* of the *Church*, have that promiſe, 1 *John* 5. that God will in anſwer to them *give him life*, *i.e.* not preſent *pardon* or *ſalvation*, continuing as he is, but ſufficient *means* of *Grace* to bring him to *repentance* firſt, and then to life. But if he have caſt off all *deſire* of being better, then as I have no ſuch grounds of comfort for him, ſo will not the principles of *diſcomfort*, that this diſcourſe hath offered, prove matter of *deſpair* to him, but rather of rouzing and wakening him out of his *preſumption*. This one anſwer is alone abundantly ſufficient in this matter, and then for any man thus to give over the *former* only *hope* (not upon any *appearance*, or *probable* argument, but upon a *phanſie* or *jealouſie* of his own, raiſed only on ſome *occaſion* or *pretence*, I am ſure not *ground* or *cauſe* taken from this *diſcourſe*) will be ſo unreaſonable (and withal ſo *impoſſible* to *clear* or *reſcue* any the trueſt and *wholſomeſt diſcourſe* from ſuch accidental *miſtakes* and *ſcandals*, and *inconſequent concluſions*) that I ſhall not add any more words to *prevent*, or *cure* it.

Of Conſcience, pag.

The truth is, there is another kind of *deſperation*, that of *going on ſtill in our wickedneſs*, (as *Jer.* 2. 25. [*thou ſayeſt there is no hope*] is ſet to ſignifie, ſaith *Grotius*, *abſtinere nequeo*, *I cannot abſtain*, and that impotence an effect of a *paſſionate will*, or a *cuſtome* in ſinning, as follows in that verſe, *I have loved ſtrangers, and after them will I go*) the *running headlong* upon all the ſin, and danger, and miſery in the world, which we are wont to call a *deſperate ſtate*, becauſe it is the neglecting of the *condition*, upon which all the *Goſpel promiſes* (the only ground of *hope*) are made over to us; and to *fortifie* us againſt that, is the only deſign and project of this paper. I wiſh it may prove *ſucceſsful* to it.

All which being not only granted, but propoſed as *neceſſary* conſiderations to be taken along with this doctrine, it remains ſtill clear and *uncontrolled*, that God may, if he will, thus puniſh a *hard* heart with *total* and *final ſubſtraction of Grace*, and ſo with *hardning irreverſibly*, either here, (which I only ſay he may, but know not that he will) or at the hour of death, at which time there is no doubt but *he will* thus proceed with every *impenitent*. And though it be *hard*, if not *impoſſible*, to judge, when the former of theſe times is come, or before-hand to divine when the *latter* or *former will come*, either to another or to my ſelf, and ſo ſtill there is *hope*, to him that will make *uſe of hope to preſent amendment*, not to *ſecure procraſtination*, yet theſe three things may be reſolved on.

Sect. 24. 1. That there is or may be ſuch a *time*, as to *nations* and people, ſo to *particular ſinners* alſo. In the *tenth generation* the deluge came upon the *old world*, and in the *tenth generation* after that, the *fire and brimſtone* came upon *Sodom*, and nothing but *Repentance* could then have reprieved them, or put off their ruine; To that end 120. years warning was given to the former, and *Noah deſigned* a *preacher of that Repentance*; and to the latter the Chaldee reads, that *God came down to ſee, whether they had made to ceaſe*, or made an end (ſo paraphraſing עשו כלה) *i.e. repented*, Gen. 18. 21. *and if not, I know*, ſaith he, *what I will do*; Irreverſible deſtruction in that caſe. And our Saviours Parable of the *Tree*, that for ſo many years deceived the owners expectation, is to the ſame purpoſe, and the iſſue of it, *Cut it down, why cumbreth it the ground?* So in the 13. of *Hoſ. verſe* 13, *&c.* the words being rightly weighed and rendred do import: *He*, i. e. *Ephraim, is a child that is not wiſe* (as a fruit in the womb that provides not for it ſelf, that breaks not out of the womb) otherwiſe *he would not ſtand ſo long in the place from whence children break forth* (i. e. defer repentance ſo long, the only means to get him out of that encloſure of calamities.) 14. *I would ranſome them from the power of the grave, I would redeem them from death; O death, I would be thy plague, O grave I would be thy deſtruction*: (i. e. if they did repent) But now *conſolation is hid from mine eyes* (*i. e.* there is nothing that can comfort me, or appeaſe my wrath, as the phraſe is uſed, *Iſa.* 57. 6. Secondly, that every day ſpent in an unreformed ſtate, brings a man nearer to one of theſe periods of *obduration*, or exciſion irreverſible, as every of thoſe *generations* continuing unreformed, came nearer to that *tenth and laſt generation*. Thirdly, that every call of Gods being *rejected*, brings him yet nearer to the journeys end. *He that being often reproved, hardneth his neck, ſhall ſuddenly be deſtroyed, and that without remedy*. Fourthly, that an unreformed ſinner, if he do (on *confidence* of longer

ſpace,

ſpace, and *reſolution* not to begin that ſo neceſſary a work of *Repentance* till the *laſt*, but in the mean *to enjoy the pleaſures of ſin, till the days come, that he ſhall ſay, I have no pleaſure in them*) *continue* ſo one minute longer, doth by ſuch preſumption terribly provoke God to bring that fatal puniſhment upon him, and ſo, if he will go on, may that next minute (for ought he knows, or any can inſure him) engulf himſelf in that *irreverſible eſtate*, out of which, when he is once in it, no *eſcape* or iſſue is to be expected.

And though after all this, one of Chriſts parables ſeem to allow as free a *reception*, and as fair an *hire* to the *labourer that cometh lateſt into the vineyard*, as to any other; yet this is in caſe he be not *ſooner called*, but come as ſoon as he is, not when the *earlier* call hath been oft rejected, on purpoſe to avoid the *heat* and *burthen of the day*; much leſs when 'tis *therefore* rejected, becauſe it is too *early*, and becauſe the going in *later* will ſerve the turn as well; for ſure God is not likely to be *circumvented*, and *cheated*, and *mockt*, by ſuch crafty *merchants* as theſe, nor to call ſuch at the *eleventh hour*, that would not come at the third, nor ſixth, nor ninth; nor to *admit*, or *reward* them that come in that manner, as they are likely to *come* (*i.e.* only with a deſire of heaven) when the doors are *ſhut*, when they are not *called*. To which purpoſe his dealing with the *Iſraelites* is remarkable; God commanded them at his *bringing them out of Egypt* to *invade* the *Canaanites*, and promiſed them *ſtrength* to *overcome* them, and *poſſeſs the land*, but they refuſed to *go up*; afterwards when he bid them not, they would *needs go up*, and then they *miſcarried* in the *attempt*: The application is *eaſie*, and *terrible* to the *delayer*, or refuſer; and the *parable* of the *fooliſh Virgins* ſeems to bring it home to our purpoſe, they come *knocking*, when the *door is ſhut*, and find no *admiſſion*, *Matth.* 25. 11. *Sect.* 25.

And beſide the *determents* that may be offered us on Gods part in this buſineſs, many other are ready at hand from conſideration of *our ſelves*: As, firſt, that though God do *continue to call*, yet we may be as likely to *defer* ſtill, as before we were, and to think that one other act of *procraſtination* may be as ſafe, as the many former have been. Secondly, that *leiſure*, *will*, or *ſtrength*, may then be wanting, and then far more probably than before, by how much a more chronical habit doth harden the heart, weaken, and ſtop the ear, and many the like; and ſo ſtill nothing is ſafe, but *preſent inſtant returning*. The Prophets ſpeech is remarkable to the confirmation and enforcing of this, *Iſa.* 55. 6. *Seek the Lord while he may be found* (it ſeems there is, as a time when God *may be found* עת מצא *Pſalm* 32. 6. ſo an end, a period of that time, and ſo a time when he *may not be found*, ὅτε ἐσφράγισαι ταμιεῖα, when the ſtore-houſes are ſealed up, ſaith *Epiphan. Decreta damnatoria obſignantur, the decrees for condemnation are ſealed*, *Aben Ezra*) *call ye upon him while he is near. Let the wicked forſake, and return, &c.* an *actual forſaking* and *returning* (ſorrow for *loſs* of *Heaven*, or apprehenſion of inſtant *hell*, will not ſerve the turn) and then comes the promiſe that *God will have mercy*, &c. And ſo *Prov.* 8. 17. *Thoſe that ſeek me early ſhall find me*, the promiſe is to the *early ſeekers*, and to no others; and ſo far of the promiſes. *Sect.* 26.

Then for any *example* in the word of God, on which to ground this hope, or make it prudent that a *future Death-bed Repentance* ſhould be depended on, I think there is but one that will be pretended, that of the *thief upon the Croſs*; concerning which it is obſervable, *Sect.* 27.

1. That it appears not of him, (nor have we any reaſon to charge it on him) that he ever *procraſtinated* or purpoſely poſted off his *converſion*, till this ſo late a date, and ſo he will not be matter of *comfort* to them that do.

2. That as far as we have any knowledge, he ſeems not ever to have heard of Chriſt, at leaſt to have been *called* or *inſtructed* by him, till he met him upon the *Croſs*, and conſequently he can be no precedent to any that hath lived an *age*, or a great part of it under the preaching of the *Goſpel*.

3. That for the thief to be *converted* then, and *believe* in *Chriſt* in that ſtate of greateſt *humility* upon the *Croſs*, (which ſo *ſcandaliz'd the Jews*, when by all other motives they were inclined to have believed on him) was a moſt notable illuſtrious *eminent act of faith*, and ought in any reaſon to be prefer'd before that which is ordinarily found among men.

4. That it was accompanied with as many *effects* of *ſincere converſion*, as that condition was capable of, *confeſſion* of Chriſt, and devout *prayer* to him for his *mercy*, or *remembrance* when he came to his Kingdom.

5. That it was not *extorted* by the *fear of death*, but proceeded from a ſight, and acknowledgment of the *innocency*, and *power* of Chriſt, even upon the Croſs, and this was an argument to himſelf and others, (and was it ſeems ſo acknowledged by *Chriſt*) of the ſincerity of his *faith*, and *converſion* to God, and that being ſuppoſed *ſincere*, will undoubtedly be *accepted*, be it never ſo *late*.

6. This was done by the *thief* in the midſt of all *temptations* to the contrary, the *Croſs* one great *temptation*, and ſuch as almoſt all the Diſciples were ſhaken with; and beſides, the other *thief* was his *tempter* to the contrary, *railing on* Chriſt, &c. *Luk.* 23. 39. and alſo the *chief Prieſts, and Scribes, and Elders, mocked him, and they that paſſed by reviled him wagging their heads*, *Matth.* 27. and ſo that new *convert-Thief* was a *ſingular* perſon, almoſt the only *confeſſor* in the company. Theſe particulars being obſerved will give us reaſon to acknowledge the *difference* great betwixt the example of the *thief*, and any that make *uſe* of that example to *defer their repentance* till the laſt, and will conſequently *advertiſe* us, that though it *ſucceeded* very *well* to him, it may *ſucceed* very *ill* to us.

For other examples it will, I believe, be very hard to produce any out of Scripture (and for allegations out of humane *ſtory*, or obſervation, it will not be pertinent to produce them, becauſe they bring not with them any *evidence* how they were accepted by God, as that of the *thief* did, *This day thou ſhalt be with me in Paradiſe*) and yet to be ſure to omit nothing, that may to any ſeem pertinent, we will ſuppoſe the *converſion of* Saint *Paul* to have ſomewhat in it, ſomething like that of the *thief*, for he was *ſtrucken to the Earth*, in the midſt of *his threatnings and ſlaughters againſt the Church*, and before he was recovered again, undoubtedly converted, and after lived to be a moſt gracious *Apoſtle*. To which example as far as can concern our caſe in hand, I anſwer, by propoſing theſe three conſiderations. *Sect.* 28.

Sect. 29. 1. Whether, ſuppoſing that *Saul* had *died* when he was thus *ſtricken*, (yea though it had been after the delivery of thoſe words, *ver.* 6. [*he trembling and aſtoniſhed, ſaid, Lord what wilt thou have me to do?*] conceiving no more to be meant by them than was by Saint *Peter*'s auditours, when they ſaid, *Men and Brethren what ſhall we do?* to which he there anſwers, *Repent, &c.* whether I ſay) any man would affirm, that he had been ſaved (and yet ſure that *trembling*, and *ſaying*, *amounted* as far as *ſorrow* for ſin, without actual *amendment*) or at leaſt bring any *evidence* of Scripture to confirm any ſuch *affirmation*. If God's abſolute *decree*, that of *Electing of his perſon* be produced for ſuch argument, that will as much hold for the ſaving him, though he had died in the midſt of his *blaſphemies*, without any ſuch *trembling*; and then he might have been *ſaved*, without ever having been *converted*; which I have not yet heard to be aſſerted by any, unleſs the *Antinomian* doctrine may amount ſo far.

Sect. 30. 2. Whether the caſe of Saint *Paul* be not quite diſtant from that of a *Chriſtian*, *delaying* and deferring *repentance* to the laſt. For that is *ſin againſt light*, and ſo a wilful, deliberate crime, and by that God is *provoked* to *withdraw*, rather than *invited* to *give more grace*. But Saint *Paul* affirms of himſelf that he *obtained mercy becauſe he did it ignorantly, in unbelief*, 1 Tim. 1. 13. and therefore though *ignorant* Chriſtians, *zealous* in their *erroneous* way, may be allowed ſome of our *charity*, upon this *precedent of* Saint *Paul's converſion*, and it may be agreeable to *analogy of faith*, to hope that God will by an *extraordinary* way bring them to a ſight of their *errours* in time of life, or accept the *Repentance* for all ſins *known* and *unknown*, (ſo there were in them a *preparation* of mind to have depoſited their *errours* upon ſufficient *light*, and to have reformed their ſins conſequent to thoſe *errours*) yet that a bare *ſorrow* ſhall be accepted for wilful ſins, when it is on purpoſe *deferred* ſo long, till it cannot *bring forth fruits worthy of Repentance*, and ſo in effect can prove nothing but *ſorrow*, (no *amendment* being added to it actually; and whether the *reſolution* of amendment be *ſincere*, it is both to the party himſelf, and to others by ordinary means utterly *un-evident*, becauſe he is ſuppoſed to dye before any *ſufficient trial* of it) I conceive will not be thought concluded convincingly from that *example*.

Sect. 31. 3. Whether the enlarging of *Sauls* life *and abundant labouring* and *ſuffering* of his, after converſion, be not an intimation (very obſervable) that great ſinners, when they are *converted*, muſt do much more in *Chriſtianity*, (I mean exerciſe more *acts* of *ſorrow* and *Repentance*, whether by way of *reſtitution* to thoſe that are *wronged*, or of *ſatisfaction* to thoſe that were *ſcandalized*, or to expreſs the ſincerity of the change by way of ἐκδίκησις, 2 *Cor.* 7. 11. of *revenge* on himſelf) than would be neceſſary to the *ſalvation* of another: and if 'twere ſo of Saint *Paul*, whoſe former ſins were committed *ignorantly*, then how much more of *wilful continuers* in ſin, as he, that thus *defers* his *Repentance*, is ſuppoſed to be?

Sect. 32. The *promiſes* and *examples* from Scripture being conſidered, and found unconcluding: the *fifth* thing to be conſidered, is, whether he that thus depends on a *death-bed Repentance*, do it not becauſe that time will be more *probable* for him to *repent* in, than any other, and that though he *repent* not before that time, yet then it will be *probable*; which if he do, then muſt he think it either, 1. In his own *power* to *repent* without *Grace*, and that is *Pelagianiſm*; or 2. That *Gods terrours*, and the imminency of approaching dangers have that or a greater force in them, than *ordinary Grace*; which is quite contrary to the Doctrine of *Father Abraham*, Luke 16. 31. (*If they hear not Moſes and the Prophets, neither will they be perſwaded though one roſe from the dead*) and indeed to all Divinity, which aſſerts the *principal* or ſole cauſe of true *ſaving Repentance*, to be no *outward impellent* (for ſuch were an *extorted*, not *voluntary*, nor conſequently *true* Repentance) but the *gift of ſanctifying Grace*, meeting with an humble malleable heart (ſuppoſing that *humility* to be firſt wrought by Gods *preventing Grace*) in that ſence that 'tis ſaid, *God gives grace to the humble*; Or 3. That there is ſome *aſſurance* or *probability* that that *ſpecial Grace* ſhall not then be wanting; For which yet we have ſhewed there is no *Aſſurance*; and for the *probabilities* which may induce *perſwaſion*, though not *aſſurance*, let us now conſider,

Sect. 33. 1. Is it *probable*, that in this caſe God ſhould give *more Grace* than ever he gave before? Or,

2. That the *ſame*, or a leſs *meaſure* of *Grace* then, ſhould work that which before it wrought not? Or,

3. That that *performance* which would not have been accepted before, ſhould then be *accepted*?

Sect. 34. For the firſt, the rule of Scripture is, *From him that hath not*, that is, hath not made uſe of *grace* given, *God will withdraw that which he had given*, and *Rev.* 22. 11. *He that is unjuſt let him be unjuſt ſtill, and he that is filthy let him be filthy ſtill*; and this not only God *permitting*, but God *deſerting*, and ſometimes God *delivering* up, and poſſibly *obdurating* alſo.

Sect. 35. For the ſecond, 'tis certain that the longer a *habit* of impenitence in any ſin hath continued, the more obdurate the perſon is, eſpecially if it have been ſin againſt *light*, (as our caſe ſuppoſes) and though it be not ſimply *impoſſible* to God to *melt* ſuch, yet extreamly *improbable* it is, that they ſhall be *melted* without a far *greater degree* than that, by which before they were *not melted*. And though the *ſickneſs* it ſelf may be a means of ſome force to work good, and being added to that *Grace*, which without it *prevailed* not, may now poſſibly *prevail*, yet is this a great *uncertainty*. For 1. Some men are worſt under the *Rod*, *Exod.* 6. 9. *They hearkned not for anguiſh of ſpirit and for cruel bondage*, their *anguiſh* kept them from *hearkning*. This *Hippocrates* obſerves, *de aqua, aere & locis*, and from thence hath a pretty heatheniſh argument, that a diſeaſe among the *Scythians* which he ſpeaks of, was not θεῖόν τι, *of Gods ſending*, becauſe it fell not on *poor men*, on whom he conceived the Gods would inflict all their evil things becauſe of their murmuring and blaſpheming. 2. They that are *affected* by the *Rod*, do not all *repent* ſincerely, *Hoſ.* 7. 14. *They have not cryed unto me with their hearts, when they howled on their beds*; thus *Ahab's humiliation*, which the *judgment* produced, was we know no *thorough Reformation*, only a *putting on ſackcloth*, and *going ſoftly*, (not much of an higher pitch than what hath been related of an horſe, who by the help of a hot *floor* and ſome Traces was taught to dance to a tune) and to that perhaps belongs that of the Pſalmiſt, *God's enemies ſhall be found lyars to him, ſubmit themſelves*, as our other Tranſlation reads, but *ſubmit feignedly*, their love of God

is

is but little improved, though there be an outward form of *ſubmiſſion*, extorted it ſeems even from *haters*; and ſo to this may belong that cenſure of St. *Chryſoſtome*, (*l.* 2. περὶ ἱερωσ.) which he brings as an argument why men ſhould be only *perſwaded*, not forced to reformation of any fault or error, ὁ τὸ ἀνάγκῃ τῆς κακίας ἀπέχομένῳ, ἀλλὰ τὸ προαιρέσει σεμνύντι τῷ θεῷ, *becauſe God rewards not thoſe that upon neceſſity abſtain from evil, but only thoſe that voluntarily do it.* And it is obſervable in the ancient *Canons*, that they that deferred their baptiſm till they thought they ſhould dye, the *Clinici* or *bed-baptiſts*, had an ill character ſet upon them, and if they recovered, though they were acknowledged Chriſtians, yet were excluded from any farther *dignity* in the *Church*, could never be admitted to *orders*, a mark of the *Churches* judgment of ſuch men. Nay, 3. that which is then done by any man, there is no certain *judgment* to be made, whether it be his *will* and intention, or no, whether it *come* from the *man*, or the *diſeaſe*. 'Tis a rule in *Juſtinian* that *ſurdus & mutus teſtamenta non facit*, there is ſmall heed due to a *teſtament* made by one that is brought ſo *low*: and ſure *repentance* is a very eaſie task, if he that is diſabled for all things elſe is ſtrong enough for that. 4. The great *diverſions* which the ſick bed preſents would be conſidered; 1. *diſquieting*, if not *enraging* or *ſtupefying* pains; 2. *decay* of ſpirits, and a conſequent *numneſs* and dulneſs; 3. the *hurry* of worldly *buſineſs* then to be compoſed and ſet in order; all which being put together will add extreamly to the *improbability* of any mans being *wrought* on, or melted at that time, and rather define that it is undoubtedly the *unfitteſt* and *unlikelieſt* ſeaſon to *begin* or *perfect* a work ſo *great*, ſo *weighty*, that before he could find no leiſure, even when time lay on his hands, to ſet about it; and yet farther, many diſeaſes there are, a *Conſumption* by name, wherein the more deſperately we are *ſick*, and the nearer our *end*, the leſs are we apt to *believe* we are ſo, and other *ſharper* diſeaſes, when they come to an *height*, deprive us of our *wits*, and *hopes* together, and by their *indications* to others, that *they are mortal*, diſable us utterly from preparing for that *mortality*.

For the third there is little *hope* of that, the condition which is now required under the Goſpel, being as *indiſpenſably* required of all that come to *years* and *powers* and *means* of *knowledge*, as ever the condition of the *firſt Covenant* was under that; And that condition is, *Repent and believe the Goſpel*; and *Except you repent you ſhall all likewiſe periſh*; now I hope, 'twill be no news to ſay, that *repentance* is more than *ſorrow*; if it be, then obſerve 2 *Cor.* 7. 10. and it will be convincing. Beſides, the example of *Judas*, that had this *ſorrow* before he *hanged himſelf*, and the example of *Eſau's birth-right* loſt, and the inſufficiency of *ſorrow* at laſt to get *Iſaac* to *repent*, or *reverſe the bleſſing*, which God had *decreed* from him to *Jacob*, will argue that *bare ſorrow* will not ſerve the turn to regain the ſpiritual *inheritance*. Beſides this *ſorrow*, the moſt that that ſtate is capable of, is a *reſolution* of *amendment*, (as for *actual amendment*, or the *evidencing* of that *reſolution* by *actions*, this ſtate is ſuppoſed uncapable of that. *Sect.* 36.

Now concerning a *death-bed reſolution of amendment* theſe eight things may be obſerved, 1. That it is at that time moſt *improper* and out of ſeaſon, very unreaſonable that the *end* of the *life* ſhould be the *firſt minute* of *living well*; It is an old rule in *Heſiod*, that 'tis *too late to ſow* ἠελιοῦ τροπαῖς, *for then the corn ſhould be growing* up; the *death-bed* is a ſpecial ſeaſon for the *exerciſe* and evidence of many Chriſtian vertues, and conſequently very improper for a *ſeeds-time*, or *plantation*. *Sect.* 37.

2. That it is a *ridiculous* thing, for a man to reſolve to *live* well upon no other conſideration, but becauſe the time is come when he thinks he ſhall *dye*. The very *foundation* of the *reſolution* being contrary to the *performance* of it, the *condition* of all his good *life*, a *preſumption that* he ſhall not *live*. And not only *ridiculous*, but *null*; 'twill be but an act of *reaſon* and *juſtice* to himſelf, to *change* the *reſolution* when the *motives* are *changed*, and a contrary *imprudence* and *unkindneſs* to adhere to the concluſion, when the *premiſſes* are *confuted*, and to do that which he *reſolved*, when that upon which the *reſolution* was made, (ſelf-love, and carnal advantages, and intereſts) ſhall as much *oblige* him to make contrary *reſolutions*; the *invitations* of the *fleſh* being as *perſwaſive* in *health*, as the *terrors* of *hell affrighting* in *ſickneſs*, the preſent *pleaſure* now as ſtrong an *argument* as was then the approaching *pain*, eſpecially when the *pleaſure* hath the *advantage* of being repreſented *alone*, without the *rival*; which was the only *means* by which the other came ever to prevail. From ſuch grounds of diſcourſe as this, what can be expected of this *ſick reſolver*, but that he *reſume* his *ſins* with his *health*, leave his new *vows* in that bed, where firſt he took them up, diſcharge his *fears*, and his *good motions*, his *Phyſician* and *Confeſſor* together.

3. That a *deſire of dying well*, of having *Heaven* in another world, may then eaſily be miſtaken for that reſolution.

4. That as a *wearineſs of pains* may be taken for a *wearineſs of this world*, ſo that *wearineſs* may be taken for *mortification*, and that *mortification* for *reſolution of amendment*.

5. That the no *ſtrength* then to ſin, may eaſily paſs for this *reſolved amendment*; or however, *reſolution* to amend at a time when I have no *ſtrength* to ſin, may *laſt* no longer than that *impotence laſteth*.

6. That although this *reſolution*, if it be *ſincere*, (and ſuch as God ſees would bring forth *fruits* of *repentance*, if time were given) ſhall certainly be * *accepted* by God, (according to that of *Wiſd.* 4. 7. *although the righteous be prevented with death, yet ſhall he be at reſt*) yet this *reſolution* while it is no more than ſo, firſt may be miſtaken and thought *ſincere*, when it is not, (there was little *difference* to any mans ſight, betwixt the *ſeed* that ſprung up without *root*, and that which was ſowed in *good ground*, till the ſhining of the Sun made the *diſcrimination*) and that errour not only others, but our ſelves may be ſubject to; we commit many things in time of *temptation*, which in abſence of the temptation we *reſolved* againſt, and really believed that *reſolution* had been *ſincere*; and ſo we omit in like manner: and the reaſon is, becauſe we reſolved it only *abſolutely*, but foreſaw not the *price* to be laid down for it, either did not *diſcern*, or elſe did not *reſolve* on the *pains* or *difficulties* that it would coſt us to perform it. He that is ſick, and is aſſured that ſuch a *potion* will cure him, *reſolves* firmly he will take it, and is perhaps at that time perſwaded that this *reſolution* is *ſincere*, and yet when the *potion* comes, and proves extreme offenſive to the ſtate, he will rather *dye* than ſwallow it; This argues the *reſolution* either not *largely* enough *extended*, or not *deeply*

* *Hi qui ærumnâ poſitis ad Imperatoris fidem confugiunt, quamvis Aries murum percuſſit, recipiendi ſunt*, Cic.

deeply enough *radicated*; he had only digeſted the *potion*, as phyſick, but not as loathſome, as preſcribed for his *good*, but *foreſaw* not then (or after is not *couragious* enough to *overcome*) the *bitterneſs* of it.

Sect. 38. And though I ſhall not affirm or conceive that every *reſolution* is *unſincere* which ever actually *failes*, or poſſibly *might* fail in time of *temptation* (becauſe thoſe *failings* my be but *infirmities*, and thoſe are *reconcileable* with *ſincerity*, or but *ſingle acts* of ſin, and thoſe if preſently retracted again by *Repentance*, and not continued, or *perſevered* in impenitently, are *reconcileable* alſo) yet ſtill ſure there is ſuch a thing as *unſincere reſolution*, and of the many kinds of that I ſhall name a few εἰς δεῖξιν. 1. The *reſolution* that doth not (or would not on ſuppoſition of tryal) *hold out* againſt the πειρασμοὶ ἀνθρώπινοι, the *ordinary humane temptations*, ſuch as are *proportioned* to the *ſtrength* which we *have*, or which, if we uſe the *means* preſcribed, we ſhall be ſure to *receive*. 2. The *reſolution* that is not *deeply rooted* in an *honeſt heart* (as that is expreſt firſt by the *good*, then by the *moſt Hoſpitable ſoyl*, contrary both to the *thorny* and *ſtony ground*, the one when the *cares of the world* are *unweeded*, *unmortified*, the other when the *hard heart* is *unſoftned*, *unhumbled*.) 3 The *reſolution* that doth not *forecaſt* the means, as well as the end, the *difficulties* and *temptations*, as well as the *eaſier* and more amiable part of the *task*: the man in the *parable* that ſets on *building* without *conſidering* the *charge*, without *laying or deſigning* the *means* whereby to go *through* with it, the *Herod* that *rejoyced* in *John Baptiſts light*, *i. e.* ſaith St. *Auguſtine*, *beheld with joy the luſtre of his doctrine*, *heard him gladly*, and in obedience to him, did *many things*, but fell off, when he lookt upon himſelf, and the *pleaſant ſins*, the *brothers wife*, that in *obedience* to him he was to *part* with; the *reſolution* that doth not extend to the *undertaking* the condition, the *unpleaſanter* part of the work, but only lays hold on the *prize*, or the *duty abſtracted* from the *condition*, which is the *pleaſanter*, the *Balaams* wiſh for the *righteous mans death*, without any *real change*, productive of *righteous life*, or the young *Auguſtines* wiſh, that would be *chaſte*, but would not yet part with the *pleaſures* of *incontinence*, or the general *humour* of the world, to like heaven as the place of *bliß*, and *piety* as the way to *Heaven*, but not to *mortifie* one *luſt* for the compaſſing of either. 4. The *reſolution* that proves *weak*, and *falling*, not for want of *ſtrength*, but of *courage*, not for want of the gift of *grace* on *Gods* part, but of *our making uſe* of this *grace* when 'tis given, or of thoſe *means* to which 'tis *promiſed*, (ſuch are that ſpiritual ἐλέπολις of *prayer*, *humility*, *ardent importunate humble requeſts* to Heaven.) 5. The *reſolution* that is not *univerſal* againſt all both *ſins*, and *temptations* to thoſe ſins, and thoſe not only ſuch as now he finds *inclinations* to in time of *diſeaſe*, but alſo all other that in time of *health* may be moſt likely to *aſſault* and to win him; And in a word, the *reſolution* which *God*, that ſees *unerringly*, ſees to be but *temporary*, or partial, or *hypocritical*, in any, or all theſe or any other reſpects; And then ſuch a reſolution as theſe (whatever it appear to us who are not ſuch *infallible* judges of our ſelves, but whoſe *hearts are deceitful above all things*) cannot have any *rational*, or *Chriſtian ground of hope* (*meerly by* the good *hap* of being taken away before tryal, *i. e.* in effect, before this *hypocriſie* was *diſcovered*) to be *accepted* and *rewarded* by God; or if it have, it muſt not be by the ſecond *Covenant*, under which nothing but *ſincerity* hath that *promiſe*.

Sect. 39. Secondly, ſuppoſing this *reſolution* to be *ſincere*, and ſo ſure to be accepted by *God*, yet there is no evidence to us that it is *ſincere*, or will be thus accepted, but by *worthy fruits of Repentance*, by *enemies* and *temptations* wreſtled with, and *overcome*; from whence though it follow not, that God will not *accept* of that *reſolution*, (becauſe he may *ſee* it *ſincere* without thoſe *trials*, which I conceive is the ground upon which the *Schools* affirm that a ſtrong *contrition* may on the death-bed be accepted without *reſtitution*, &c. *i. e.* that in him, who hath no *time* and *ability* for any thing but *contrition*, God may ſee that *ſincerity* of *change*, which he will *accept*, becauſe he ſees it would bring forth *fruit* if it were allowed *time*) yet we our ſelves in this caſe cannot *know* it, and conſequently the *death-bed Repentance*, if in any particular it prove to be ſuch as ſhall avail in *another* world, yet cannot afford the dying man any *comfort* or *rational* aſſurance in this, nor conſequently his *friends* any thing but the judgment of *charity*, *which hopeth all things*, for which there is no evidence to the contrary.

Sect. 40. 7. Let it be conſidered whether any *example* can be brought in *Scripture* or *ſtory*, of any that wilfully and adviſedly *deferr'd preſent* repentance, and *rely'd* and depended on *late death-bed Repentance*, to whom it ſucceeded well. I profeſs my ſelf to have heard *terrible* ones to the contrary, but as yet none in favour of ſuch *deferrers*. Methinks the mention of *Felix* in the *Acts* 24. 25. hath ſome efficacy in it. He when (after ſome *preaching of Chriſt*, *v.* 22. *and knowledge of that way*) he heard St. *Paul reaſoning of righteouſneß and continence* (things in which it appeareth by the Text and by ſtory, by *Tacitus* and *Joſephus*, that *Felix* was much failing) did, as 'tis added, *tremble* and anſwer, *Go thy way for this time*, *when I have a convenient ſeaſon I will call for thee*. This man upon *advice* and *deliberation*, through the prevalency of his ſins which he loved dearly, *defers* his repentance till a *convenienter ſeaſon*; And all that I obſerve is, that we never read of any ſuch *ſeaſon* that he made uſe of to this purpoſe.

Sect. 41. 8. Let it be conſidered, whether when the *laſt hand* of *God* comes on any man, (I mean that diſeaſe that cuts him off ſpeedily) if that man have remained *impenitent* till then, it be not a very *ominous* and *inauſpicious ſign*, that that man hath *fill'd up the meaſure of his iniquities*, and now the *voice* be peculiarly gone out againſt him, as againſt the Tree (even now mentioned) that had *fruſtrated Gods* continual expectation, [*Cut it down*, *why cumbreth it the ground?*] If on the coming of a diſeaſe, (which like the *laying the axe to the root of the Tree* is oft-times an *hazning call* to repentance) this *uſe* be ſuddenly made of it, and Gods *long ſuffering* do interpoſe in the *counter-voice*, *Nay but ſpare it one year longer*, *and if it bear fruit*, *well*, *but if not*, *then cut it down*, and that voice be hearkned to, that is, if that *diſeaſe* do not prove the laſt, but upon *reſolutions* of *new* living, the life be *enlarged*, and the *reſolutions performed*; then 'tis very well; But if not, if it be (without more time of *repentance*) *cut down*; if Gods *long-ſuffering*, and *patience*, which was on purpoſe to *bring to repentance*, have been made uſe of (as it was ſaid of *Gods long-ſuffering* to *Pharaoh*) *as a means to harden his heart*, have we not reaſon to *fear*, *that Gods coming to ſtrike*, is an argument of a *ſevere* purpoſe againſt that man?

man? or have we any reaſon to *hope* that when his *patience* is at an end, his *mercy* and gifts of *effectual grace* is not at an end alſo? that which the *Apoſtle* ſaith, *Heb.* 10. 26, 27, 29, 31. is much to this purpoſe. And I know not what will be called *falling into the hands of the living God*, if this be not, *viz.* to continue in ſin *impenitently till we fall into Gods* attaching apprehending *hands*, of which the *doom* is there moſt *ſad*: *It is a fearful thing ſo to fall.*

Having proceeded thus far in *defining* (as *warily* and as *ſafely* as I could, by the conduct of Gods Word and Spirit) one thing may perhaps be neceſſary to be added, though not by way of *anſwer* to the poſſible *exceptions* and *objections* of diſputers, becauſe the doing of that, I find, would lead into ſome more *nice* and leſs *profitable ſpeculations*, and contribute little to the direction of *practice*, the only aim of this paper, (and therefore what was thus *prepared* ſhall not here be *inſerted*) yet by way of neceſſary *ſatisfaction* to a practical *queſtion*. And the queſtion is this, In caſe I be a *Miniſter*, call'd to give *comfort* to ſuch an one, *viz.* an *habitual cuſtomary ſinner*, which were thus *ſurpriſed* by the *hand of God*, any *mortal diſeaſe* or wound, and were thus *caſt down* with extreme *horrour of mind*, and from thence profeſſeth himſelf *reſolved* that if God ſhall *ſpare* him, he will certainly *lead a new life*, whether I would not give that man *comfort* in that caſe, but ſuffer him to be *ſwallowed* up with *deſperation*. *Sect.* 42.

To this I *anſwer*, 1. by ſetting before our eyes an *example* of *God* himſelf in a caſe not very diſtant from this propoſed, which may be matter of *direction* to any who ſhall be called to for *comfort* in this kind, *Judg.* 10. 6. *The children of Iſrael did evil again in the ſight of the Lord, and ſerved Baalim and Aſhtaroth*, &c. *and forſook the Lord and ſerved not him*, v. 6. upon this *Gods anger was hot againſt Iſrael*, and he brought a double *diſtreſs* upon them, *v.* 7, 8, 9. *and Iſrael was ſore diſtreſſed. And then v.* 10. *the children of Iſrael cryed unto the Lord, ſaying, We have ſinned againſt thee, both becauſe we have forſaken God and alſo worſhip'd Baalim.* Here is that *confeſſion* and *ſenſe* of the provocations, which our caſe ſuppoſes, and that in time of the *ſore diſtreſs*, and ſo in that parallel alſo. And then Gods return to them is remarkable, 1. An *expoſtulation* continued for three verſes, to *aggravate* their *crime* and *ingratitude*, and the cloſe an abſolute *refuſal*, a denying *preſent pardon* to theſe *confitents*, *wherefore I will deliver you no more.* And then farther yet, a bitter *reproach* and *ſarcaſm*, v. 14. *Go and cry unto the Gods which ye have choſen, let them deliver you in the time of your Tribulation.* And then the ſtory proceeds to tell us the good *uſe* and *effects* that this *ſeverity* wrought upon them. And *the children of Iſrael ſaid unto the Lord, We have ſinned, do thou unto us what ſoever ſeemeth good unto thee, deliver us only we pray thee this day*, v. 15. *And they put away the ſtrange Gods from among them and ſerved the Lord, v.* 16. their penitence is approved to God by their patience, and ſubmiſſion, and importunity, by preſent reformation, and contrary acts of piety; and then it follows, *his ſoul was grieved for the miſery of Iſrael, i. e.* God ceaſed to afflict them; and on the other ſide proſpered them to victory in the next Chapter. And then this dealing of Gods being exemplary to us, as far as the caſes ſhall appear parallel, may paſs for a general or firſt anſwer. But then ſecondly, and more diſtinctly to the queſtion, I anſwer, that in this caſe the courſe I would *preſcribe* to others, or *obſerve* my ſelf, is this, according to this copy premiſed, not preſently to make haſt to apply *comfort* to that man (meaning by *comfort* words of pardon, or promiſe, or aſſurance, that his *ſins*, in this ſtate, ſhall certainly be *forgiven*) but to diſpenſe my *comfort diſcreetly*, and ſo that I may lay a *foundation* on which he may more *ſafely build*, and I more *infallibly aſcertain comfort* to him; I mean by *preparing* him to a right *capacity* of it, by *encreaſing* yet farther in his heart, and *rooting* as deep as I can the *mourning* (which if *ſincere*, hath the *promiſe* of *comfort*, *Mat.* 5.) the *ſorrow for ſin*, the *humiliation* and *indignation* at himſelf, the *vehement deſire*, the *zeal*, the *revenge*, the all manner of *effects* of *Godly ſorrow*, and indeed by doing my utmoſt in *perfecting* this ſo neceſſary work in him; which if by the *help of God* it be done, and thoſe *graces* deeply *rooted*, (through a conſideration not only of the *inſtant danger*, but deteſtable *uglineſs* of ſin, the *provocation* offered to a moſt *gracious Father*, and moſt *merciful Redeemer*, and *ſanctifying ſpirit*, together with all the other *humbling* matter from the particular *ſins*, and *aggravating circumſtances* of them) it will then be that *Godly ſorrow* which the *Apoſtle* ſpeaks of, and that will (if God afford *ſpace*) bring forth that *Repentance*, which conſiſts in a *ſincere change* and *Reformation*, (called by the ſame Apoſtle, 2 *Cor.* 7. 10. μετάνοια ἀμεταμέλητος, or as ſome manuſcripts read, ἀμεταγόητος, i. e. as I conceive, a *Repentance*, a *change*, or *amendment*, *which will not be retracted* again, a *laſting* or *durable Reformation*) and then there is no *doubt*, but to him which is in this *eſtate*, *mercy* infallibly belongs; And to him I ſhall then haſten to *aſcertain* it. And yet of this mercy if I through ſome *errour* or *neglect* of mine, ſhould not give him (nor he himſelf through the greatneſs of his *ſorrow*, the floud of tears in his eyes, otherwiſe find) any *comfortable aſſurance*, yet is he by Gods immoveable *promiſe* ſure (*certitudine objecti*, though not *ſubjecti*) to be partaker, and all that he loſes, by not being *aſſured* of it *here* by me, or by his own ſpirit, is the *preſent comfort*, and *joy* of ſome few minutes, which will ſoon be repaired, and made up to him at death, by Gods *wiping off all tears from his eyes*, the gracious revelation of his Saviour judge unto him, with a *Come thou bleſſed of my Father*, thou haſt *cordially mourned* and *converted*, and thou ſhalt be *comforted*. Whereas if I ſhould go about too *haſtily* and *prepoſterouſly* to grant him any ſuch *comfortable aſſurance* that he were already *accepted* (I mean not now that he ſhould be *accepted*, if his *change* be *ſincere*, or his *ſorrow* ſuch as would bring forth that *change*, for that *conditional comfort* I have all this while allowed him, but *poſitive* aſſurance for the preſent upon a view of ſuch his *ſorrow*) I might then poſſibly raiſe him up too ſoon, before the work were done, the plant rooted *deep* enough, (and that were utterly to *ruine* him; by *giving him his good things*, his comfort *here*, to *deprive* him of it *eternally*) or at the beſt *refreſh* him a little here before-hand, but not at all *advantage* him toward another life; which *loſs* being ſo unmercifully *great*, and *acquiſition* ſo unconſiderably *ſmall*, it were great *uncharitableneſs* to run that *hazard*, and ſo ſtill the beſt way muſt be by propoſal of *conditional*, but not of *abſolute comfort*, to *humble him unto the duſt*, *if ſo be there may be hope*, to ſet him this only task of *working out his ſalvation with fear and trembling*, laying hold on Gods mercy in Chriſt, his *general* but *conditional* mercy for all *penitent purifying* ſinners, (for *confeſſours*, and *forſakers*, and none elſe) and ſo labouring for that *ſorrow*, that *purity*, that *confeſſion*, *Sect.* 43.

An Ancient one in *Magdalen* Colledge in *Oxford.*

con-

contrition, and *forſaking*; and then, *if he periſh, he periſh*, no way is imaginable to do good upon him, if this do not.

Sect. 44. And if it be farther demanded, whether in this caſe ſuppoſed, I would upon his *demand* deny him *Abſolution*? I anſwer, that *Abſolution* may ſignifie two things. 1. The *abſolution* of the *Church*, as it is the *Churches pardoning* him all offences done againſt her, *quantum in ipsâ eſt, viz.* the *ſcandal* of his ſins, &c. and this *abſolution* the *Church* (and I, if ſhe have intruſted to me that power) ought to grant him *in articulo mortis*, when the *binding* him, or *retaining his* ſins is not probable to do him any further good, by way of παιδεία, or *diſcipline*; in like manner, as every ſingle perſon *offended*, or injured by him, is by *charity* obliged upon his *demand* (though he be not confident that he is *ſincerely contrite*) to grant him his free *forgiveneſs*, and the *denying* of this being thus *demanded*, were hurtful not to the *dying* man, but to him that were ſo uncharitable as to *deny* it; and the *giving* it, an *obligation* of *charity* both to *him* and to my ſelf: But for the ſecond thing ſignified by *abſolution*, *viz.* the *pronouncing him abſolv'd in heaven*, all that I am obliged to by *duty* or in *prudence*, is then to do it, when by examination of his *ſorrow* and *reſolutions*, I am inwardly perſwaded that his *repentance* is a well *grounded* and *radicated repentance*; and in that as I would not perſwade any man to be over *eaſie*, or *popular*, (that humour of the *Emperour* now adays ſtoln into the *Confeſſor*, *neminem triſtem dimittere*) becauſe of the poſſible *hurt*, and unproportionable gain of it; ſo if any man ſhould be over *auſtere* and *difficult*, only out of deſire to make the *penitent* yet more *penitent*, (and not to *bruiſe the broken reed*, to *tyrannize* over his *wounded* ſoul) to make *Heaven* more *ſurely* his, by his being not yet *ſure* of *Heaven*; this will be at the worſt but an *errour* of *charity*, which will never be imputed to the *Confeſſor*, much leſs to the *penitent*, it being acknowledged that the *Miniſters abſolution* doth not *avail*, *niſi clave non errante*, and conſequently that his *denying abſolution* (*clave errante*, ſtill) will never do any *hurt*; the *errour* of his *key* in *ſhutting* or *retaining* being in reaſon no more *mortiferous*, than the like *errour* in *remitting* is *ſalvifical*.

Sect. 45. Agreeable to this deciſion you ſhall find the *practice* of the Church anciently, when *Eccleſiaſtical diſcipline* was in its *vigor*. In ſuch or ſuch caſes they would not afford the dying man *abſolution*, becauſe they had no ground of *aſſurance*, that the ſtate of the perſon was *capable* of it, and yet would they make no ſcruple to allow him place of *comfort* and hope, that God might poſſibly abſolve him, God having other ways of *diſcerning* the *ſincerity* of *Repentance*, (*viz.* by ſeeing of the heart, or by conditionate preſcience) which they had not; and ſo much for the ſatisfying of the queſtion.

Sect. 46. All that I have now to add to this theme is only this, (which will bring the whole diſcourſe home to the particularity of the *preſent eſtate of this Kingdom*, and ſo give you the *full end* of the writing of this diſcourſe) that by this long *debate*, and the evidence of the truth aſſerted, concerning the *ſouls of particular men*, the condition of this *poor* calamitous *Kingdom* is now *diſſected* alſo. We have enjoyed a long *day* of Gods merciful and gracious *calls* to *Repentance*, and many ſolemn admonitions at the *door* as it were of every *Church*, at the *beginning of our daily ſervice* [*To day if you will hear his voice, harden not your hearts*] and it is moſt ſadly evident by our *preſent* puniſhments, that we have not *heard* the *voice* in that *day* of *peace* and *proſperity*, but *hardned the heart*; The *judgments* being now fallen moſt *formidably* on the Land, and no part of it now remaining which hath not had its *ſympathy* in this *ſhaking*, *falling* fit, ſome *ſorrow*, and *humiliation*, and withal ſome acts perhaps of *confeſſion* have been extorted from us; Were there to theſe an addition of that other part of *Repentance*, that of a *ſincere change* and *thorough reformation*, no doubt there would be mercy; God would *return* upon our *returning*; Nay were the *reſolutions* of amendment, (which perhaps may be obſerved in many) *ſincere* reſolutions, ſuch as that *all-ſeeing* eye doth diſcern, would hold out againſt all the *temptations* of peace again, there were yet hope that for that *ſincere change* of thoſe *many*, the judgment (of the παρωλεθρία at leaſt, that *final total exciſion*, that ſeems to be threatned) might be reverſt, (according to the purport of the treaty that was about *Sodom*, betwixt *God* and *Abraham*.) But by the *continuance* and no kind of *relaxation* of God's heavy hand, it is as clear, as if *Euclid* had demonſtrated it, that yet that work is not done, that the *repentance* of the Land is but hypocritical, ſuch as the preſent weight of the *judgments* hath *extorted* from us, not ſuch as would *continue* upon their *removal*, like the ſtrange quick ſcent that is reported of the wild boy of *Liege*, to have been acquir'd by a thin Foreſt-diet, and to have been loſt again aſſoon as he came to full feeding, (perhaps only a *ſorrow* for the *ſmart* we are under) and this is ſuch a repentance as would not be for the *honour* of God to reward with ſuch a *donative*; The only courſe that a whole Synod and aſſembly of *Angels* could upon conſultation adviſe us to, and *promiſe* it *proſperous* for the averting of ruin from the Land, is ſo to improve our *ſorrow* above the *occaſion* of it (the *afflictions* that are upon us) as that it may be a *ſorrow for ſin*, purely for *ſin* (for though *judgments* may be the *monitor* to put us in mind of thoſe *ſins*, and ſo the *occaſion* of that *ſorrow*, yet nothing but ſin may be allowed the *cauſe* of *that ſorrow*, or if it be, as ſoon as ever that be *removed*, the ſorrow will be *ſuperſeded* alſo) and then that *ſorrow bring forth* ſuch a *change of mind* as would prove *immutable* upon Gods allowing us a time of *reſpite*, bring *forth fruits of repentance worthy* of ſuch *reprieval*. When the whole *heart* of this *Kingdom*, or of that part of it that ſtill *cleaves* to the *houſe of David* is thus ſmitten, and really affected by God's rod, ſo that he to whoſe eyes all things are *naked*, γυμνὰ, as when the skin is pull'd off, and τετραχηλισμένα, *Heb.* 4. 13. (as the *entrails* of a *ſacrifice cut down the back*, which the Prieſt doth μωμοσκοπεῖν, view it cenſoriouſly, and ἐξετάζειν εἰ ἔντελὲς, *examine* ſtrictly, whether it be perfect, whether there be any *blemiſh* in it or no) may pronounce it ἄμωμον, a *blemiſhleſs* repentance, a *ſincere hearty change*, then will there be a place for *hope*, aſſured *hope*, then may the *Prieſt* intercede with confidence, *Spare thy people, O Lord, and give not thine heritage to reproach*; and the *hearer of prayers* will be obliged by that his Title to anſwer that importunity. But till this *Rod* of the *Lord* be thus *Heard*, all hope in God for *mercy* to the Land, or for *victory*, (though to the juſteſt cauſe that ever man eſpouſed) will be little better than *Preſumption*.

Lucian de ſacrif.

If ye offer the blind for ſacrifice, is it not evil? and if ye offer the lame and ſick, is it not evil? Offer it now to thy Governour, will he be pleaſed with thee, or accept thy perſon, ſaith the Lord of Hoſts? Mal. 1.8.

Si tu

Si tu sis securus, at ego non sum securus. Aug.
Spondere aliquid in tam sera curatione temerarium. Salv.
Si tunc vis agere pœnitentiam ipsam, quando jam peccare non potes, peccata te dimiserunt, non tu illa. Aug. Hom. 91.

OF FRATERNAL ADMONITION, OR CORREPTION.

THAT the journey to heaven, through obedience to *bliß*, is not only a more *rational*, but a more *grateful* travel, than that *error* of *our way* that seduces us to *destruction*, and first torments us in the length and baseneß of the voyage, before it pours out the *full vials* of *bitterneß* at the journeys end, is a mystery not so sufficiently discern'd by the heathen world, till *Christ* having assured his Disciples not only of the *lightneß*, but * *graciousneß*, *profitableneß*, *sweetneß*, of his *yoke* and *burden*, when 'tis once taken up (the only *difficult* rough part of it being that of *taking it on us*, the laying down our former trades of sin, taking leave of our contrary habits, and *preferring* a new course of *Christs* chusing, before our old familiars) had vouchsafed to reveal it to us. That revelation of his, without any other inducement, must, unless we utterly disclaim his *Disciple-ship*, be matter and ground of full *conviction* to us; yet that our *Faith*, which is usually very *infirm* and *crazie*, may, as *Parisiensis*, have a *staff* or *crutch* to sustain it, an *auxiliary* of humane reason and observation, which may bear witness unto *Christ*, this one *Aphorism* may deserve to be considered by us, That there are few *vices* (the most dangerous and unchristian) but are placed ἐν μεθορίῳ, in the *confines* of somewhat, which is very *good* and *pretious*, and consequently that the change or migration from the folly and disobedience of the world to the *obedience and wisdom of the just*, is not so vast, and so astonishing as the worldling at the distance apprehends. 'Tis many times but the *transplanting* of the affection on another *object*, and then in that case let the affection retain the same (nay improve into a greater) *intension* and *vehemence*, and it shall have a more abundant approbation and reward from *God* and *Conscience*, than ever it could hope for from the *passionate world* and *flesh*: The same *zeal* of a *blasphemous and persecuting Saul* that haled men to prison for believing on *Christ*, being but directed from a *mistaken* to a *true*, from an *impious* to a *Christian object*, will lay another violence on mens souls, and drive whole sholes, whole nations before him to the *Faith of Christ*, *which he once persecuted*, and allow the *Apostle* more abundant, passionate, *sensitive* joy in seeing the work of the *Lord thus prosper in his hands*, than that kicking against the *goads* or *thorns* (as Christ calls it) could ever have yielded him. At another time perhaps the *change* is not so great, nor the *chasm* so wide, but a meer *abating* or *heightning* the degree of the affection, subduing it (if it were excessive) to a *temper*, or infusing a little more *heat* into it, if it were too cold, and the object may remain the same, and the *inordinate* or *Lethargick* sinner become an approved *Saint of Christ*, by no greater change, than that of a *gradual alteration*.

* ζυγὸς χρηστὸς, as Κύριος χρηστὸς, rendred by us, that the Lord is gracious.

This hath been all premised to demonstrate Christ to be, what he is prophetically entitled, the *desire of all nations*, that confluence of all that is *desirable* even by those that never heard of him, to shew how possible it is through *Gods* mercy, to satisfie our selves and *God* together, to make our own most irregular delights (as *Satan* himself is sometimes fain to do) to minister unto *Christ*; now there is not a sin that hath more of our *flesh* poured out upon it, more of our *wits*, more of our *licentious passions*, than that of *judging* and *censuring* other men, one of the richest *voluptuousnesses* and *sensualities* of our life, a kind of *savage* rejoycing in the *shame* (as unhumane as in the *blood*) of others, and in order to that, the setting up a perpetual *inquisition* upon our brethrens actions, hunting for *faults* and infirmities in other men, as for our royallest game and prey, our triumphs, and our delights, and all our conversation (which should bring us in those Christian advantages, that we subsist on, all the rest of our lives) laid out intirely on this one commodity, the news that *Pasquin* or *Marforius* hath furnisht us with that morning, I mean the *hearing* or *reporting* the *shame of absent brethren*. *Sect.* 2.

Now that this *viperous flesh* of ours, that *sets all the world on fire*, being it self first begotten of that *burning serpent*, *set on fire by hell*, might like the *vipers* flesh, or the image of that poysonous serpent, it self prove medicinable, cordial, and useful to other more Christian purposes, of *inflaming* our chilly-frozen hearts, and infusing some spiritual gracious warmth or zeal into us, there will need no long *preparation*; Let but *Charity* design what *passion* is wont to forge, let but *Christ* supplant *Satan* for a while, and get into his place, and the same *perspective* that we use to observe our neighbours faults, and to convey them to others (to whom they become not a favour, but a temptation) may be used still as diligently and industriously, only with this difference, to *communicate* them to him who is *Sect.* 3.

alone concerned in them. And that this eaſie, happy *Metamorphoſis* may be thus wrought in the world, κατηγορία τῶν ἀδελφῶν, (that is in Scripture ſuppoſed to be *Satans* incloſure) *accuſing of our Brethren* or fellow *Chriſtians*, turn'd into *fraternal correption* or *admonition*, as it is the wiſh of every good man, ſo would it be the ἀγαλλίασις ἀγγέλων, the *joy* and *exultation* of the *Angels in Heaven*, and may therefore well be allowed the ſubject and deſign of a brief diſcourſe; which will be ordered moſt to the Readers advantage, if it proceed by theſe few degrees or ſtages,

Sect. 4. And firſt, tell you what *fraternal correption* is, and how it comes to be a duty, Secondly, *What are the benefits and advantages of it.* Thirdly, what be the main *prejudices* and *objections* which men have conceived againſt the practice of it, together with the ſolution of them, that ſo there may be no excuſe left to them that will neglect it.

Sect. 5. For the firſt, 'twill not be amiſs to premiſe that there is a double *correption* or admonition; the former, *paternal* or *authoritative*; the latter, *fraternal* or *charitative*: The former is to be lookt on as an office of ſingular *truſt* referr'd by *nature* to the *Parents*, as a peculiar duty of theirs, required of neceſſity, to make that *being*, which under God they have beſtowed on their children, to become a *benefit* or *advantage* to them; it being for them who are engaged, and go on un-reformed in any ſin, *far better, morally, and more eligible, that they never had been born*; and by way of *Phyſick* to help and aſſiſt nature, by way of ſupplement when there is need, or *in majorem cautelam*, becauſe 'tis poſſible there may be need of it, when actually there is not. This is again by the Laws of *Nature*, of *Nations*, and of *Chriſt* referred to the *Governours* of *Church* and *State*, who are the *Parents* alſo in a political notion, and owe this due of *legal* and *ſeaſonable* correption of the ſons of the *Civil* or *Eccleſiaſtical* weal, as much as they do any *exerciſe* of commutative *juſtice*, as men, or (as *parents* again) of *diligence* and *vigilance* over them for their preſervation. But this is ἑτέρας σκέψεως, the ſubject of * another diſcourſe.

* *Of binding and Looſing.*

Sect. 6. Only by the way 'twill be worth the marking, that the *authority* and weight which is to be acknowledged in the *paternal*, over and above that which belongs to the *fraternal correption*, will, if it be obſerved, give us a ground of reconciling the *three correptions*, or *admonitions* mentioned by *Chriſt*, *Matth.* 18. with the *firſt* and *ſecond*, *Tit.* 3. 10. after the performance of which, in both places, they are to be proceeded againſt as *obſtinate*. For in the place of St. *Matthew*, the direction being given to a private man, (under the title of a *Brother*) that in caſe of *treſpaſs* he ſhall go *firſt* and *reprove the offender privately*; then *privately* again, though in a more *publick* manner [*take two, farther, two or three with him*;] and at laſt make it a publick matter before the *Church*, (which in what notion ſoever, will not exclude, but contain the *Rulers* of it:) and in the *Epiſtle to Titus*, the perſon to whom the direction is given, being now changed, no private *perſon* but *Titus* the *Biſhop*, and he alſo ſuppoſed to have a *Presbytery* aſſiſtant to him: The ſecond *admonition* being performed by ſuch an one, is proportionable to the third of the *private* man (or his *complaint* unto the *Church*, and the *Churches* backing his, with her *admonition*) and the ſtanding out againſt that ſecond, in thoſe more ſolemn hands, becomes as cenſurable a *contumacy*, as the *not hearing the Church* in the third and laſt reſort in the *Evangeliſt*.

Sect. 7. And ſo in like manner, 2 *Cor.* 13. 2. when St. *Paul*, that was no *private* man, but an *authoritative Apoſtle*, doth admoniſh them τὸ δεύτερον, a *ſecond time*, (and [*in the mouth of two or three*, &c.] which is the character of the *ſecond admonition*, *Mat.* 18. 16.) it follows, that they are to expect no third warning, but *when he comes he will not ſpare*, he will proceed to *cenſure* againſt them.

Sect. 8. The concluſion from whence will be only this, That though the *Chriſtian Law* lay a more weighty *cenſure* on thoſe that reject or diſobey the *Father* of the *Church*, in his *paternal*, *authoritative* correptions, yet the ſame Law hath a ſeverity of denunciations alſo againſt thoſe, that do not make a *Chriſtian uſe* of the *fraternal*; and therefore perhaps it is, that as *Excommunication*, or expulſion from the *Church* is the puniſhment of the former ſort of *refractory* ones, where there is an *Eccleſiaſtick conſeſſus* to inflict it, ſo where there is not that ſetled courſe of ſtrict diſcipline, through any *defect* or *diſorder* in a *Church*, the μὴ συναναμίγνυσθαι, the abſtaining from *familiarity* or near converſe, may be the *Apoſtles* counſel, not only to ſignifie our diſlike of thoſe whom our exhortations found ſo *obſtinate*, and to ſhew that we will deny our ſelves thoſe lawful joys of *friendſhip*, when they prove ſcandalous to others, either by *encouraging* them in their ſins, with whom we converſe, or *inviting* thoſe beholders to the like, who will be apt to conceive we do not diſlike them, but moreover to declare our acknowledgment of that great truth, that the main, almoſt ſole uſe of *Friendſhip* is the advantage of admoniſhing and amending one another; which when it begins to ceaſe, to be obſtructed, or to grow deſperate, *Friendſhip* is but an empty, formal, juiceleſs thing, fit enough to be laid aſide, being become ſo perfectly unprofitable.

Sect. 9. For this *Charitative fraternal correption* then, which is not any mans peculiar Province or incloſure, but the engagement and duty of every brother, or common *Chriſtian*, it is the ſame thing (though belonging to us in another capacity (that the *firſt admonition* both *Matt.* 18. and *Tit.* 3. was, and therefore will properly be expreſt by thoſe two common words there uſed of ἔλεγξις and νουθεσία, (which by comparing of *Matt.* 18. and *Tit.* 3. appear to be all one) the firſt ſignifying * *the telling the brother the clear and undiſguiſed truth*, and ‖ *bringing him to the ſenſe of the fault*, and making him *aſhamed* of it; the ſecond, *a rectifying his judgment, putting him in mind* of ſomewhat which was not before obſerv'd by him, and ſo * *exhortation* and *counſel*, ‖ *reproofs* and *chiding*, all deſign'd to that one end, *the reforming ſomewhat which is amiſs, the not ſuffering ſin upon the Brother.*

* ἐλέγχω, ἁπλῶς ἀληθὲς φανερόω, Phav. ‖ ἔλεγχος ἐπ' αἰσχύνῃ τίθεται. Ibid.

* νουθετῶ, παραινῶ, συμβουλεύω. Phav. ‖ νουθέτησις λόγος ἐπιπληκτικὸς ἕνεκα ἀποβολῆς ἁμαρτίας. Ib.

Of this (which is the adequate ſubject of our preſent diſcourſe) there be ſeveral degrees apportioned to the ſeveral occaſions or wants in the *Brother*, and preparative and previous one unto the reſt.

Sect. 10. 1. That of *inſtructing* one another, teaching the fellow *Chriſtian* whatſoever I know him ignorant of, on the which the purity and welfare of his ſoul doth depend, not the *communicating* to him all the

the *secrets* of my *profession.* or again all the *knowledge Theological* acquired by any, much less labouring to *infuse* into all others, all the *opinions* and *persuasions* I have imbibed, (which how true soever we conceive them to be, we are not to believe them all *necessary*, or profitable to all others) but particularly that practical knowledge which may tend to the *preventing* of sin, *resisting* temptations, (those especially to which I discern him most subject) *mortifying* of lusts, *regulating* of passions, *subduing* the Kingdom of Satan, and erecting the gracious Kingdom of *Christ* in the *brothers* heart. This is called, *Coloss.* 3. 16. διδάσκοντες καὶ νουθετοῦντες ἑαυτοὺς, *teaching and instructing one another*, and that as the means whereby *the Word of Christ may richly, abundantly inhabit among us.* The *frivolous, impertinent, empty* conversation of the world, but especially the *detracting, noisome, wanton* discourse, that goes for our only entertainment, or divertisement, is the *inhabiting of Satan* among us, either as *Belzebub*, a *god* of *flies*, or as a διάβολος, *Calumniator*, or as an ἀπολλύων, a *destroyer*, (either of which deserve a whole age of *Fasting*, and *Prayer*, if no other means will prevail to cast out that worst kind of noxious *spirit*) and only that kind of *converse* that is employed in spiritual instruction for the building up of the Soul, for the bettering of life, and which alone will be owned by the title of [πᾶσα σοφία, the *all wisdom*] in that place will be allowed the means by which *Christ* is said to *inhabite in us*, the *Devil* himself in the *Oracle* pronouncing this to be the only notion of true superlative *wisdom*, this of moral practical knowledge, and the Scripture by the mouth of *Solomon* especially, and *Christ* calling all things else but *simplicity and folly.*

A second degree is that of *observing* and *watching* over our Brethren. 1. To *provoke to goodness*, *Sect.* 11. putting them in mind of every occasion, wherein any *Christian vertue* of *mercifulness*, *Alms-giving*, *Meekness*, *Purity*, *Peace-making* is more than ordinarily seasonable, and by our example, and the examples of other pious men, (present, or read of in story, especially sacred) encouraging to abundance in well doing, and upon all occasions remembring them of the various dispensations of the *love* and *mercy of God*, through *Christ*, wherein they have had their peculiar portion and the infinite immarcessible crown, that *super-abundant weight of glory*, which is not in the same degree poured out to all, but dispensed *according to works*, according to the proportion of that *labour* of *Love*, and *work of Faith*, that shall be observable in every *Combatant of Christs*, when the great ἀγωνοθέτης, the * *leader and crowner of our Faith* shall come out to his day of retribution; and each of these is an excellent way to *provoke all to well doing*, the duty prescribed, *Heb.* 10. 24. *Let us observe one another to* * *sharpen or provoke* (in one another) *Charity and good* or *laudable works.*

* ἀρχηγὸς καὶ τελειωτὴς.

* εἰς παροξυσμὸν ἀγάπης καὶ καλῶν ἔργων.

2. To give the Brother a *sight* not only of his *Sins* (the not doing of which is an argument of a most mortal enmity, a *hating the Brother in the heart* whom we do not in that case *rebuke*, *Lev.* 19. 17. and no man must be ever accounted otherwise, than a treacherous contriver of his brothers destruction, that is guilty of it (but even of his *passions*, his *inclinations*, the weaknesses and peculiar distempers of his nature, things of which no man is a competent judge to discern them in himself, and wherein a man may live and dye ignorant, if he be not taught by anothers more impartial observation, and of which there is far more reason to expect to be *admonisht* by a *friend* that takes notice of them, than of a jaundice-look, or earthy *breath*, which being but symptomes of bodily diseases, and yet by all rules of *friendship* to be revealed to him who is concerned to know and seek out for cure of them, are not near so *dangerous*, to be *concealed*, or unlikely to be *discerned* by the patient, as the more subtile, secret *diseases* of the *Soul.* Thus, if the interpretation of learned men will stand good, St. *Paul* received benefit by the admonition of the by-standers, *Acts* 23. 4. without which he had not considered (as οὐκ ἤδειν seems best rendred) what was his duty to the *high-Priest.* And thus did Christ befriend St. *Peter* with the knowledge of his *passionate* temper (transported with *zeal* at the present, *though he should dye with Christ he will not deny him*, and afterwards, when danger was instant, transported as much with a contrary passion) and foretold him, that he peculiarly should *deny him*, which it seems, he never would have discern'd in himself: And if any had been armour sufficent against *fear*, this of all others would most probably have secured him.

The third is, (in case of falling into, but especially continuing in sin) *frequent, repeated, importunate calling* and rouzing to awake, and get out of it. That title of the friend among the *heathens*, to be the *other* or second *self*, being far from being lessen'd or superseded by *Christ*, (but improved indeed, and *applied* to the divinest and most sacred offices of *friendship*, and the rescuing from sin, as from the most formidable danger) laies an obligation upon every *friend*, every *brother*, *i. e. Christian* (toward every other, that comes within the reach of his warmth or influence) to supply all those offices, that every ones self, *i. e.* his * *Soul*, his *Conscience* is concerned and obliged to do. Thus when the *Conscience*, beside the *directive* office, hath another of *punishing* and disciplining too, of playing the *Erinnys* with the Torch within us, to scorch and light us out of our road of darkness, *the Brother*, *the Christian*, *the second Soul*, *and Conscience* within the fellow-*Christians* breast, received thus into his most venerable secrets, the knowledge of the deformities and sins of his very *Soul*, when either he hath neglected to perform the duty of the οἰκεῖος φύλαξ, the ἔνοικος θεὸς, the ἐπίτροπος δαίμων, the *Domestick divine guardian*, the assiduous watch to keep off the hostile approaches, or mines of sin, or hath not been obeyed in his warnings, he hath now this only last part of duty behind, that of becoming the *Angel to Lot*, calling him, leading him, forcing him out of *Sodom*, *setting him without the port*, with an *escape*, *flie for thy life*, *neither stay thou in all the plain*; and again reinforcing the admonition and warning, with an *Escape to the mountains*, *lest thou be consumed.* And he that hath no heart to be thus importunate upon his perishing brother, may by that ghess, how little he hath of that *Angelical* temper in him.

Sect. 12.

* Ἡ ψυχή, σὺ, said Pyth. & Αὐτοί μὲν ἅ χρεὼν ἦν σωλήσιον. ὅδε ξένος ἄμμορος, ὃν ἀλλά τι τοιοῦτον οὐδέν. ἀλλὰ ψυχὰ ἄσμεν, &c. *Gem. Pleth. l.* περὶ ἀρετ.

The fourth degree of this duty, is (in case any or all the former, though conscientiously and diligently used, have yet been without success, then) watching of *seasons* and opportunities, calling in *prudence* to assist *Charity*, the *brain* to aid the *heart*, either coming, as God to *Adam*, * *in the cool of the day*, when the temper of the wax may probably make it more capable of *impression*, or (as the Fathers say of Gods dealing with the Elect, whom he doth, as 'tis thought, by that means infallibly work on) calling him *tempore congruo*, at a fit chosen time, when in all probability a seasonable admonition may be hearkned to; Great variety there is of these opportunities, not defineable particularly,

Sect. 13.

* Ἐάν τίς σε καιρῷ γε μαλθακῷ κάμψῃ, καὶ μὴ σφεισῶντα δυσὸν ἰχνεύειν βίᾳ. *Æschyl. Prom. vinct.*

but only obſervable by him, that not only in his duty towards *God*, and toward *himſelf*, but alſo toward his *weak* or *ſick brother*, doth ἀκριβῶς περιπατεῖν, *walk circumſpectly*, and obſervingly, * *not as an unwiſe, but wiſe* watchman, and that is the meaning of ἐξαγοραζεσθαι τὸν καιρὸν, *Eph.* 5. 16. parallel to ἐξαγοράζειν καιρὸν, *Dan.* 2. 8. rendred in the former place, *redeeming*, in the later, *gaining the time*, *i. e.* delaying in time of the rage, or fury of the *Prince*, in *Dan.* or of the *evil times* in St. *Paul*; and ſo in the *heat* of a violent ſin, when *admonition* is out of its place, until the preſent tempeſt be over, and then there be more hope, or poſſibility for reaſon to be hearkned to. And as a branch of this comes in at laſt

* οὐκ ὡς ἄσοφος ἀλλὰ σοφός.

Sect. 14. A fifth degree of this duty (when nothing elſe will, and that may probably, or poſſibly do ſome good, but never elſe, never upon *wearineſs*, or *wrath*, or any thing, but grounds of deepeſt *charity*) the *breaking off familiar converſe* with him, to whom all other methods of kindneſs have prov'd ſucceſſleſs. For as in the *authoritative proceſs*, when the *cenſures* of the *Church* are found neceſſary [to the σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλὸς] to which only *Chriſt* deſigned them, the *ſaving that which is loſt*, the courſe is to deny him the moſt intimate ſociety, that of the *communion of the faithful*, and neither joyn with him in the *prayers* and *leſſons* (the συναναμίγνυσθαι) nor in the participation of the *Lords Supper*, (the συνεσθίειν τῷ τοιούτῳ) ſo in the image of that, the ſociety of *ſingle friends* or *Chriſtians* (eſpecially where there is no place for the publick *cenſures* either through want of *government* in a new planted *Church*, or where Schiſm hath driven it out, or where the *crime* is not of that nature, as to be capable of that publick *audience*) when all the former offices of the *Angelus cuſtos* have been perform'd improſperouſly, then that of the *Angel* with *Jacob*, a *wreſtling to get from him*, to deny him the *bleſſing* of his company and familiarity, may prove ſeaſonable, not out of a faſtidious paſſionate diſpleaſure to the ſinner, (O, he is then the moſt natural, proper object of *pity* and *kindneſs*, the incorrigible ſinner is fit for any thing rather than our *anger* or *impatience*) nor again, leſt I be polluted by his company, (in this caſe 'tis with the friend as with the *believing husband*, if the unbelieving wife is willing to *live with him, let him not depart, how knoweſt thou but that by thy Chriſtian* contrary example thou mayeſt yet ſave thy impenitent *heathen brother*?) but I ſay only on that great principle of ſaving *charity*, ἵνα ἐντραπῇ, that by ſeeing himſelf avoided, withdrawn from, left to converſe with none (beſide his *ſin*) but *fiends* and *flatterers*, he may poſſibly be *aſhamed*, and by that confuſion of ſpirit awakened out of that ſnare, whence the calm, leſs ſenſible admonitions were not able to rouze him, and this perhaps was the kind of παιδεία, that belonged to the ἀτακτοι, the *diſorderly diſobedient*, 1 *Theſ.* 5. 14. which the *Theſſalonians* are ſo earneſtly entreated (peculiarly under the notion ὡς ἀδελφοὶ, as *brethren*) to uſe in this caſe; and an opportunity ſometime may be wiſely choſen, when it may prove proper and ſeaſonable.

Sect. 15. I have done with the firſt particular; only by the way of appendage to it, I promiſed to ſhew alſo *how it comes to be a duty*, and that being quickly reſolved, becauſe it is commanded by Chriſt and St. *Paul*; and yet again, the rule being old and true, that affirmative precepts though they always bind, yet do not *ad ſemper*, ſo as to lay obligation on every man, that he ſhould *always* exerciſe the duties ſo commanded; and for the making of it *neceſſary* at any particular time, there being ſome *conditions* required by the concurrence of which it becomes *neceſſary*, and not otherwiſe; it remains worthy of a brief conſideration, what thoſe conditions are, neceſſary as to qualifie this *correption* aright, ſo to make the particular exerciſe of it neceſſary as an act of duty in each Chriſtian. And of theſe a very pious man, *John Gerſon*, the *Chancellour of Paris*, about 250. years ſince, in a ſhort Tract on this ſubject hath given us a ſufficient account: I ſhall chuſe to receive it from him in groſs, and as briefly preſent it to you. This of *Correption*, ſaith he, is by Chriſts precept become our duty, whenſoever theſe ſix conditions do concur. 1. That I have a *certain knowledge* of the Brothers ſin; a *ſuſpicion* being not ground ſufficient for ſo doing. 2. That I uſe all *mildneſs* or *manſuetude* in admoniſhing; the angry paſſionate correption being apt rather to provoke, than to amend. 3. If on conſideration I diſcern not, that *ſome other* is *fitter* for that performance than my ſelf, *i. e.* either more *familiar* with him, or elſe his *ſuperiour*, that may have ſome authority over him (as for a third conſideration, whether ſome body elſe be not more *pious*, or better qualified, I ſhall not put that into the ſcheme, leſt the moſt pious men being alſo the moſt humble, ſhould by that κριτήριον judge themſelves ſuperſeded from that duty.) Yet this alſo with this limitation, that if all other do appear to neglect that performance, then it muſt devolve to me again, and as far as concerns that condition, become my duty, if all the other conditions do concur with it. 4. If I have any probable ground of *hope* that he will be reformed or better'd by my *Correption*; whereas on the other ſide, if there be no ſuch hope, but rather that he will be provok'd, inflamed and grow worſe, I am not then bound thus to contribute to his deeper condemnation. 5. That the matter of the ſin be of ſome *weight*, and again, that it were done upon *advice* and *deliberation*, not out of *ſurreption*, *ſudden motion*, or *imperfect conſent*, (for by thoſe two he otherwhere makes up the interpretation of his notion of *mortal ſins* as he oppoſes them to *venial*.) And laſtly, if there be not hope of ſpringing ſome *happier opportunity* for this performance at ſome other time, which may make it prudent and charitable to defer it till then. The concurrence of theſe *conditions* is that which makes the *exerciſe* of this duty *neceſſary*, and the neglect a ſin, and the concurrence of at leaſt ſo many of them, as may give me hope of the deſigned ſucceſs, (that unto which the firſt mention of it by Chriſt was ordered, *to ſave that which was loſt*) the reforming any lapſt treſpaſſer, lays it upon me as a moſt excellent work of Chriſtian mercy; the uſefulneſs of which to my poor brother, is able to commend it to every Chriſtians practice, though there were no obligation, or precept lying on him.

Sect. 16. Now for the ſecond thing propoſed, what are the *benefits* and *advantages* of this performance, they have many of them been more than intimated already, in reſpect of the perſon whoſe turn 'tis at that time to be ſo friendly dealt with. 1. *Saving knowledge*, (a natural product of the inſtruction) and probably a right judgment in thoſe things that are moſt worth our moſt diligent ſearch, the intereſts of our ſouls.

Sect. 17. Secondly, the bettering our κριτικὴ, or *judicative faculty* in general, which is much betrayed, and *decayed* by loneneſs, and is moſt naturally improved by *comparing* our ſelves with other men, hearing their clear undiſguiſed opinion of our thoughts and actions.

Thirdly,

Thirdly, repreſſion of paſſions by this check; the compliance of ſociety being of all things moſt apt to ſmooth and draw on the vicious *diſpoſition* into a corrupt *habit*, and proportionably the denying us that compliance, or company, the expreſſing *diſlikes* of our ways, but eſpecially the undiſguiſed correption of thoſe friends, whoſe compliance would have had that force in it, being the moſt probable means to traſh our *Jehu-march*, and make the *Chariot-wheels drive heavily*, to take off from the pleaſure, and guſt which we have of ſin. *Sect.* 18.

Fourthly, it robs *Satan* of one of his greateſt advantages, the *faſhionableneſs* and creditableneſs of ſin, by which moſt of his moſt poyſonous recipe's, are gilded over; it brings *Chriſtianity* into a reputation, when it ſhall be ſeen that *Gods* cauſe can be own'd by his profeſſors, and the ſame zeal layed out on that Chriſtian deſign of driving *ſins*, as of old in the heathen world of driving *Centaures* and monſters out of the *Region*. *Sect.* 19.

Fifthly, it is the ſanctifying the vicionſeſt noyſomeſt part of our lives, our *converſation*, and communication among men; 'tis the only way of carrying back *friendſhip* unto *Paradiſe* again, drayning it from all the cloſe impurities, that have long been ſo inſeparable to it, and making it the only *Heaven*, that this earth is capable of, a ſtate of *love* and *purity*, of *enjoying* and *believing* one another; this one *rod*, as Saint *Paul* calls correption, being once animated, will, as *Moſes*'s did, *devour* all the *rods* or *ſerpents* of the *Magicians*, all thoſe other helliſh parts of our diſcourſe, *backbiting*, *whiſpering*, &c. which turn all our *Paradiſe* into a *wilderneſs*, make a kind of *hell* of that, which was intended for the greateſt and moſt hallowed *bleſſing* of our *life*. *Sect.* 20.

Sixthly, The mutual practice of this duty, fits for the benefit of *mutual Prayer*, and, beſide that great advantage which comes in from thence, in order to *another* life, Saint *James* mentions one peculiar *to this life*, ἵνα ἰαθῆτε, *that you may be healed*; the temporal puniſhments, *diſeaſes*, &c. (which are an effect of ſin in all; but eſpecially in *Chriſtians* lapſt, and not yet reformed, and ſometimes particularly of *treſpaſſes* againſt our brethren) are removed by the *prayers* of faithful men, to whom the παραπτώματα, whether *treſpaſſes*, or in general any *ſins* are confeſt, and as by the Apoſtle it appears, 1 *Cor.* 11. 13. the total omiſſion, the no kind of uſe of this *correption* publique or private, was it that brought theſe many *ſickneſſes*, *infirmities*, and *deaths* among them, which the practice of this *Duty*, and the opening their hearts to it would probably have prevented, *for if we would thus judge*, admoniſh, rebuke *our ſelves*, one the other, we ſhould not need any of that *judgment of the Lord*, that *diſcipline* from Heaven. And not only for *diſeaſes*, but alſo in matters of an higher alloy; Even *pardon of ſin*, and eternal ſalvation, may be the return of the brethrens *prayers*, 1 *John* 5. 16. for *him that ſinneth not unto death*, i. e. who although he hath faln into Gods diſpleaſure for his ſin, quench'd that grace in him, which was neceſſary to bring him back to life, hath yet in caſe of *fraternal correption* behaved himſelf *meekly*, not contumaciouſly againſt it, and ſo though he hath no promiſe to his own, hath yet a poſſibility of having other mens *prayers* heard for him (as *Jobs* for his *friends*, and *Noah* for all that would be perſwaded to come into the *Ark*) to obtain for him from *God*, *repentance* firſt, and then *life*, which no other humane means could in that deſolate eſtate give him any probable *hopes*, or aſſurance of. *Sect.* 21.

Laſtly, it is of infinite advantage to him that acts this part of a *friend*, he engages the other to the paying this debt of *Gratitude* and *juſtice*, hath the ſame charity return'd him again in time of need, and ſo lays up a good treaſure for himſelf, of all others the moſt profitable in this life; and acquires a *right* to his part in that glorious prophecy concerning him, that *turns many* unto righteouſneſs, that of *ſhining like Stars in the Firmament for evermore*; and that other (more than *prophecy*) down-right affirmation, *James* 5. 19. *Brethren, if any of you do erre from the truth, and one convert him, let him know, that he which converteth the ſinner from the errour of his way, ſhall ſave a ſoul from death, and ſhall hide a multitude of ſins.* *Sect.* 22.

Having now given you the parts, and the gains of this duty, which will be able to commend it to the *Chriſtians* conſtant practice, and ſet it up in his heart as a prime fundamental *Charity* and mercy to the moſt precious part of mankind, his fellow *Chriſtians Soul*, There were no fear that *Satan* would ever be able to diſſwade the exerciſe of it, were there not ſome *Objections* fitted to his hands, ſome prejudices that *phanſie*, and humour, and contrary *cuſtomes* do confront againſt it, when we come particularly to the practice of it. 'Twill be neceſſary therefore in the laſt place to *remove* thoſe *obſtacles* that they may not obſtruct ſo rich a medicinal vein of *charity*, when it is ready to overflow and bleſs the fields about it. *Sect.* 23.

The firſt Objection is, that of the fleſh, the ſame that is pretended againſt all other duty, *the pain of doing it*, the *difficulties* and uneaſineſſes of ſpeaking plain truth to any man, when it muſt be ſo unacceptable, as *reprehenſions* are generally found to be. This objection is at the very propoſing, the greateſt reproach to the objecter that could be charg'd on him by an enemy. 1. It ſeems this man can neither ſerve *God*, nor his brother, of *that which coſts him any thing*; If any *uneaſineſs* can be pretended by the *fleſh*, *Chriſt* and his *Chriſtian member* muſt be ſent away without their dues, and rather ſtarve for want of their neceſſary bread, than we diſeas'd, or (like him in the *Goſpel*) *raiſed out of our beds* to give it to him. 2. This gives a ſtrange character of that mans temper in judging of *hard* or *eaſie*; it muſt be hard to venture the doing any thing unacceptable to another; but certainly to deliver him up to *deſtruction*, *for whom Chriſt died*, and for whom, if I am any thing like affected with Chriſt, I would lay down my *life* alſo, there ſhall be no difficulty in this. 3. This is a piece of the perfecteſt *phanſie*, an effect meerly of ſluggiſh cowardiſe, which always pretends the *Lyon in the way*, and by that is kept from attempting any part of duty, which if it were but heartily approacht, would appear far from *formidable*, matter of *eaſe*, and pleaſure to any, whoſe *phanſie* were but once cured and purged of thoſe *figments* or *chimæra's* of difficulty, which keep us from ever trying to do any thing. Many men, I doubt not, which have taken heart, and caſt off theſe ſluggards *phantaſmes*, have found more comfort in the practice and exerciſe of one act of this duty toward a *friend*, than in all the other fruitleſs converſation of their whole age with him. 4. 'Tis a moſt *ignoble degenerous* humour this, to be able to *flatter* a friend, (for ſuch is all that *civility* of not *rebuking* when there is need) but not to be able to *reprove* him, to have the heart to ſee him poyſon'd clancularly, but not dare *Sect.* 24.

dare preſent him with an *antidote*, leſt that ſhould let him know, that he is conceiv'd to want it: this was the *criticks* nicety that would not let ὑγιαίνειν be the prayer for an *Epiſtle* to begin with, for fear of being thought to have reproacht him whom we meant to ſalute, to call him *madman*, by wiſhing him *ſanity*. The vileſt ſin that ever *Moraliſt* declaim'd at, that which never got any *advocate* to plead for it, nor ſcaped the rudeſt ſcoffs of the bittereſt *Satyriſts*, is that of *flattery*, and this is now owned by him who makes this *objection*, (the *negative flattery* being as truly, though not ſo groſly ſuch as the *affirmative*, the concealing of *faults*, as the *depradicating* of *vertues*) and never had the fate or favour to be ſo civilly uſed by any other kind of *pultroon* before him. 5. 'Tis in all probability (at leaſt in charity ſhould be conceived to be) an act of the greateſt *injuſtice* toward him, whom 'tis thus *uneaſie* for us to *reprehend*; It is by *interpretation*, the *reproaching* him of all the *baſe humour*, mean diſpoſition in the world, the telling him that he is, what the Poets do perhaps but feign of the *Elephant*, and the *Phyſicians* count a *madneſs* where ever 'tis diſcernible, one that dares not look upon himſelf, or ſee his ſhape in any *reflexion*, can be guilty of *deformities*, but dare not *behold* them, hath a perfect antipathy to the *looking-glaſs*, one that *hates to be reformed*, profeſſes the Art of *begwiling* himſelf into *hell*, and hath no other *ſolicitude* or deſign, but only to go undiſturbedly thither, hath promiſed himſelf to *Satan*, and will not indure to be ſo much as *cheapned* out of his hands. 'Tis clear what an accumulation of *reproaches* of the fouleſt nature is here pour'd out on this one man, whom the objecter was ſo nice to reprehend, and that he might keep him his friend told him *covertly*, and by way of *interpretation* (which are generally the bittereſt acts of *reviling*) that he was of all perſons the moſt uncapable of that title, one of a temper the moſt perfectly contrary to *friendſhip*, for ſuch is *impatience* of ſeaſonable reprehenſion where ever it is obſervable.

Sect. 25. A 2*d. prejudice* againſt this duty, is the danger of unſeaſonableneſs, either in reſpect of the *perſons* who may be our *ſuperiours*, and then ought not to be *rebuked* by us; or in reſpect of the *time*, if that be not ſo luckily choſen, for in that caſe there will be danger, not only of *miſcarrying* and *doing* no *good*, but even of bringing greater *guilt* and danger upon that man, whom we meant to reſcue out of it, that ill accident being common to this, with all other kind of *Phyſick*, that it hurts when it doth not mend, proves *poyſon* to him, whoſe diſeaſe gets the *conqueſt* over it, or hinders it from working; eſpecially if there be any errour committed but in the circumſtances of *mixing* or *applying* it, no errours being more *fatal* and *irreparable* than ſuch.

Sect. 26. To this again the anſwer will be prompt, firſt, That for the firſt kind of unſeaſonableneſs, as it is a real objection, ſo it will eaſily be avoided, and conſequently that care muſt be taken indeed, that our *Conſcience* or zeal of this duty do not put us on any *publick rebuking* of *our ſuperiours*, whoſe duty it is to beſtow that *alms* upon us, and ours on the other ſide to receive it meekly from them, and not to think that we are their *Magiſtrates* back again; ſuch an irregularity may be of dangerous *Conſequence*, may make the ſuperiours vile in the eyes of thoſe whoſe honouring of them is a neceſſary preparative to incline them to *obey*, and ſo may have a fatal *influence* on the publick; and the but poſſibility of this being ſo conſiderable, will in all reaſon put in a *reſtraint* and *caveat*, that this be not done in any manner, but what is perfectly *private* and remote from that danger, and that alſo competible with that *honour and civility* due to thoſe from all their inferiours: Nay, 2. there may come a great deal of hurt to *inferiours* themſelves by their apprehending this to be their *office*, or *duty*. They will not be ſo careful to *obey* uniformly, when they think they have another capacity, wherein they ought to be *obey'd*; it being more pleaſant and agreeable to paſſionate fleſh and blood to give, than to receive directions or rules of life, and a piece of prime ſenſuality to be *tampering* any way, or interpoſing in the actions of our *ſuperiours*, which we ſhall be ſure to do, when we have *duty* or *charity* to pretend for it.

Sect. 27. Nay yet farther, upon this ſcore, the caveat muſt extend, not only to our legal *ſuperiours*, but even thoſe, who by their learning or knowledge, are placed in an higher orb than other men, from whoſe *mouth the people ſhould receive the Law*, and not think themſelves obliged to *inſtruct their teachers*, but meekly to be inſtructed by them, in all thoſe things, wherein the *knowledge* of the one, and *ignorance* of the other may be preſumed to make it ſeaſonable. Wherein that our duty may not preposterouſly be inverted, it will be fit, that even, where there may poſſibly be ſome need, the exerciſe of that fraternal duty be ſuſpended ſo far at leaſt, as may not interrupt that regular order, which ought to be obſerv'd among men, *i.e.* without queſtion in *publick* (which will be always under ſuſpicion of proceeding from ſome other principle than that of *Charity*) and even in *private* alſo, unleſs it be in matters of that nature which are *groſs* and *criminous*, and confeſtly evil, and out of all doubt and queſtion among men, and that in caſe we be their *equals* alſo in *condition*, although not in *knowledge*. As for other points of *opinion* as are controverted among men, we ſhould in all reaſon *ſuſpect* our ſelves, when we find not the concurrence of more *knowing* judgments with ours, rather than take upon us to *rebuke* thoſe from whom 'tis much fitter for us to *learn*, to receive that dole of charity than to *beſtow* it.

Sect. 28. And for the ſecond ſort of *unſeaſonableneſs*, that in reſpect of the time and other circumſtances, I anſwer, 1. That *ſeaſonableneſs* is a prime ingredient in the duty: and the *brother* who is bound to admoniſh, is bound alſo to do it as *prudently*, i. e. as *ſeaſonably* as he can, with all the circumſtances that may aſſiſt the *Phyſick*, and help it to a kindly working; To which end, as the *Phyſician*, before he will adminiſter the moſt ſafe known *medicine*, will enquire not only into the *diſeaſe*, but the *complexion*, *conſtitution*, *ſex*, *age*, *diet*, *courſe of life of his patient*, the ſtate of his former *health* and *inclinations*, whether he formerly uſed to be thus, and how long and often; ſo will it concern (him eſpecially, that takes this to be ſtrong *Phyſick*, is not ſure 'twill be ſafe) to examine all theſe *accidents*, and *circumſtances*, (and to that purpoſe to be very vigilant over his *patient*) and then accommodate his *Phyſick* as *prudence*, and skill in this art (which would therefore be worth our moſt ſerious *ſtudying*) will beſt *direct* him. But then 2. as theſe hazards are not proper to make the *Phyſician negligent* or *ſullen*, but rather more careful over his charge, ſo will not this danger of *unſeaſonableneſs* excuſe any for a *total omiſſion* of this duty, but only increaſe his *vigilance* and care, that it may be wiſely and well performed; and if that man would know whether he have done his *duty* in this kind,

he

he had beſt examine, whether having omitted to perform this act of mercy at a time *unſeaſonable*, he have ever found and made uſe of a fitter *ſeaſon* to practiſe it. Otherwiſe as *Felix* diſmiſt Saint *Paul for that time, and when he had a more convenient ſeaſon*, promiſed to call for him again, but is never read to have done ſo, and ſo demonſtrated, that 'twas the ſubject of Saint *Pauls* Sermon, *juſtice and continence, and a judgment to come* upon his ſcandalous guilt of the contrary ſins, and not the *unſeaſonableneſs* of it at that *one* time, that made him put off the hearing of it: or as the ſordid ſcandalous Miſer can quarrel with ſomewhat in every object of *charity* he meets with, and never find it perfectly *ſeaſonable* for him to be (what naturally he is not) a liberal *Alms-giver*; ſo this over-wary prudent pretender hath reaſon to judge of himſelf in this matter, that the *unſeaſonableneſs* of the duty was but the *excuſe*, the coldneſs of *Chriſtian* charity, the true cauſe of his neglects. And,

Sect. 29. The truth is, this Objection hath been ſo far admitted among men, as to make many of the moſt *neceſſary* Duties of Chriſtians, when there hath been moſt uſe of them, then particularly to be thought *unſeaſonable*: Thus *confeſſion* of our *Chriſt* in many of his *Precepts*, when they have been oppoſed, when obedience to them, eſpecially an avow'd reſolution never to diſobey, hath been thought a matter of ſome *danger* to us, to our *eſtates*, our *liberties*, our *good names* (though only the *contrary* it is that menaces *danger* to our ſouls) hath ſolemnly been reſolved to be *unſeaſonable*; and there is no way to fortifie us againſt this miſtake but by defining what *unſeaſonableneſs* is, taking off the diſguiſe, or *equivocalneſs* of it, and ſetting it its due limits, in which, but not beyond which, there may be ſome truth or reality in the Objection.

Sect. 30. And that will be done by ſetting one rule in general, and by remitting the reſt to *prudence* and *conſcience*, (not to ſloth or cowardice) to apply to the particular emergencies. The rule will be this, that whenſoever *admonition* may probably do good to the perſon to whom 'tis deſigned, and not *harm* either to him or any other, then it cannot by any ſecular poſſible inconvenience, that may be fear'd to my ſelf, become *unſeaſonable*; whatever cenſure falls upon me through anothers *miſtake* or ſuddenneſs of *paſſion*, (which are not in my power, and ſo cannot be my duty ſtrictly to provide againſt) it matters not, ſo the brother receive benefit by it, (and I were the perſon from whom it was due to him) and that he may poſſibly do, when he doth not expreſs it at the time, yea, when on the contrary he doth ſeem to believe, that he is cauſleſly reprehended. For he may be of a *proud humour*, and then he will not be apt to acknowledge any crime, leſt that paſs for a *ſubmiſſion*, which though it be in that caſe a perfect *errour*, (that *victory* over his *paſſion*, and over his *ſin* being an act of ſpecial *magnanimity* beyond all our little *ambitions* and *emulations*, and deſires of conquering others) yet may it perhaps have that real effect on him, as to make him unwilling to yield at the preſent through *paſſion*; which act of reſiſtance yet, afterward upon ſober judging, and diſcerning the truth of the reprehenſion, he may be willing to retract, and mend that privately upon his *own pleaſure*, which he would not be reproacht or forc'd out of by his brothers *importunity*. Many other occaſions may intervene which may keep our *reprehenſions* from the preſent deſired effect, which yet notwithſtanding, the ſeed may take *root* in the ground, and *after many days* ſpring up, though it do not *inſtantly*, and then the *Parable* of the Sower ſets no ill character on that ſoyl, which did not preſently ſhoot up, but brought out ſo leiſurely, that the Husbandman was fain to have ſome exerciſe of his *patience* for the while. And therefore I ſay, whenſoever the *rebuke* may moſt probably do good, either inſtantly, or for the future, by committing that ſeed to the *furrows*, which will after bring forth fruit in the *harveſt*, 'twill be all *injuſtice* and falſe witneſs, and puniſhable as the ſpreading of *falſe news*, to affirm it *unſeaſonable*. Every thing 'tis acknowledg'd from *Solomon*, hath its propriety of *ſeaſon*, and the *ſeaſon* for *reproof* is, when there is any fault committed, or when probably it may without a warning; Nay, if through *errour*, the *phyſick* be adminiſtred, when there was no need of it, only ſome *appearance* of it, which cauſed the *miſtake*, there may yet be ſome uſe of that, both to rectifie the *miſtake* in the one, and to warn the other, that ſuch a lawful action may yet be apt to be *miſtaken*, and this will be no hurt to either of them, the one to be *rectified*, the other to be *inform'd*. But then to be over-nice in judging of *ſeaſons* (any farther than by diſcerning that the man is awake, and in his right wits, and capable of what is ſaid to him) will be the ſame ſcrupuloſity that keeps the *weather-wiſe* husbandman from *ſowing*, and if upon ſtrict advice it ſhould yet be prudentially decreed, that ſome *ſeaſons* were not at all fit for this turn, I ſhould yet reſolve that 'twere *corrupt cuſtome, popular errour, &c.* which hath help'd this to be true, and then the planting the contrary truer notions in the World (to which this paper is deſign'd) *viz.* a *belief and aſſurance* that *fraternal correption* is not only a *Chriſtian* duty, and ſo an act of *righteouſneſs*, but that of the moſt neceſſary *charity* to our *brothers* ſoul, and that 'twere better and ſafer to venture the *caſting* away one *Almes* ſometimes, than by *ſcruples* and *prudence* to endanger the detaining a thouſand, when they are due and neceſſary, will ſoon diſpatch this Objection out of the way, how ſullenly and ſwiniſhly ſoever it be lain down in it.

Sect. 31. Should but an inhumane cuſtome come into the World, making it *uncivil for Scholars* to diſcourſe of books, allowing them any other kind of converſe, but that which might tend to the *bettering* one another, what were to be done by Students in this caſe? The only *ſeaſonable*, were a reſolution to bear down this *irrational* mad faſhion with the contrary, a conſpiration of all men, who are ſo nearly concern'd in it, to ſet themſelves againſt this, as againſt their mortalleſt enemy, deſign'd for the ruine of *Academies* and *Libraries*, and all that is civil; and within a while a more rational contrary *cuſtome* may get in, and then that prove *ſeaſonable* and neceſſary by the ſame argument, by which before 'twas *unſeaſonable* and *ſuperfluous*; and if this moſt reaſonable inſtance may be heeded, I ſhall reſolve, that then this *objection* will be anſwered, if before it were not.

Sect. 32. If it be further demanded here, whether ſome *places* may not be *unfit* for the exerciſe of this duty, and that will be *equivalent* with *unſeaſonable*; I anſwer, that if *prudence*, true, ſad, *Chriſtian prudence* ſay they be, thoſe places which are more *ſeaſonable* ſhould be choſen in their ſtead, and on condition that the duty be performed, the propereſt place ſhall be left to the *Chriſtians* choice; and for his direction this *general* rule may be reſolved on, that the more private the *correption* is, the more

ſeaſonable

ſeaſonable it will be, and probably the more effectual. But then 2. that which is moſt eligible in ſome regards, may be leſs in others, a *publick* calm *reproof* may, beſides the good of the perſon to whom 'tis addreſt, prove beneficial to the whole ſociety: as 1. It may give them an *example* of that *faſhion*, which perhaps they may tranſcribe from thy *practice*, though they have not from the *precept* of *Chriſt*, and ſo make them both better *men*, and more valuable *friends* when they have acquired this moſt uſeful accompliſhment of friendſhip; and 2. it may *arraign* the like vices in other men, which are *rebuked* in one, which is but the placing our *charity* at the beſt advantage, (like the Almſ-giver at the corner of a ſtreet, which is viſible and exemplary both ways) ſo as may be moſt diſcernible, and ſo uſeful to many, (moſt contrary to the niggardlineſs of the incloſure) that ἀφθονία in *Damaſcen*, the ſpecial attribute of the true *God* (contrary to the φθόνος θαλμοῦ among the heathen) an improvement I ſay, ſuppoſing it free from the *vain-glory* and other vices incident to this kind, not any errour, or miſplacing of it. In this caſe if it be rightly ſet, there is place for *exception* to the *general* rule; And yet ſtill if the *private* reprehenſion may be probably the more *available* (and not only the leſs difficult) no queſtion the *private* is to be made uſe of.

Sect. 33. A 3*d.* Objection is the danger of undergoing the *cenſure*, either of *proud*, or *cenſorious*, or *impertinent*, and ἀλλοτριοεπισκοπος being *over-buſie in other mens matters*, if we thus take upon us to be ſuch ſevere *Cato*'s to obſerve and rebuke others. This hath already been anſwered in the general, that the duty muſt be perform'd, what ever the *hazards*, *dangers* to us ſhall appear to the contrary. Our Apoſtle hath told us there is *no fear in love*, 1 *John* 4. 18. (and the love there is ἀγάπη μεθ' ἡμῶν, the *Charity of Chriſtians one toward another*, ver. 17.) and *that perfect love caſteth out fear*, i.e. (as the Text importeth to my ſeeming) all fear of danger that may attend the diſcharge of any *charitable* office to the brother; if the love be ſuch as *Chriſts*, ſuch as it ought, it will boldly ſet about the duty (Saint *Paul* will be content to be a *fool*, when his *love* thus *conſtrains* him) and never interpoſe ſuch ſcrupulous objections of *fear* to keep from expreſſing acts of *love*. But then more particularly for the ſeveral branches of the danger, 1. That of being counted *proud*: If it had been of being really ſo, of doing any thing that aroſe from any principle of *animoſity*, or *inſolence*, &c. I ſhould acknowledge *great* force in the objection; but as it is only the danger of being *counted* guilty of that, when we are not guilty; if that vain *fear* might be allow'd to be an excuſe, or *ſuperſedeas* for ſo weighty a duty, if our *reputation of humility* muſt be tended ſo warily, and the ſouls of our poor *Brethren* ſo prodigally and wretchleſly neglected, if we may not be content once to appear, what moſt of us conſtantly are, guilty of any degree of *pride*, though for the ſaving that ſoul for which *Chriſt* ſubmitted his glorious *Majeſty* to a reproachful *death*, yet certainly this may be a ſatisfaction to the objection, that the wiſer ſort of men have reſolv'd with *Plutarch*, that δυσωπία or *baſhfulneſs*, (ſuch is this of not daring to do our duty in *rebuking* our ſtray *brethren*) is a moſt certain evidence, and *ſymptome of pride*; He that dares not ſpeak to others, leſt he ſhould not appear ſo extreamly handſome to them, as he deſires to do, leſt he ſhould at all diminiſh himſelf in their opinion, by admitting them to a cloſer ſurvey of him, ſignifies that he ſets an *huge value* upon himſelf, and ſo not without reaſon, the moſt *reſerv'd* generally are accounted the moſt *ambitious*, if not the moſt *proud*; as the Heathen *Gods* that never convers'd with men, and are by the *Epicureans* conceiv'd not to meddle with the obſervation, or puniſhment of what is done here below, are ſaid to ſpend their whole time in *admiration* of their own *excellencies*; All which is little leſs than *demonſtration*, that this coyneſs, tenderneſs, niceneſs of reprehending any, that I may hope to amend by it, is a ſpice of the greater ſtate and *pride*: I am ſure ſo diligent a ſtrict watch over their actions, as not to venture on any thing that may bring that *cenſure* upon them, is an argument, that they are guilty of it, far greater, than the performance of this duty would be, (after men have imbibed the right notion of it) among the ſoberer ſort of *Chriſtians*, whoſe judgments are only worth the heeding; he that muſt approve himſelf to all others, and either *ſeek*, or *receive* the *praiſe of men* indefinitely, will never be a *believer*, or *Diſciple of Chriſt*, never profeſs thoſe *truths*, or practiſe theſe *duties*, which are oppoſed by any prevailing party.

Sect. 34. Next, for that of being counted *cenſorious*; This is the not diſcerning things that are moſt *different*, by wanting that faculty of κριτικὴ, the reproach of having of which he doth ſo paſſionately avoid. For ſure the *judging* betwixt *good and evil*, and making uſe of it, either to the avoiding of the *evil* in my ſelf or others, would never by any miſtake be ſhuffled under that title. The fault of *cenſoriouſneſs* is *uncharitableneſs*, and delighting to gnaw on the reputation of other men, or judging in their *actions* or *counſels*, that are ſet over us by *God*, and this is wont to be founded in *miſtake* and *injuſtice*, and accompanied with *back-biting*, *ſlanders*, and *ſedition* ſometimes; and though this of *fraternal correption* be the good quality that dwells neareſt that *vice* of any other, yet is that no more ground of diſcouraging, or blaſting that *vertue*, than it proves the drowning of the *earth*, that it hath the *ſea* ſo near it; 'Twas part of the deſign of this paper to root out the former of theſe, and to ſecure the *Chriſtian* againſt it, by planting this other in the room of it, as there is not a better anſwer to *Satan*, than that of the *non vacat*, there is no room, or place for him; and if the fear of being counted *cenſorious* now, muſt make the *charity of reproving* unfit for my turn, as before the ſin of *cenſoriouſneſs* did, Satan is ſure become a very dextrous artificer, able to get the victory, which ſoever ſide of the cauſe is ſet him to ſollicite, or rather our uncharitable corrupt hearts have prov'd ſuch, and *Satan* leſs guilty of theſe wiles and contradictious crafts, than we.

Sect. 35. Laſtly, for *impertinence*, or *buſying our ſelves in that which doth not belong to us*: Opinion or fame is very unjuſt, if it charge this guilt on us on no other grounds but theſe. For that we were not born only to conſider our ſelves, our own eaſe, or intereſts, was the *heathens* rule, and the *Apoſtles* plain words, that we are *members one of another*, and if the *foot* cannot *ſay to the hand*, nor the *hand* retort to the *foot*, or meaneſt member of *Chriſts* body, [*I have no need of thee*] then ſure the health, the ſafety of a *periſhing brothers* ſoul, that hath ſo ſpecial particular inſtant need of thee, may well claim ſome of thy aid, account it ſelf within the reach of thy *providence* and *vigilance*, and

and till *Chriſt* ſhall make a new *wall of partition*, a γεισὸς or *ſept*, or μεσότοιχον τὸ φράγμα, ſuch as was anciently in the *Jewiſh Temple* to divide *Jew* from *Alien*, (and was ſaith Saint *Paul*, *taken away by* CHRIST) till he ſhall think fit to erect another in the ſtead, and preſcribe us our *bill* of *divorce*, or *ſeparation* to all mankind, with a [τὶ ἐμοὶ καὶ σοὶ] or [*Res tuas tibi habe*] that which is ſo preciouſly valuable to any other *Chriſtian*, muſt never be vile in thy eyes, never far baniſht from thy heart, I mean the conſtant faithful obedience of every *Chriſtian* to *Chriſt*, or his returning again after each miſcarriage; and when thy reprehenſions are thus inſtrumental in themſelves, and by thee thus deſigned, and withal the caution formerly mentioned, carefully obſerv'd, that our *Fathers* whoſe *charge* we are, be not by errour miſtaken for *our charge*, thy charity ſhall never by any reaſonable Judge be thought too diffuſive, to have roved *impertinently* out of its *dioceſs*, nor muſt ſo irrational a *fear* diſturb, or ſuſpend the exerciſe of that *Charity*.

I cannot gueſs at any more than only one Objection, that is ſtill behind: He that would excuſe himſelf from the obligation of this duty, will be apt to ſay, that he hath not ſuch an *authority* with him, as is required for the due diſcharge of this duty. To this I anſwer, 1. That if he have obſerved the cautions premiſed, and perform this duty to the *equals*, or *brethren* (as that doth not include the *fathers* or *ſuperiours*) the objection is evidently falſe: For to the due diſcharge of the *Fraternal Correption* there is no greater *dignity* required, than to be an *equal* or *brother* alſo. Or if he think he muſt be a *ſuperiour*, or elſe he is not fit for this performance, then 2. I anſwer, that this is a *petitio principii* again; that which is every mans duty *neceſſitate præcepti*, by *force* of that *Precept* of *every mans minding* and caring for the things *of others*, what may be for their *edification*, is not only preſcribed the *Cato* or the *Ariſtarchus*; He that looks in an even level, may ſee ſomewhat, and many times the full portraicture of every action within his reach, though he that looks down, hath the larger and more commanding view of all under him; The *authoritative* rebuke may require ſomewhat of *Authority* and gravity in the perſon that manages it, and therefore to the *Biſhop Timothy* the exhortation is not unſeaſonable, that he take care that *no man deſpiſe him*; but for the *fraternal*, which ſuppoſes not that *gravity*, he that hath *Chriſts precept* to back him, and practiſeth it within the due ſtrict limits, needs no *authority* that can accrue to him from any outward accompliſhment: beſides that rebuke that meets with uncapable *objects*, or is not prudently managed by the *admoniſher*, would proſper no more in caſe it brought *authority* with it, than from a *friend*; nay perhaps not ſo much, becauſe *ſtout* men are ſometime *well natured*, and therefore ſtill that is no objection. 'Tis true indeed, where *Pride* is rooted in the heart, there is little place for *correption*, *fraternal* or *authoritative*, nay the ἔλεγχος or *conviction* of the *ſpirit* it ſelf proves generally uneffectual on ſuch, the humble are the malleable perſons, (*of whom is the Kingdom of Heaven*, *Matth.* 5.) and the εὐαγγελιζόμενοι, the peculiar ſort of men are *wrought on by the preaching of the Goſpel*; but on the other ſide, the *proud* heart is fortified impregnable againſt all, and is conſequently the greateſt plague, and *curſe*, that *a fiend could wiſh* or help us to. But this is no objection againſt the preſent doctrine, but on the other ſide, the ſoft word may *break* the *bone*, that the more violent aſſault was not able to bend; the *fraternal calm rebuke* may do more good, than the moſt *paternal and authoritative*. *Sect.* 36.

But to ſuppoſe this *objection* yet to have ſome force in it, (though we have demonſtrated it hath none) I ſhall grant it very unfit for any *private* man, to think he hath any *authority*, or but σεμνότης or *gravity*, that may make him fit to *rebuke* his *ſuperiour*, nay that may render him *venerable* in his *brothers* eye: But then ſure that which is not ſo fit for him to *aſſume* to himſelf, (and without which he is yet obliged to do his duty, to rebuke when it is *ſeaſonable*) is fit enough for others to attribute to him, eſpecially thoſe, who by that means are to receive a ſoveraign ſaving benefit; even the *ſuperiour* himſelf, who is to be as wary of his *ſoul*, as any other, and wants in all probability more helps than other men for the *preſerving* it *ſpotleſs from the world*, (as much as his *burthen* is *heavier*, his duty more *extenſive*) may do well to call in the opinions of other men, and not refuſe to gain, or benefit by the meaneſt. And then to draw toward the concluſion of this Diſcourſe, and prevent all poſſibility of farther objections againſt it, the reſult will be, that it is every *Chriſtians* part, at leaſt to chuſe out ſome body as a *Monitor*, that may keep a daily watch over him, be it the *friend*, the *ſon* of his love, the *wife* of his boſome, (or any that is not too *ignorant*, too blindly *fond*, or too *puſillanimous* to diſcharge it.) For the truth is, it is moſt rational that the buſineſs ſhould lie at the *ſick mans* door, that he that finds his wants of this kind, (as every man will do, that is not perfectly *inſenſate*) ſhould ſeek out, and be at the coſt and expence of a little *care* at leaſt, and a little *humility* to repair them; And then the *Phyſick* will be ſure to come *ſeaſonably*, when 'tis call'd and begg'd for, when the perſon of the *Phyſician* is ſuch, as I can *phanſie*, and ſo confide in, eſpecially if ſuch, as *Hippocrates* appoints him to be, (directing the compoſition of the *Phyſician*, as well as the *medicines*) one of a good *healthy conſtitution* himſelf, that hath prevented thoſe *diſeaſes* in his own ſoul, which he profeſſes to cure in others. And that this may be done, is my humbleſt requeſt, and he whom the *love of Chriſt*, and the ſoul which he hath redeemed, will not *conſtrain*, O yet let the *terrours of the Lord perſwade*, to be in conſtant fee with ſome ſuch *ſanctified familiar*, (that like the *Divine* appointed to be aſſeſſor in ſome well order'd Senate, may ſit by, and watch, *ne quid contra pietatem*, *that nothing be done againſt piety*) with ſome faithful obſerver, and true relator of all the occurrences, and obſervables of his life, which it will concern him to be adviſed in, and in this ſence [*væ ſoli*, moſt ſad *woes to him that is thus alone*] was the interpretation of the *terrours* that I mentioned. He that is *overtaken in a fault*, if there be not ſome good *Samaritan* near to have pity on him, to pour ſoft, but healing *oyl into his wounds*, and ſo καταρτίζειν, *to bind up*, and reſtore him again, may unhappily lie ſo long in his ſin, that there be no more life left in him; the repulſed *grace* of *Chriſt* in this caſe conſtantly withdrawing it ſelf, and not ordinarily returning again to thoſe noyſome dwellings which have once ſo *grieved*, and baniſht him out of their coaſts. By which you will diſcern the advantage of a ſeaſonable *friend*, the benefit of a timely cure. *Sect.* 37.

Sect. 38. And yet once more, becauſe it may be expected from us, though we be never ſo fooliſhly *kind*, yet to prove neither truly *juſt*, nor *charitable* to our ſelves, It may be fit for me before parting, to call back again to them that are abroad, and tell them 'tis poſſible for one that ſtands or paſſes by to diſcern a *ſeaſon*, and interpoſe as fitly and opportunely, as if he had waited never ſo ſtaunchly for the patients call; fit for others that ſee a man in danger and inſenſible, to adviſe him to ſeek out for help to thoſe that are *Maſters* of the faculty, if poſſibly their skill and experience, and impartial ſurvey may enable them to ſee more by him, than he can do by himſelf. This is it that we never fail to do in the *indiſpoſitions* of the *body*, and the ſame in the *hazards* of our *Eſtates*: The *Lawyer* and *Phyſician*, every friend will importune to have call'd into the *conſultation*, leſt our confidence ſhould coſt us over-dear; and unleſs the ſoul be the only *impregnable*, ſafe, (our hold in our part of Gods decrees, an amulet, and abundant ſecurity againſt all dangers) or (which is more frequently the caſe) the only *refuſe*, *vile*, *deſpicable* commodity, this muſt be a good advice in the *ſpiritual* eſtate alſo.

Sect. 39. One thing only may yet farther be asked by way of *caſe*, to whom this office is due from every of us. To which I ſhall anſwer by giving you two marks or rules of diſcerning; The firſt very obvious and plain, that every *brother* that hath *treſpaſt* againſt thee, by the peculiarity of that character, and the force of our *Saviours* ſpeech, *Matt.* 18. 15. is pointed out to thee as thy peculiar lot or portion, whom thou art to take care of, *to go and tell him his fault between him and thee alone*, repay him charity for treſpaſs, *if ſo be by that means thou mayeſt gain thy brother.*

Sect. 40. The ſecond rule will be a reſult made up of ſome *negative*, and one *poſitive* obſervation, and will be beſt ſuggeſted to us by remembring, that this is a duty of *charity* to the brother, and conſequently to be determined and defined to the object, as other *almes*, and *charities* are wont. Now as the precept of *giving* or *lending* to *all*, muſt certainly have two reſtraints, 1. That it lay not a charge on me to take every man in the world into the *Catalogue* of my Beadeſ-men, but [all] only as that takes away the difference betwixt *good and bad*, and denotes indefinitely, without excluſion of any, the ſeveral ſorts of men, or Chriſtians, (ſo that every man of what *qualifications* ſoever may be capable of my *liberality*, if he be by any direct means of God's providence particularly preſented, or offered to it:) 2. That rich men are not thereby enabled to claim a part of my *liberality*, or *lone*, but only thoſe, whoſe wants render them fit *objects* of that *charity*: So in this matter it may *negatively* be reſolved, 1. That the precept of *correption* obliges me not to take all men living into my care, but only concludes againſt all *uncharitable diſcriminations*, every one that is capable of the title of *Brother*, being alſo capable of this *charity* that belongs to ſuch; And 2. That there is no part of this *charity* due to thoſe who have no need of it, thoſe I mean, whoſe careful, watchful lives, their *growth in grace*, and the practical *knowledge* of *our Lord Jeſus Chriſt* ſets them above all ordinary want or uſe of our charities, nay nor to thoſe that are eminently ſuperiour to us in knowledge or place, becauſe whatſoever the matter is, we have reaſon to conceive others of their quality or learning to be more competent judges, and more fit to diſcharge that duty than our ſelves: Which being taken in by way of caution, the reſult again is, that as in the *negative* marks of knowing to whom our charity is *not* a due, ſo in our *poſitive determination* of it to the particular object, the ordinary *deciſion* will here hold alſo, that as, when we cannot extend our munificence to all, who are fit objects for it, (for if each ſingle man ſhould do ſo, no others would have any objects left them) every man ſhould think himſelf obliged to take thoſe into his particular *care*, on whom as it were, the *lot* is faln, whoſe living near him, under his wing or verge, marks them out for his *Peculium*, ſo ſhould every man think his duty obliges him to practiſe this other more ſpiritual *Charity* towards thoſe who are by providence caſt or faln into his *circuit*; Not his *ſuperiours*, (in publick eſpecially, or any way but wherein *prudence* ſhall make it ſtrongly probable that good may come to them, and no *incommodation* to any) but peculiarly his *equals*, and of them particularly, his *friends* to whom he hath a nearer tie (and by that a more articulate call) than other men to them, or he to any other; and ſo this will be the ſecond poſitive mark, that I told you of, and from thence the reſolution no more than neceſſary to all that ſhall ever enter that precious league of *friendſhip*, and do not profeſs to turn *Chriſt* quite out of the company, that they will by compact, and bargain oblige themſelves, and never fail in performance of this duty moſt conſtantly and faithfully to one another; that they will reſolve of it as of an *axiome* or principle, that when ever any one act of this *rebuke* is exerciſed, it is by all Laws of *Heathen* and *Chriſtian friendſhip*, to be counted the prime evidence of true *love* in him that uſes it, and that which nothing but a reſolution not to fail in *kindneſs* and *charity*, could have extorted from him; and conſequently ſo to be received and uſed by him on whom 'tis beſtowed, as becometh a precious dole of *charity* pour'd out of the very *ſoul*, which is again, in all reaſon, to *provoke* him to that one gratitude of retributing readily, and chearfully in the ſame kind, whenſoever there ſhall be need of it.

Sect. 41. Thus have you a view of this *ſpiritual*, and in a manner *Angelical charity*, as the moſt *excellent*, ſo (in the generality of the World) the moſt *deſpiſed*, diſreliſht duty. The *animal* man *receives it not*, for 'tis like the other *things of the Spirit*, *a meer fooliſhneſs unto him*; and the *rebuking* this *folly* of the World, admoniſhing them of it, deliberately, and meekly, and (if abundance of ſin be the *ſeaſon* of ſeeking out ways of Reformation) I hope or fear opportunely, and ſeaſonably alſo, was a piece of my *duty*, and *kindneſs* to my *brethren*, and may ſerve for a δεῖξις, an eſſay, or experiment, how it may be likely to thrive among them.

Gem. Pletho πε. ἀρετ.

Γρέπει ἂν εὐπορῶ μὲν δωρεῖσθαι, ἀποροῦντι δὲ λαμβάνειν ἃ ἂν ὑπορεῖ, καὶ ἀμείνονι μὲν ἐπανορθοῦν ἐξαμαρτάνοντα, χείρονι δὲ ἐπανορθοῦσθαι.

THE END.

Of Resisting

The Lawful Magistrate,

Under Colour of

RELIGION.

To the

LORD FAIRFAX

AND HIS

Council of War,

THE

ADDRESS

Of

H. HAMMOND.

A

VINDICATION

Of

Dr. *HAMMOND'S* Address.

I.

Of reſiſting the Lawful Magiſtrate under colour of Religion,

And Appendant to it,

Of the word KPΙΜΑ, *rendred* Damnation, Rom. 13.

Alſo,

Of the Zelots among the Jews.
Of taking up the Croſs.
A Vindication of Chriſt's reprehending Saint Peter *from the exceptions of Maſter* Marſhal.

II.

To the Right Honourable the Lord Fairfax *and his Council of Officers,*
The humble Addreſs of Henry Hammond.

III.

A Vindication of Doctor HAMMONDS Addreſs, *&c. from the Exceptions of* Eutactus Philodemius,

In two particulars,

Concerning { The Power ſuppoſed in the Jew, over his own Freedom.
{ The No-power over a mans own Life.

Together with

A Brief Reply to Mr. John Goodwins Ἀντιστρεπτικαι, *as far as concerns Dr.* HAMMOND.

Of Reſiſting the Lawful
MAGISTRATE
Under Colour of
RELIGION.

IN this propoſal of the point for debate, there are only two words will need an account to be given of them: 1. What is meant by *Reſiſting*. 2. Why the word *Colour* is put in. For the firſt, *Reſiſting* here ſignifies violent, forcible, offenſive reſiſtance, fighting againſt, as *Heſychius* the beſt Scripture-gloſſary explains it, (ἀντιτεταγμένον and ἀνθιστάμενον all one, and ἀντιστάτης * ὁ ἀνθίστη ἐν τῇ μαχῇ) and the Apoſtle in like manner, *Rom.* 13. 2. uſing ἀντιτασσόμενος and ἀνθεστηκὼς promiſcuouſly for the ſame, and ſo in other places, although it is true, it is uſed ſometimes in a wider ſenſe; but that will not here be material, when we here ſet down before-hand what we mean by it. For the ſecond, the word [*colour*] is in the Title added, only for this reaſon, (not to prejudge the Religion, which is fought for, to be only a colour but) becauſe it is poſſible for a man to fight for Religion, and yet not upon colour of Religion, to wit, in caſe the Religion for which he fights be eſtabliſhed by the Law of the Land, for then his colour for fighting may be the preſervation of Law, which the Magiſtrate is bound by oath to maintain, and though he fight for Religion. yet it is under that other colour: whereas he that fights upon colour of Religion, making that his only pretence of fighting, is *ipſo facto* ſuppoſed to fight for a Religion diſtant or contrary to that which is eſtabliſhed by Law, and ſo all pretence or colour of Law excluded, yea, and all ſuppoſition of failing in the Magiſtrate; he ſtanding for the Law preſent, not againſt it; which I deſire may be the ſetting of the caſe, to exclude the fallacy, *plurium interrogationum*, and to diſtinguiſh the quarrel of Religion from that other of Law, and ſo to meddle at this time only with that which is fully within the Divines Sphere, and leave the other to ſome body elſe.

* γρ. Ἀντιστάτης

Thoſe two terms being thus explained, and ſo the ſtate of the queſtion ſet, the lawful Magiſtrate, and the eſtabliſht Law of the Kingdom on one ſide; and ſome perſon or perſons inferiour to him, upon colour of Religion, *i.e.* for ſome Religion not yet eſtabliſhed by Law, on t'other ſide, that it ſhould be lawful to them to take up Arms againſt him, would ſeem not very reaſonable, if he were but a private man, abſtracted from Regal power, (which ſure doth not make it more lawful to reſiſt him than any body elſe) having broken no eſtabliſhed Law, (as is ſuppoſed in the caſe) for what Legal accuſation can lie againſt him in a point wherein he hath not broken the Law? But then this will be more unreaſonable, if moreover it be conſidered, that colour of Religion is ſo wide and unlimited a thing, that no man, that is never ſo much in the wrong in any opinion, but thinks himſelf in the right (for otherwiſe he would not continue in that errour) and ſo that colour will be plea equally good to all ſorts of errours, as well as truths: and beſides, he that hath not ſo much Religion as to be in an errour, may yet have ſo much wit as to make uſe of that Apology for his ſedition (to wit, colour of Religion) and plead it as legally as the moſt zealous profeſſour; and conſequently, if that will ſerve turn, who ever ſhall but pretend to believe contrary to the Religion eſtabliſhed in any Kingdom, ſhall be *ipſo facto* abſolved from all bond of Allegiance in *foro humano*, and if he will adventure the hazard of the judgment to come, ſhall have no reſtraint laid on him by any earthly Tribunal; and ſo by this means already, the grounds of the diſſolution of any government are laid by this one unpolitick principle, and the world given up to be ruled only by the Religion (which is in effect, the will) of every man; whereas before, there was a State as well as a Church, Policy as well as Religion, a power in the Magiſtrates hand, beſides that in every mans own breaſt or conſcience; and yet more particularly, a reſtraint for hypocrites, as well as any elſe, *i. e.* for pretenders of Religion, who, if this ground would hold, were left unlimited. Where, if it be interpoſed, that ſuch an one that fallaciouſly pretends Religion, though by this diſguiſe he eſcape here, yet ſhall ſurely pay for it hereafter; and that that is ſufficient, becauſe there is no other Court, but of that ſearcher of hearts, to which the hypocrite can be bound over; I anſwer, that although that be true, yet it is not ſufficient, becauſe, although there be a judgment to come for all crimes, yet it is notwithſtanding thought neceſſary to have preſent judicatures alſo, not to leave all offenders to terrours at ſuch a diſtance: and indeed for the continuance of the peace of Communities to provide ſome violent reſtraint at the preſent for thoſe, whom thoſe greater but future determents cannot ſufficiently work on. This every man knows is the original of humane Laws, yea, and of Dominion it ſelf, a *proviſion* that all men will not do their duties for love or fear of God, (it is apparent, the Jews would not under their θεοκρατεια) and therefore for good mens ſakes, and for peace ſake, and for the maintaining of Communities, thoſe ſuperadditions have been thought neceſſary, as ſome thorns in the hedge of Gods Law, that may pierce the hands and ſides of him that ſhall attempt

tempt to break over or through it. From whence the concluſion will be evident, that the rules for the preſerving of Government muſt be ſuch as ſhall have force to reſtrain the Atheiſt or the Hypocrite, as well as the good Chriſtian (which ſure will leſs need thoſe reſtraints) or elſe they are utterly unſufficient to the attaining of their end, *i. e.* to the preſerving of Government, Peace, Community, or protecting any that lives under it: which being ſuppoſed, it will alſo follow, that nothing muſt be indulged upon any colour of Religion, (be his Religion never ſo true, and himſelf never ſo ſincere in it,) which will open this gap or outlet to others, that may make the ill uſe of it. For this will be utterly deſtructive of the end of Government (which is, that we may lead a peaceable and quiet life, 1 *Tim.* 2. 2.) yea, and of Government it ſelf.

This argument being thus proſecuted and cleared might be ſufficient to determine this whole buſineſs, were it not for one rejoinder which is ordinarily made, the force of which is taken from that ſupream care that every man ought to have of his own ſoul, and conſequently of the maintaining of his Religion on which (to abſtract from all poſſible diſputes concerning the particular truth of it, he being perhaps not acute or artiſt enough to uphold it againſt all objecters) he is fully convinc'd, the health and ſalvation of that wholly depends. For the maintaining of which againſt all the humane power in the World, if he may not take up Arms or do any thing, he cannot ſee what can be fit for him to fight for (nothing ſure being more precious, than that;) or conſequently, why he may not take up that opinion of the beyond-ſea Anabaptiſts, That it is not lawful to fight at all: which if it ſhould be yielded to, although for the preſent it would produce peace, yet it would be little for the advantage of Magiſtrates in the iſſue. To this I ſhall anſwer, by conceſſion of theſe four things: 1. That Religion is to be every mans Supream care, the prime Jewel in his Cabinet. 2. That it cannot, at leaſt in humane conſideration, be expected that any man ſhould be leſs careful of his falſe Religion (if he be really perſwaded of the truth of it) than any other is of the true. Nay, 3. that if he do not uſe any lawful means to defend that falſe (whilſt he is convinc'd it is the true) Religion; this is a ſin of luke-warmneſs in him, though indeed through prepoſſeſſion not to open his eyes to greater light and revelation of the truth offered to him, and perhaps through ſluggiſhneſs not to ſeek that light, be yet a far greater ſin in him. For though no man ought to defend the contrary to what he takes to be truih, yet ought he to be moſt ready to depoſite his errour, not only when it doth, but alſo when it may appear to him to be ſo, and to ſeek to thoſe helps that may be inſtrumental to that end. 4. That in ſome caſes the uſe of Arms is not unlawful. But then all this being thus granted, and ſo in effect, that all lawful means may be uſed for the maintaining of Religion, we muſt yet ſecondly deny the inference of the Objection; upon this only ground, becauſe though Arms may lawfully be uſed in ſome caſes, and Religion be to be maintained by all lawful means, yet Arms are not a lawful means for this end, and ſo may not be uſed in this caſe, that is, by Subjects againſt the lawful Magiſtrate in caſe of Religion, at leaſt when ſome other Religion is by Law eſtabliſhed in that Kingdom. Which aſſertion I ſhall confirm only by four Arguments; 1. Taken from the nature of Religion. 2. From examples of Chriſt and Chriſtians. 3. From the very making of Chriſtianity, and particularly of the Proteſtant doctrine. 4. From the Conſtitution of this Kingdom, which being ſubordinate to the other three may deſerve conſideration, as far as it agrees with them.

1. From the nature of Religion, which is an act of the ſoul, which cannot be forced or conſtrained by outward violence, and therefore, 'tis apparent, needs no outward defence for the maintaining of it, much leſs, invaſion of others. A man may be as truly religious under all the tyranny and ſlavery in the world, as in the moſt triumphant proſperous eſtate. They that have power to kill the body, are not able to commit the leaſt rape upon the ſoul; they may rob me of my life, they cannot of my Religion; the weakeſt creeple in the Hoſpital may defie the whole Army of the Philiſtines in this matter. But you will ask, Is not the outward profeſſion and publick exerciſe of Religion, ſome part of it, and that to be thus maintained, where any attempt to hinder it? To which I anſwer, That the firſt of theſe, the outward Profeſſion, can no more be hindred than the former act of the ſoul, but rather may be moſt illuſtrious in the time of depreſſion. I may confeſs Chriſt in the den of Lyons, in the furnace, on the rack, on the gridiron, and when my tongue is cut out, by patient, conſtant ſuffering in that cauſe. Religion is not ſo truly profeſſed by endeavouring to kill others, as by being killed patiently our ſelves rather than we will renounce it. When I fight, it may be malice, revenge, ſome hope of gain (or impunity at leaſt) by the preſent ſervice, any one of a hundred worldly intereſts, that may help to whet my ſword for me; or moſt clearly, a hope I may kill, and not be killed; and ſo all this while here is no act of confeſſion of Chriſt in thus venturing my life, although I do affirm I do this for my Religion; becauſe though I ſo affirm, men are not bound to believe me, there being ſo much odds againſt me, that I do it for ſomewhat elſe. But when I lay down my life patiently, the ſacrifice of my God, reſign up all poſſible worldly intereſts for the retaining of my own ſpiritual truſt, this is to the eye of man a profeſſion capable of no reaſonable ſuſpicion of inſincerity; and indeed none ſo, but this.

As for the ſecond, the publick exerciſe of the true Religion, it were by all men heartily to be wiſht that it might be enjoyed at all times, for the advancing of Gods glory, increaſe of charity, converſion of others, *&c.* But if it may not be had by the uſe of lawful means, it will not be required of us by God, without whoſe ſpecial providence it is not, that he permitteth us to be forbidden that exerciſe. Till the ſame providence be pleaſed to remove ſuch hinderance, and open to us a lawful way of obtaining it; the primitive Chriſtians ſecret meetings will firſt be imitable to us, and if thoſe be obſtructed alſo, their ſolitudes next. And however, that deſign of obtaining free exerciſe of our Religion, will never make any practice lawful to be uſed in order to that, that before was utterly unlawful.

But are we not to take care of our children and poſterity, as well as of our ſelves? If our Religion be now ſuppreſt, our poor children and progeny to the end of the world may in all probability be kept in blindneſs and ignorance, and ſo left to the place of darkneſs irrecoverably. This objection ſounds ſomewhat pathetically and is apt to affect our bowels, more than our reaſon; moves our com-

compaſſion firſt, and through thoſe ſpectacles is then repreſented with improvement to our judgment. But for anſwer to it, though the doctrine of election of particular men, as well and as abſolutely to the means as to the end, might be to him that acknowledges it, a ſufficient amulet againſt this fear, and ſo no need of that their jealous care for their poſterity, any farther than it is in their power to contribute toward them (which ſure is no more than to do what is lawful for them to do) yet the anſwer will be more ſatisfactory to all that acknowledge Gods providence, however opinionated concerning decrees, that whoſoever conſiders himſelf as a man, much more as a father of Poſterity, muſt have many things to truſt God with, and only God, and among thoſe, nothing more, than the future eſtate of thoſe which are come from him. Yet if he be importunate and ſtill unſatisfied, unleſs he himſelf contribute ſomewhat to the ſecuring of his poſterity in this matter, let me tell him there is nothing (after his prayers to God and paternal bleſſing on them) ſo likely to entail his Religion upon them, as his ſealing it by his ſufferings. This ſure will be a more probable way to recommend his religion to them (when they ſhall hear and be aſſured by that teſtimony, that their fathers thus hoped in God) than that other ſo diſtant, that they died in a rebellion againſt the King, or that this Religion had been in their time turned out of the land, had not they done ſomething ſo unlawful to protect it. Beſides, the greateſt prejudice which that poſterity (of which we pretend ſuch care) can ſuffer by my non-reſiſtance, is only to be brought up in a contrary Religion, to hear that way firſt, but ſure not to have their ears deafed againſt all others when they ſhall be repreſented, nor to bring the guilt of non-repreſentation upon them if they be not. And if I bring forth reaſonable creatures, I hope they will, by the grace of God, make uſe of their reaſon and his grace, to find out that truth that their ſouls are ſo much concerned in; and if (through no default perſonal of theirs) they ſhould miſs of it, I hope the invincibleneſs of their ignorance, and their ſincere repentance for all their ſins and errours known and unknown, and their readineſs to receive the truth, if it were or might be repreſented to them, would be antidote ſufficient by Gods mercy in Chriſt to preſerve them from that poiſon, ſo they were capable according to their means of knowledge to eſcape all other dangers. And all this upon ſuppoſition, but not conceſſion, that the Religion of him that would fight for it, were the truth and only truth; whereas indeed there is not a more ſuſpicious mark of a falſe Religion, than that it is fain to propagate it ſelf by violence; The Turks and Papiſts being the only notable examples hitherto of that practice, till ſome others, directly upon Popiſh principles a little varied in the application, have faln upon the ſame concluſion.

Now ſecondly for the examples of Chriſt and Chriſtians, but firſt of Chriſt: his example (as to this purpoſe) is evident in three paſſages (beſides that grand tranſcendent copy propoſed from the aggregate of all his life and death, *Matth.*11.29. *Learn of me, for I am meek and lowly.*) The firſt is, *Luke* 9.54. the Inhabitants of a Samaritan village would not receive Chriſt, *verſ.*53. upon that *James* and *John* remembring what *Elias* had done in the like kind, 1 *Kings* 18. and 2 *Kings* 1. ask'd his judgment of it, whether he would be pleaſed that they ſhould command fire to come down from Heaven and conſume them, as *Elias* did; that is, in effect, whether they ſhould not do well to uſe what ever power they had (and be confident that God would aſſiſt them in it) to the deſtroying of thoſe who ever they were (and yet that they were not their Magiſtrates it is clear) which affronted them in the exerciſe of their Religion, or indeed which would not receive Chriſt. To this Chriſt anſwers ſternly, the words are emphatical, *he turned* (as to *Peter* when he gave him that check, *Matt.*16.23.) *and rebuked them, and ſaid, Ye know not what manner of ſpirit ye are of*: that is, *Elias* was a * Zelot, 1 *Mac.* 2.58. (the full importance of which will belong to another diſquiſition) *& jure zelotarum* might do ſomewhat againſt *Baals* prophets, which will not agree with that diſtant calling or profeſſion of a diſciple of Chriſt, or Chriſtian; they are miſtaken if they think they may do as *Elias* did. From whence by the way is a prohibition fully legal put in againſt all examples of the old Teſtament (if any ſuch there were) from being pleadable amongſt Chriſtians, upon this ground of *Joſephus* his obſerving, that the Jews were governed by a Θεοκρατεια, God being as it were their King on earth for a long time, preſiding immediately, and interpoſing by his oracle, and other particular directions, as well as ſtanding Law, as in that caſe of *Phinees* and *Elias*, &c. by which thoſe acts of theirs, though authorized by no ſetled or ordinary Law, were yet as legal as whatever in any other Common-wealth were done by authority legally deſcending from the ſupreme Magiſtrate. Which whoſoever ſhall now apply to Chriſtians, beſides, that he profeſſes himſelf an aſſerter of Enthuſiaſms, will meet with Chriſts check to the Boanerges, *You know not what ſpirit you are of*: I have not authorized you to pretend to the ſpirit of *Elias*, or to do what a Zelot among the Jews might do.

* Ἐν τοῦ ζηλῶσαι ζηλὸν νόμε. ἀναλήψη.

The ſecond exemplary paſſage to this purpoſe in the ſtory of Chriſt is, *Matt.* 26.51. when Chriſt was apprehended by thoſe tumultuous perſons, at the beſt but ſervants of the chief Prieſts and Elders (not again by any power of lawful Magiſtrate) *Peter* drew the ſword and ſmote off one of thoſe ſervants ears; upon that, Chriſts anſwer is the thing to be obſerved, *verſe* 52. *Then ſaid Jeſus unto him, Put up again thy Sword into his place; for all they that take the ſword ſhall periſh with the ſword:* The ſpeech particular to *Peter*, a prime Diſciple or Chriſtian, that he having drawn the ſword in defence of Chriſt, and in him of Chriſtianity it ſelf (a more juſtifiable courſe than ever any man ſince undertook under the colour of Religion) muſt put it up again; but the reaſon added of an unlimited univerſal obligingneſs to all Chriſtians; *For all they that take the ſword* (as *Peter* did, in defence of Chriſt, *&c.* or elſe the citation had not been pertinent to him) *ſhall periſh by the ſword.* And the two parallel places which are noted in the margent of our Engliſh Bibles are ſomewhat conſiderable, the firſt *Gen.*9.6. where that Law was given to the ſons of *Noah*, עַל שְׁפִיכוּת דָּמִים concerning the effuſion of blood, which ſure was not any prohibition to legal, though capital puniſhments of Malefactors (but rather the inveſting the Magiſtrate with that power of the ſword) and yet is by Chriſt urged as a prohibition to St. *Peter*, ſignifying that effuſion of blood by him in that caſe to be utterly illegal, and againſt the intention of that old Law, not abrogated (it ſeemeth) by Chriſt. The other parallel place is, *Rev.* 13.10. where immediately upon the repeating of thoſe words, *He that killeth with the ſword ſhall be killed with the ſword*, is ſubjoyned, *Here is the patience*

and

and faith of the Saints, i. e. Chriſtian Martyrs, *ver.* 7. whoſe faith, it ſeems, and patience muſt go together, which ſure is moſt irreconcileable with forcible reſiſtance *.

* The force of this place of Chriſt to Saint *Peter*, I ſee Mr. *M.* hath laboured to delude, and therefore I have laboured to vindicate in another Diſcourſe hereto appendant, to which I refer the Reader.

The third exemplary paſſage of Chriſt was in his ſuffering, wherein many particular circumſtances might be obſerved, eſpecially his anſwer to *Pilate*, *John* 19. 11, in acknowledgment of his legal power given him from above. But all that I ſhall obſerve is only in the general, That he that had ſo many Legions of Angels, certainly ſufficient to defend him and invade his enemies (whatſoever will be thought of the Chriſtians ſtrength in *Tertullians* time to have done ſo too, of which more anon) did yet without the leaſt reſiſtance give himſelf up to ſuffer death. And if it ſhould be objected, that this was to accompliſh what God hath decreed (*ought not Chriſt to ſuffer theſe things*, and *thus it is written*, and *thus it behoved Chriſt to ſuffer*) and in obedience to that decree, not as matter of example to us, or of intimation, that it had not been lawful for him to have done otherwiſe: To this I anſwer, that as Chriſt was decreed to that death, and non-reſiſtence, ſo are Chriſtians (if S. *Paul* may be believed) *predeſtinated to be conformed to the image of his Son*, Rom. 8. that is, to that pattern of his in ſuffering, not fighting for Religion; and that revelation of Gods will in that decree being ſuppoſed, it will follow, That though Chriſt might have lawfully done otherwiſe, yet we Chriſtians now may not, eſpecially being commanded to learn of him particularly his meekneſs; *i. e.* eſpecially that Lamb-like quality of the Lamb of God in his ſufferings, *Iſa.* 53. 7. So much for the examples of Chriſt.

Now for the like of Chriſtians, it will be needleſs to mention any other than thoſe of whom *Tertullian* and S. *Cyprian* ſpeak, being ſo perfectly home to that purpoſe, *Tertul in Apol. c.* 37. and his book, *Ad Scapulam*, wholly to this purpoſe: and S. *Cyprian* in his book againſt *Demetrianus*, &c. the ſum of which is this; That the Chriſtians of that age had ſtrength ſufficient either to have reſiſted or avenged themſelves upon their heathen perſecuting Governours, but in obedience to the Laws of Chriſt, choſe rather to dye, than do ſo. The ſeveral teſtimonies (of which this is the Abſtract,) being ſo fully produced by many, and known by all, it will be more to purpoſe to vindicate them from all exceptions, and intercept all evaſions which the wit of this laſt * year (beyond all that any former age pretended to) hath invented to evacuate thoſe teſtimonies, witneſs *Goodwins Anticavalieriſm*, *p.* 23, *&c.* and this I ſhall take leave to do at large, becauſe it is ſaid, many have been ſatisfied in the lawfulneſs of their preſent courſe by thoſe Anſwers and Objections which that book hath helpt them to.

* 1643.

1. It is objected, *The father* (Tertullian) *might eaſily be miſtaken in making the eſtimate of the ſtrength of Chriſtians in compariſon of the ſtrength of them that were to oppoſe them.* This is in civil terms, to ſay, *Tertullian* wrote he knew not what, or at the ſofteſt, he might be ignorant of what he affirmeth he knew, and I am confident was more likely to know, living then, than the Objecter now, ſeeing or conjecturing at the diſtance of ſo many hundred years, who hath not the leaſt authority (which muſt be the Judge in matter of fact) on his ſide againſt ſo diſtinct and clear affirmation, not only of *Tertullian* in ſeveral places (and that in an *Apology* againſt the Gentiles, who could and would certainly have tript him in ſo manifeſt a falſehood, if it had been ſuch; and though the negative Argument be not fully convincing, that they did not thus trip him, becauſe we do not hear or read they did, yet will this be of as much force as any he hath to the contrary: This certainly, the writing to the Gentiles, will be able to conclude, that *Tertullian* had been very imprudent and treacherous to his own cauſe to have affirmed a thing in defence of it, which his adverſaries could ſo manifeſtly have proved a falſity, if it were not ſo as he affirmed) but of *Cyprian* alſo, who lived about the ſame time; and no writer of that age or ſince produced (I doubt not but I may ſay producible) to the contrary.

Of the proofs that are offered to make it appear poſſible and probable that *Tertullian* ſhould be ſo miſtaken, the firſt is, *Becauſe this was no point of faith*, &c. *and therefore a devout father might fall under a miſpriſion herein.* I grant he might; but that doth not prove he did; no nor that it is probable he ſhould be a more incompetent judge in ſuch a matter, than he that now undertakes to control him: nay ſure, leſs reaſon is there to deny the authority of the ancients in matters of fact (which if they were not evident to them, muſt needs be much leſs evident to us, who have no means to know any thing of them but their relations, nor cauſe to ſuſpect ſuch relations, but either by ſome impoſſibility in the things themſelves, which is not here pretended, or by ſome other as authentick relation contradicting it, which is as little pretended) than of faith, the ground of which being only the written word of God, is common with them to us, and therefore may enable us to judge whether that which they affirm to be matter of faith, be ſo indeed, to be found really in that ſacred Writ from whence they pretend to fetch it.

And whereas it is farther added, *That no rule of charity or reaſon binds us to believe another in any thing which belongs to the art or profeſſion of another, and wherein himſelf is little verſed or exerciſed.* I anſwer, that this ſaying thus applied will take away the authority of a very great part of thoſe Hiſtories which no body yet hath queſtioned. If it were ſpoken of Doctrines, it might hold, and ſure to that belongs the axiome quoted, *Unicuique in arte ſuâ credendum eſt*; but in narrations it is the unreaſonableſt thing in the world to require the Narrator to be of that profeſſion of which he relates the fact, for then no man muſt adventure to write a Kings life but a King; and if Mr. *M.* Mr. *A.* or Mr. *S.* being Miniſters of the Word, ſhall write their letters concerning the Parliaments victory at *Keinton*, and relate the number of the ſlain on that ſide ſo far inferiour to thoſe on the Kings, we muſt now upon this admonition retract that belief we then allowed them, and begin now (though too late) to queſtion whether it were indeed a victory or no, which cauſed ſuch ſolemn thankſgiving in this City. But then ſecondly, why this Relation ſhould ſo wholly *belong to the profeſſion of another, i. e.* not to *Tertullians*, I cannot yet diſcern. For the main of *Tertullians* teſtimony was,

was, That the Christians chose rather to suffer than to resist, though they were able, because Christian Religion taught the one, and forbad the other: and this sure was not without the sphere of the Divine: but for their strength to resist, depending on the number of Christians, not as even ballancing the Heathens in the Empire, but as very considerable and able to raise an Army, if they would make head, I doubt not but *Tertullian*, a Presbyter, that now laboured in converting and confirming Christians, and was not always in his study, nay, who had lately been a Lawyer, and so not unacquainted with the publick, might know and relate with far better authority, than any who hath dared now to contradict him. For, for the art of *ballancing the power of parties in a Kingdom, and grounds of precise determination of such differences* (which as the Objecter denies *Tertullian*, so he is unwilling to yield to the States-man himself) you shall see anon that we have no need to make *Tertullian* Master of it; his relation will stand unmoved without it.

The second proof to blast *Tertullians* relation, is the ordinary one in fashion now adays, if any man differs in opinion from us, presently to examine his whole life, and if ever he did or spoke any thing unjustifiable, lay that vehemently to his charge, and by that defame him, and then we may spare the pains of answering his reasons, disproving his assertion: he once lied or sinned, and therefore it is ridiculous to expect any truth from him. The argument is this, He might *mistake and miscarry* in this, for *not long after he miscarried so grievously, as to turn Montanist, who called himself the Holy Ghost, &c.* Just as if I should resolve to believe no relation of any Minister (present in either of the Armies) of the strength of that Army, until I had examined, and were assured that he were not a Chiliast, an Arian, nor guilty of any other Heresie condemned by the Church: Yea and more, till I had some degree of assurance that he would never be such. Or as if I should resolve this man knew no Logick, because in this period he offends so much against Grammar in these words, [to turn Montanist, who called himself the Holy Ghost,] where the Relative [who] hath certainly no Antecedent; *Tertullian* cannot, for he called not himself the Holy Ghost (but onely used that stile so ordinary now adays [*nos spirituales*] and all others [*animales psychici*;] and Montanist cannot, unless as once * *Areopagi* signified the Areopagites, so now by way of compensation, Montanist must pass for *Montanus*, for he it was that called himself the Holy Ghost, not all or any of his followers. This way of concluding, from a slip in Grammar, an ignorance in Logick, (especially being backt with the suffrage of so many unconcluding Arguments) will be as fair Logical proceeding, as to infer, because *Tertullian* afterward turned Montanist, therefore then he spake he knew not what. But then Saint *Cyprian* was no Montanist, and yet he affirmed the same that *Tertullian* doth, *contra Demetrian.* As for the *approving of dreams and furious phantasies for true Prophecies* (which is added to be revenged on *Tertullian* for contradicting this Objecter) I confess I excuse not him, but wish we might learn any thing of him, rather than that. But I hope the narration we have now in hand was neither *Maximilla*'s nor *Prisca*'s *dreams.* If it was a *phantasie*, it was quite contrary to a *furious* one. And for the close of this Argument, wherein *the warning is given, as it were from Heaven, how unsafe and dangerous it is to build on the authority of men*, as I desire the Reader may take it home with him, and from thence resolve to believe no longer any thing upon this Objecters authority, so denudate of all reason, so I do not yet see, why he that once erred, must never be allowed to speak truth, the making of true narrations being compatible with the greatest Heresie in the World.

* *Smect.*

The third Argument against *Tertullians* testimony, is an observation of ὁ Νένα, that *there is a proneness of inclination in much devotion in persons devoutly given to over-value the works and piety of other men.* To which my onely answer shall be, that yet I hope it is not observed that devout men are so strongly inclined to tell plain lies, to this end that they may make themselves overvalued by others. This must be *Tertullians* infirmity (if the Objecter guess aright) being a Christian himself, and in his Apology labouring to raise an high opinion of Christians in the Gentiles to whom he writes, to which purpose if he should forge falsities, I must confess it were a shrewd weakness, very ill becoming devotion, whatever the practice of later times may say in excuse of it.

The fourth proof is from a second observation, that in *the pious and Orthodox Fathers themselves there are some touches, and streins, some fibræ of the root of bitterness, which afterwards grew rank in the times of Popery, &c.* The answer. All that I can collect from hence toward the conclusion designed, is, that this Objecters sence is, that, for *Tertullian* to say there were Christians enough in the Roman Empire to work revenge on their oppressours, was a spice of Popery; and so there is one new piece of Popery more added to the many which this age hath concluded under that title above the Inventory of the *Trent* Catechism. And so now to debate this any further, or profess my self to opine as *Tertullian* did, is to acknowledge my self Popish, and that is as bad as Prelatical: and so from henceforth all my arguments will but pass for temptations which none but carnal men must submit to, be they never so demonstrative. Yet must I have leave to wonder how in the close of this Section these words [*the sounder and more considerate knowledge of these latter times*] can have any reference to the point in hand. For certainly, for the strength of the then Christian party, our knowledge in these latter times cannot be sounder or more considerate, than theirs that then lived among them; or if it be, the words [*latter times*] will be improper, for sure it will be affirmed only of that time wherein Mr. *J. G.* wrote this part of this book; for I am confident he was the first that ever revealed this Act of more considerate knowledge to the World.

The fifth and last proof is, That *whatever their number was, yet it is no ways likely they should be suffered to have any Arms, &c.* To which, and to all the prudential state motives whereon it is grounded, (and so to all that Section) I shall return no answer, but the very words of *Tertullian*, which if all put together they do not defend their author from all their assaults, neither will I believe the Christians strength was sufficient to buckle with their adversaries. His words are plain; first, if we would *hostes exertos agere*, deal like profest enemies, *desisset nobis vis numerorum & copiarum?* should we have wanted force of numbers? (*i.* men) or armed souldiers (for so sure *copiæ* signifies.) Secondly, he saith as plainly, *castella vestra, castra implevimus*, we have filled

your Caſtles and Camps, (there ſure they were armed; and ſo the *Thebean* Legion, which yielded themſelves to the Emperours butchery, wanted neither number nor arms to have reſiſted.) Thirdly, he ſaith, *cui bello non idonei?* what War had we not been fit for? (*etiam impares copiis*, though we had not had ſo many armed men as they) *qui tam libenter trucidamur*. Their deſpiſing of death, (nay, gladneſs to die) might have put them upon any hazard unarmed; and he profeſſes the only thing that kept them from reſiſting, was the Doctrine which they had learnt, that it was more lawful to be kill'd, than to kill. Fourthly, he ſaith, They had a way of revenge without Arms, to wit, by departing from them, by that ſeceſſion to have brought envy upon them (as for example, upon diſlike of the preſent ſtate, to have gone to *New-England*, *&c.* to raiſe an odium upon the Old) but this they would not be ſo malicious as to do neither: nay, beſides, *amiſſio tot civium ipsâ deſtitutione puniiſſet*, the loſs of ſo many Citizens would have been a puniſhment by making them leſs able to reſiſt other enemies; *plures hoſtes, quàm cives uſque remanſiſſent*, there would have been a greater number of enemies, than there would have been Citizens remaining. Fifthly, to put all beyond exception, he put them in mind how one night with a few fire-brands they might have wrought their revenge, if it were lawful for them to repay evil with evil. This one laſt particular being conſidered, is ſo full a demonſtration of the truth now in debate, that ſuppoſing there were but one Chriſtian at liberty to uſe that one fire-brand, there can be no longer doubt but that there was ſufficient ſtrength to work their revenge, if their Religion would have permitted them to do ſo. And if their Religion (as was ſaid out of him) were the only reſtraint, then certainly their weakneſs was not. Nay, though they ſhould after all this (by a morally impoſſible ſuppoſition) be ſuppoſed weak, yet if their Religion did truly reſtrain them, as he profeſſes it did, this were abundantly ſufficient to decide the controverſie betwixt us and the Objecter.

Having proceeded thus far in anſwer to the ſeveral exceptions againſt the truth of *Tertullians* aſſertion concerning the ſtrength of thoſe Chriſtians, I am invited farther by a ſecond proffer of the Objecter to make appear, that although *Tertullians* aſſertion ſhould be ſuppoſed true, yet it were unſufficient, it would not reach the queſtion, or caſe in hand. This certainly is ſtrange at firſt ſight, the caſe in hand being, Whether the reaſon of their non-reſiſtance were their want of ſtrength. Which in all reaſon muſt be determined negatively, when once theſe two things are ſuppoſed; firſt, that they had ſtrength; ſecondly, that the command of Chriſt, or making of Chriſtianity was the cauſe of their non-reſiſtance, and not want of ſtrength. But there is no truth ſo evident, but the cunning of ſuch a crafts-maſter will be able to transform, both from evidence and truth, and therefore (though in all juſtice a man might vow never to have commerce with ſuch a man more, that ſhould undertake thus to maſter his underſtanding, that he ſhould believe and not believe the ſame thing, yield the want of ſtrength to be the cauſe, at the very time when he acknowledges or ſuppoſes, firſt, no want of ſtrength; ſecondly, ſomewhat elſe, to wit, the command of Chriſt, to be the cauſe) yet I ſhall (to exerciſe that Chriſtian meekneſs which I deſire to aſſert by my actions, as well as words) wait on this great Artificer to the ſecond part of his Anſwer. The ſum of which, as he firſt ſets it, is this, that *ſuppoſing the Father ſpake truth*, concerning their ſtrength, yet on ſome conſiderations he mentions, *It had been in thoſe that were called to ſuffer both want of wiſdom in reſpect of themſelves, and of charity in reſpect of others, if they ſhould have made the leaſt reſiſtance.* To which my only anſwer ſhall be to beſeech him to conſider, that this is part of *Tertullians* teſtimony, that the thing that reſtrained them was (not this wiſdom but) the doctrine of their Chriſt; concluding it more lawful to be kill'd, than to kill, and utterly unlawful to repay evil for evil. And as for *charity* to *others*, I humbly wiſh that were, or may yet be conſidered, *how much burthen*, &c. this reſiſtance (of which he is the profeſt abetter) hath brought on others who are no parties on either ſide, nor I hope, ill Chriſtians, if their only puniſhable crime be, making conſcience of non-reſiſtance.

To the next Section, in anſwer to a ſuppoſed reply, where he ſaith, *That it is not probable they had any ſufficiency of ſtrength.* I anſwer, that I cannot be ſo tame as thus to be caught, or ſo wild as to imagine that improbable, at a time when *Tertullians* teſtimony is ſuppoſed to be true (as now it is ſuppoſed) the ſpecial part of which teſtimony is yielded to be, that they had ſufficient ſtrength. And where he adds 2. that 'twas *not neceſſary they ſhould be of one mind and judgment touching this ſufficiency*, &c. I anſwer, that we do not aſſert any ſuch neceſſity, nor doth our cauſe any way incline us to it, or want that refuge. For ſure we affirm not, that they did actually reſiſt (to which only, that concurrence would have been neceſſary) but only that they would not, though they were able, and to the evidencing of that, the concurrence of judgment you ſpeak of, is not material; for if they that did ſo think of their ſtrength, were upon grounds of Chriſtian patience and obedience, as far from doing or attempting it, as any other; theſe men would certainly have continued in the ſame obedience, though all the world had concurred with them in the opinion of their ſufficiency. For, to profeſs Chriſtian meekneſs firſt, and then upon any ſupervenient occurrence to be ready for reſiſtance, though it might be a character of the temporary (that I ſay not hypocritical) ſubjection of our days, yet muſt not we be ſo groundleſly uncharitable as to affix it on thoſe Chriſtians; and though the Objecter ſhould renounce his preſent ſuppoſition, and again contend, that *Tertullian* lied, and ſo diveſt him of all authority as a father, of common honeſty as a relater, yet ſure he will not be ſo ſevere to deny him ſo much of an ordinary *Rhetor*, as to make that an ingredient in his Apology for Chriſtians, which were the higheſt piece of an accuſation. Grant but *Tertullian* to have any skill in any of his profeſſions, ſuppoſe him but an Orator, if not a Divine, a tolerable pleader, if not a tolerable man, allow him but skill at the Desk, (his firſt Trade, before he was a Chriſtian) the reputation of a little eloquence, though no ſincerity) and his very pleadings will be argumentative, though his words may not.

But 'tis added in the third place, *that having no invitation, countenance, or command from any authority*, &c. *their caſe was differing from ours.* To which I anſwer again, 1. That it was not ſtill the want of ſuch command or invitation, that reſtrained them, but the contrary command of Chriſt, as hath been clear; but then ſecondly, I pray let me ask a queſtion as of one which I will in reaſon ſuppoſe not to be unacquainted with the ſence of *Junius Brutus*, and *Buchanan*, and it is only this,

this, whether, if all temporal Magiſtrates neglect the work of Reformation, the Miniſters may not and ought not to attempt it, if they can hope to prevail? If ſo, then though the caſe be not juſt the ſame now and then, yet the difference is not material or pertinent, for then ſure Miniſters there would have been to invite, if that had been the Chriſtian way.

But when it is added within three lines, that we are *invited*, &c. *by as great and as lawful an authority as this State hath any.* I muſt confeſs I had thought that the King and both Houſes had been a greater authority; unleſs the meaning be not ſimply, but *ad hoc*, as great and as lawful an authority as this State hath any, to do what is now done, and then ſure it ſhall be granted by me, who profeſs my ſelf to ſuppoſe it impoſſible that any command given to this purpoſe ſhould be lawful, or able to ſecure any from that ſentence of Saint *Pauls*, *They that reſiſt ſhall receive to themſelves damnation.* Yet once more, it is poſſible that the Authour, by *this State* may mean a Republick, which though it be a word of ſome ſignification in ſome other Countries, yet that our Laws acknowledge any ſuch here, I have not yet been taught, nor ſure can any part of this Kingdom without the King, be capable of this Title, till we have moulded a new form of Government, and new Laws, as the Model of that; for undoubtedly the old ones are not acquainted with any ſuch. But that I will hope is not the meaning, becauſe it is added that *inferiour Magiſtrates*, &c. which ſeemeth to acknowledge that the Parliament without the King are but inferiour Magiſtrates. Of the agreeableneſs of that Title of *Magiſtrates and Rulers*, to that body without the head, I purpoſe not to ſpeak; only to that which is added, that they *ſhould be obeyed, as well as Kings*, I anſwer, (without canvaſing of the place in Saint *Peter*, which others have done) that if they are *to be obeyed*, but *as well as Kings*, then, 1. The King that commands not to do it, is to be obeyed, as well as they. 2. Not they againſt the King, for that the inferiority implies. An inferiour Magiſtrate, in that that is lawful, and within his Commiſſion, and not thwarted by a ſuperiour, is to be obeyed as well as if he were ſuperiour in that, or as well as the ſuperiour in any thing elſe; but ſure not to the deſpiſing of the ſuperiours lawful commands, when they do interpoſe, for that were more than *as well.* When the King commands that which God and the Law doth not forbid, it may be ſaid, that his commands are to be obeyed as well as God's, which the Apoſtle intimates, when he ſaith, *you muſt be ſubject for conſcience ſake*; and the ground of this truth is, becauſe indeed God the ſupream, commands that ſubjection to the King in ſuch matters. But ſure for all this the King is not to be obeyed againſt God, or where any countermand of his hath intervened, for this were in Saint *Peters* phraſe *to obey men*, (not as well, but) rather than God. Thus is it in that other caſe, the inferiour is to be obeyed, *as well as the ſuperiour* (in things lawful and not contradictory to the Superiours commands) upon that ground of neceſſity of obedience to the Superiour, from whom he hath his Commiſſion, and as Saint *Peter* ſaith, δι' αὐτοῦ πέμπεται, *is ſent of him*, *i.e.* of, or by that ὑπερέχων, ſupereminent perſon, the King; but ſure this holds not againſt the ſuperiour, as in the other caſe it did not. 3. Not they when they command to take up Arms againſt him whom Saint *Paul* bids me not reſiſt upon pain of damnation, and by my oath of Allegiance (if it were otherwiſe lawful) I have bound my ſelf that I will not. Whereupon it is obſervable, that the aſſertors of this War are now brought to undertake, that damnation, or κρῖμα, *Rom.* 13. ſhall not ſignifie damnation (poor men, what a weak thred doth the Sword hang in, that is juſt over their ſouls? and what a ſad condition would it be, if to one that dies a confident Martyr in this War, damnation at the day of doom ſhould prove to ſignifie damnation?) but ſome temporary mulct; and yet withal that this war is not againſt the King (when yet that other againſt the Earl of *Eſſex* his Army, is not doubted to be againſt the Parliament) which two ſo ſtrange, and yet diſtant holds (for if it be not againſt the King, what need of that other evaſion from the damnation, that belongs to reſiſters, or if reſiſters ſhall carry it away ſo eaſily, why may not War be avowed againſt the King, by any that will adventure his wrath?) do ſure ſignifie mens conſciences to be ſtrangely grounded, and themſelves very groundleſly confident, which are ſatisfied upon no better principles, and whoſe practices are capable of no better ſecurity.

Upon theſe grounds thus laid, of obedience due to inferiour, as well as ſuperiour (ſupreme it ſhould be, for ſo ὑπερέχων muſt here ſignifie, and I hope that our King amongſt us is ſuch) Magiſtrates, the Objecter *puts a caſe*, *that the inferiour Governour requires that which is only honeſt*, &c. *as to do our beſt to defend our ſelves againſt thoſe that, contrary to law and conſcience, aſſault us, the ſuperiour that which is contrary to both*, viz. *to ſit ſtill*, &c. In this caſe he reſolves it is moſt clear on his ſide, for (whether the lawfulneſs or neceſſity he intimates not of) *reſiſtance againſt the ſuperiour.* To this I anſwer, that it is hard to believe that the Objecter did not purpoſely intend to deceive his Reader by that phraſe [*only honeſt*, &c.] For that is a very doubtful ſence, it may ſignifie, that nothing elſe were honeſt, and then it is in that ſence apparently falſe, for if it were honeſt to take up Arms againſt a King, yet ſure may not-taking-up Arms be honeſt too, for (whatever the crime of neutrality ſignifies in theſe days) it may be lawful for a man to ſuffer injury, to ſuffer himſelf to be defrauded (and that by a King, as well as by an equal) 1 *Cor.* 6. 7. I hope reſiſtance, though it have lately commenced, and taken upon it the degree of vertue, yet hath not turned Projector, got the monopoly of vertue and honeſty into its hand, that it ſhould engroſs and encloſe that title, and there be no other vertue or honeſty beſides this; yet would the affirmations of ſome out of no meaner place than the Pulpit, [that all that are for the King at this time are Atheiſts or Papiſts] conclude and perſwade thus much. But I would fain believe that the meaning of the Phraſe [*only honeſt*, &c.] is, [no more than honeſt] *i.e.* not neceſſary. But if that be it, then ſure the ſuperiour Governour may deſerve to be obeyed in forbidding it, as well as the inferiour in commanding: For it will not follow in that caſe, that the King *commands* ſomewhat contrary *to the Law of God, and nature*, but only ſomewhat contrary to ſomething which was agreeable, *i.e.* not againſt the Law of God, and nature, *i.e.* prohibits a thing lawful, not neceſſary, as the other is ſuppoſed to command a thing lawful, not neceſſary: which ſure were as free for him to do, as for the inferiour, ſuppoſing, as the Objecter ſuppoſes, *that the command of God indifferently extends it for obedience to either, in things that are lawful.* Hence it appears that in the caſe here put, the command of the Superiour is falſly affirmed, to be an unlawful command

(for then the matter of the inferiours command muſt be ſuppoſed, not *only honeſt*, but neceſſary) and if it be a lawful one, it may and will then make void that obligation for that particular, which is ſuppoſed by the Law of God to lye on us, to obey the inferiour in that which is lawful. The ſhort is, if that which is here ſpoken of, be in it ſelf neceſſary, we muſt do it, as in ſpight of all countermands of the ſuperiour, ſo without all commands or invitations of the inferiour Magiſtrate; but if it be not neceſſary in it ſelf, neither will the commands of an inferiour make it neceſſary to any who ſtands prohibited by a ſuperiour.

In the fourth Section the Objecter offers at a reaſon, why thoſe ancient Chriſtians (ſuppoſing ſtrength in them) ſhould *rather patiently ſuffer*, becauſe before their converſion *they had conſented to the Emperours power, whereby thoſe Edicts were made for the murthering of Chriſtians*, &c. To which I anſwer, that it is ridiculous to ſeek out or impoſe upon the Reader probable or poſſible reaſons for their non-reſiſtance, when *Tertullian* in their name ſpecifies the true only reaſon, the Goſpel doctrine of Chriſtian patience and obedience. But for the particular of their conſent, much might be added, to ſhew the vanity of that plea, if that were *tanti*, or pertinent. I ſhall only ſay, that if the Emperour legally murthered *Chriſtians*, then their conſent to that Law (or to the power of the Emperour who made it) would not bind or diſpenſe with them to omit any thing neceſſary or otherwiſe commanded by any greater power; for if I ſwear to do ſo, I muſt break my oath, *non obſtante* what is concluded from *Pſalm* 15. 4. And if it were not otherwiſe neceſſary or commanded by greater power, then neither is reſiſtance now. And then the Kings prohibition will as much reſtrain me in any thing not neceſſary, as their heatheniſh conſent could be ſuppoſed to reſtrain them then. Nay, he that makes that *conſent a nullity* (as this Objecter in fine doth) what reaſon can he render why he that gave that conſent, might not plead that nullity for ſuch (though carnal) advantages as life is, if he could make good his pleading, and no other reſtraint lye on him, but only that null-conſent?

For the fifth Section, How that may be lawful [for an entire body to do, which may not be lawful for a part] and ſo for us now, though not for them; I anſwer, That if the phraſe [entire body] ſignifie the head and members too, then the period is true; if not, then the whole Section is fallacious: for it follows not, that though the repreſentative body without the head is more, than a party in the Empire, without the repreſentation of the reſt, therefore the firſt may reſiſt forcibly, though the ſecond ſhould not: for he that from St. *Paul* denies reſiſtance of Subjects indefinitely to Kings, will not be moved from that hold, by diſcerning ſome other ſlight differences between Subjects, unleſs they may appear ſuch that on one ſide they may authorize reſiſtance. But then ſecondly, If the Doctrine of Chriſtian patience, *&c.* were the cauſe of Non-reſiſtance, then ſure was not this other conſideration wherein they differ from us, the cauſe of it.

Well, having gone thus far, in attendance on this Objecter, and to exerciſe that patience, which we ſo much deſire to perſwade: there is yet the greateſt Fort behind unvanquiſhed, erected in the ſixth Section, and reſcued from all ſuppoſed aſſailants in ſix particulars following, ſet up like ſo many fortreſſes about it. The ſum of it is (for I would not be bound to recite what every one may read in a printed Book) that if *thoſe Primitive Chriſtians had ſtrength, and might lawfully have reſiſted*, (by the way *Tertullian* only affirms the firſt, and is ſo far from ſuppoſing, that he abſolutely denies the ſecond) yet might *God hide this liberty from them*; and ſo his *after diſpenſations did require that he ſhould hide it from them, and yet manifeſt it to us: and theſe diſpenſations he ſpecifies to be Gods counſel of Antichriſts coming into the world then, and of his being deſtroyed, and caſt out now.* The *hiding of this truth* of Subjects power and right to reſiſt their Superiours, *being neceſſary to help Antichriſt up to his throne.* And the *Commonalty of Chriſtians doing contrary to the will of their Superiours, being the men that muſt have the principal hand in executing Gods judgments upon the Whore. Revel.* 18. 4, 5, 6, *and* 8. that is, in the pulling him down.

To this whole Diſcourſe (the firſt I am confident that ever was written on this Subject) I muſt anſwer by degrees, (that I may not omit any thing that is added for proof or explication by the Authour) and firſt, I muſt deſire the word *may* or *might* [may hide] may be changed into plain intelligible ſence. Say, did God hide the liberty of reſiſtance from thoſe Primitive Chriſtians, or no? If he did not, then away with this whole Section, and particularly that affirmation, *Pag.* 30. that God's diſpenſations did require that it ſhould be hid from them: but if God did indeed hide it; then firſt this is more than a ſuppoſition, it is a plain conceſſion that thoſe Chriſtians *Tertullian* ſpeaks of, might not lawfully have reſiſted, though they had had ſtrength (which was ſo long denied) for the light being hidden, they muſt have done it without faith, or againſt conſcience, yea, and againſt Gods determinate counſel, who, (the Objecter ſaith) had great cauſes to hide it, of which one ſure muſt be, that it ſhould not be uſed. 2. Here is a great ſecret of new Divinity, that God hides truths (not, as Chriſt ſpake in parables, becauſe they ſeeing ſee not, *Matth.* 13. 13. but) on purpoſe to help Antichriſt to his Throne, (of which more anon.) As for that inſtance of thoſe *that eat herbs*, I pray conſider, whether that be pertinent to prove that God purpoſely hides truths from us, or particularly this truth in hand. For ſure that liberty God hid from none in the Apoſtles time; for the preaching of the Goſpel manifeſted the lawfulneſs of meats, as well as herbs, only ſome ſaw not, or conſidered not, that that was manifeſted, and thinking ſome old legal obligation (as others did circumciſion) to lye ſtill on them, ſubmitted to it out of piety. Now apply this to the point in hand. Certainly the liberty of forcible reſiſtance againſt Superiours (though it ſhould be granted) would never be found of this kind, a liberty brought into the world by Chriſt, which before had not been there. If he ſhall affirm it was, (as he muſt if that inſtance of eating be pertinent) though by the conceſſion of the latter part, he muſt diſclaim all his former old Teſtament pleas for reſiſtance, from the people about *Jonathan*, from *David*, and from *Eliſha*; yet will he never give any probable appearance for the affirmation in the firſt part, that Chriſt gave any ſuch new before-unrevealed liberty: but rather, if any ſuch liberty before there were, it was undoubtedly taken away by Chriſt, from whoſe example and precepts it was that thoſe Primitive Chriſtians, and we alſo, dare not make

uſe

uſe of that ſuppoſed liberty. The only thing I can imagine poſſible to be replyed, is, that though the compariſon hold not exactly, yet it may hold in this, that as that liberty of eating was hid to ſome (it matters not by whom, or how) ſo this of reſiſting to others. To which I return, that then it is confeſt, that this inſtance doth only illuſtrate the Objecters meaning, but not ſo much as probably confirm his aſſertion: and then I am ſorry I have conſidered it ſo long, and therefore to bring the point to an iſſue, I muſt thirdly ask, Where this liberty, or the authority for this liberty was, when it was thus hid. Was it in the old Teſtament? Though it ſhould be there, as it is not, yet it might be taken away in the New, (as thoſe things which in the old Teſtament, or the law of nature, are neareſt to giving of that liberty, are abſolutely reformed by Chriſts Doctrine and practice) and then that were good for nothing. Was it in the new? Then deal plainly, ſhew the place in the New Teſtament which gives that liberty, and is now found out by poſterity, though hidden to them. Sure we have found out no new Scripture, to them unknown (the Nazarites Goſpel though it rehearſe ſome ſpeeches of Chriſt not in our Canon, yet is not produced for any of this nature: that famous one which it fathers on our Saviour, *Nunquam læti ſitis niſi cum fratrem in charitate videritis*, is of another ſtamp, I would to God this Apocryphal Precept might be Canonical among us) and for any place of the known Canon miſ-underſtood by them, and now clearly unclouded and revealed to us in a right underſtanding, which inforces this, I muſt be ſo charitable to the Objecter, as to think that if he had diſcerned any ſuch, he would not have failed to have ſhewed it us, (as well as his interpretations of *Rom.* 13. and *Revel.* 17. 17.) if it were but to leave us unexcuſable for not being his Proſelytes. Beyond theſe ſeveral ways of revelation, if poſterity have had any other (or indeed any but that of underſtanding of Scripture, by Scripture light, or aſſiſtance of Gods Spirit, which was not before underſtood) from whence to fetch a liberty which is not in the old Bible, or is denied in the New, this is it which we deſire ſo to warn men of under the name of Enthuſiaſme, which is hardly ever diſtinguiſhable from a demure frenſie, and I muſt call it now the dream of the dreamers, *Jude* 8. that *deſpiſe dominion, ſpeak evil of dignities*, but far from divine revelation. And yet that this is the thing that this Objecter hath an eye to, (and not the underſtanding of Scripture more clearly, than before) may appear, in that he affirms this truth *hid from their teachers*, (though *not from all without exception*) who yet if it were hid in the Scripture, were of all others moſt unlikely not to find it. As for that offer of proof, that this truth might lye hid, becauſe there was *no occaſion of ſtudying it*: I anſwer, that in *Tertullians* days, when there was occaſion to ſtudy it, (as great as ever can ariſe any, becauſe the perſecutions then, were as heavy perſecutions) we may by that argument think they would have ſearcht into it, at leaſt the light then would not in ordinary account have proved more dim, as he ſaith it did, if the Scripture were the Candleſtick where this light was held out. That which he adds in the next place, *of the ſpirit of courage, patience, and conſtancy, which was by God poured out on the Church in thoſe days, and ſo made Martyrdom ſeem a deſirable thing to them*, is more like a reaſon indeed of their not enquiring into this liberty: and herein, I muſt acknowledge the ingenuity of the Objecter, or the power of truth which extorted this reaſon from him, ſo little to the advantage of his cauſe, and ſo much of ours. For this is certainly the bottom of the buſineſs, the want of Chriſtian courage, patience, &c. (for that kind of courage is not in fighting, but ſuffering) hath helpt us of this laſt age to that (dream, not) revelation of liberty, which was never heard of among the ancients. But by the way, it ſeems by the Objecter that now Martyrdom is no deſirable thing, nor taking up Chriſts Croſs, nor following of him. We are reſolved to have no more to do with Martyrdom, think that the thouſand years for the Saints to reign on earth are now at hand, and ſo ſuffering, or conformity to the image of Chriſt, no longer the thing we are predeſtined to, we muſt ſet up a new trade of fighting, deſtroying, reſiſting, rebelling, leave enduring to thoſe *Chriſtians which were furniſhed with extraordinary ſtrength from Heaven.* Which are the Objecters words of the Primitive Chriſtians, which, ſaith he, kept them from ſtudying caſes and queſtions about lawfulneſs of eſcaping, (which word meer ſhame hath put in, utterly impertinently, inſtead of reſiſting.) I confeſs, I had thought our Queen *Mary* Martyr had had this ſtrength from Heaven too; and that it was not like miracles, an extraordinary gift only for the Infancy of the Church: but now it ſeems we muſt expect to ſee no more Martyrs, till we can remove Mountains again: This Objecter, it is clear, is reſolved againſt it at this time, and that his actions, as well as writings, will be ready to teſtifie. For my own part, I truſt I ſhall be as ready to oppoſe the one, as I am to confute the other, and to think nothing more Chriſtian ſtill, than to be crucified with my Chriſt, and if I might chuſe the Article of Chriſtian Doctrine which I ſhould moſt deſire to ſeal with my bloud, I think it would be that of meekneſs, patience, non-reſiſtance, peaceableneſs, charity, which I conceive Chriſt hath been ſo paſſionately earneſt to recommend unto me, as moſt diametrically oppoſite to the moſt unchriſtian damning ſins of pride, ambition, malice, rebellion, unquietneſs, uncontentedneſs, &c.

Fourthly, for the whole diſcourſe about Antichriſt, there muſt many things be returned. 1. That it is not tolerable in a Chriſtian to affirm, that God purpoſely hid truths, that Antichriſt might come into the world; this ſo harſh ſence the Objecter firſt diſguiſes in another Phraſe, that God *by ſpecial diſpenſation ſuffered him to make many truths his footſtool*; but indeed that reaches not home to the buſineſs undertaken to be proved: For it follows not thence, that this of reſiſting Superiours was one of thoſe truths; if it were, then God ſuffered him to make uſe of it, which he could not but by its being made known, whereas he ſuppoſes it was then hid; If he mean Antichriſt hid it, and ſo made the hiding it, his foot-ſtool, Then 1. it was not God that hid it, as before he ſaid, but Antichriſt. 2. It had then been manifeſt before, and then began to be hid, when there was moſt occaſion to uſe it, which before he made improbable. If I were put upon the rack I could not give a rational account of thoſe words of the Objecter laſt-recited, or ſuch as may but be conſonant to his preſent undertaking: that which follows is more clear, that *God cauſed a dead ſleep to fall upon thoſe truths:* If he did, I wonder who firſt raiſed them out of that dead ſleep; *Jun. Brutus*, or *Buchan.* or Mr. *Goodwin?* but ſtill it ſeems God did on purpoſe hide truths in favour and aſ-

ſiſtance

ſiſtance to Antichriſt to help him into the world, and this, not like the Spirit of ſlumber ſent on men for their puniſhment, but on divine truths which ſure had not deſerved it: yet more particularly that the doctrine of liberty to reſiſt Superiours ſhould be *ſo oppoſite in a ſpecial manner to Antichriſt*, that it was fain to be laid aſleep to give him paſſage into his Throne, ſeemeth very ſtrange to me; 1. Becauſe one piece of Antichriſts pride is to exalt himſelf above all that is called God, which is moſtly interpreted Kings; and if rightly, then they that do ſo enhaunce the power of the people, as to make the King *univerſis minorem*, and looſe the reins of obedience ſo far as to permit reſiſtance; will I fear diſcern ſome part of the mark of the Beaſt upon their own breaſts. 2. Becauſe the τὸ κατέχον, 2 *Theſ.* 26, and ὁ κατέχων, verſe 7. that hindred, or let Antichriſt, and was like to do ſo ſtill, till he were taken out of the way, was by the Fathers commonly reſolved to be the Roman Empire or Imperial Soveraignty of *Rome*, ſee *Tert. De reſurr. c.* 24. *Ambr. com. in* 2 *Theſſ. Hier. qu.* 11. *ad Algas. Chryſ. in* 2 *Theſ. Cyr. Hier. catech.* 11. *Aug. de civ. Dei. l.* 20. *c.* 19. *Lact. l.* 7. *c.* 25. *Oecum. in loc. & ib. Sever. & Gen.* and therefore on the ſacking of *Rome* by *Alaricus* the Goth, St. *Jerome* preſently expected that Antichriſt ſhould come, and in his book *ad Ageruchiam de monogam.* wonders that any one would think of marrying at that time. Hence, have learned men obſerved, was that cuſtom in the moſt ancient times to pray in their Liturgies for the laſting of the Roman Empire, that ſo Antichriſt might be long a coming, *Tert. Apol. c.* 33. *ad Scap. c.* 2. From whence though nothing elſe can be demonſtratively inferred, yet this certainly may, that in thoſe many Fathers opinion, the power of Kings continuing intire, was not like to help Antichriſt in, nor conſequently the bringing down that power by the revelation of the doctrine of reſiſtance, like *to cauſe an abortion in Antichriſts birth*, or now tend to the caſting him out of the world.

As for the evidence of that Revelation-rule that the communalty in oppoſition to their Kings, muſt have the great ſtroke in executing Gods judgment on Antichriſt, proved, *Revel.* 18. 4, 6, 9. I muſt anſwer, 5. That I ſhall never wonder enough at the power of Prejudice evidenced in this Objecter, by what he hath put together to this purpoſe, Pag. 32. To prove that the people contrary to their Kings ſhall deſtroy Antichriſt, this is thought by him ſufficient evidence, that *the people are commanded to go out of her*, verſe 4. when verſe 9. it follows that the *Kings of the earth ſhall bewail her, and lament for her:* The unconcludingneſs of the argument I ſhall not inſiſt on, but only look forward to another place which he cites immediately, *Revel.* 17. 17. *Where the ten Kings are ſaid to hate the Whore, and make her deſolate.* Now the word Kings in this laſt place ſignifies, ſaith the Objecter, not the perſons of Kings but their ſtates and Kingdoms, and to this purpoſe proofs are produced: But 1. I beſeech him to deal ingenuouſly; Doth the word King ever ſignifie the Kingdom oppoſed to the King, *i. e.* any part of the Kingdom excluding the King? But then 2. See the myſtery of prejudice which I mentioned; where it is for the Objecters turn, *Revel.* 18. The Kings of the earth muſt ſignifie their perſons in oppoſition to their people; but where it is not for his turn, *Revel.* 17. there the word Kings, muſt ſignifie the people, or any but the King: Would not the ſpirit of meekneſs have eaſily compounded this buſineſs, and have given the word [Kings] leave in both places, to ſignifie both their perſons and their Realms, and ſo have reconciled the places, that ſome Kings with their Kingdoms ſhould bewail her, and ſome again hate her? they bewail her, that continued with her till her deſtruction, when they ſee the ſmoak of her burning, 18. 9. and others hate her, who had once taſted of her filthineſs, and repented and left her before; this were very agreeable to thoſe texts, if we had not peremptorily reſolved to fetch ſome other ſence out of them. 3. That firſt place alone by it ſelf concludes only thus much, that good men come (or are exhorted to come) out from Antichriſt, and avenge the whore, and earthly men that have love to her, bewail her, but not that either the firſt are all common people (for ſure Kings may be called Gods people, or be in that number) or the ſecond none but Kings. As for the proof that thoſe people, verſe 4. are the ſubjects of thoſe Kings, verſe 9. becauſe they are ſuch as come out of *Babylon*, ſure that is very weak; for *Babylon* being the Province of the Whore, there may be Kings as well as ſubjects there, and thoſe Kings come out too, as well as thoſe ſubjects. For ſuppoſe King and people of *England* all Popiſh, why might they not all reform together? It ſeems Antichriſt muſt never be caſt out of a Kingdom till the people do it in ſpight of the King, and therefore it is concluded that it was not done here in the days of King *Edward*, nor Queen *Elizabeth*, nor King *James*, and now ſince the new Revelations have aſſured men that Antichriſt muſt now be caſt out utterly from among us, it is become neceſſary that our Soveraign ſhould be a Papiſt, and as much zeal and as ſolid arguments uſed to perſwade our friends that indeed he is ſo, (though his conſtant word and actions now evidence the contrary) as are produced to maintain any other article of our new Saints belief: One of the moſt ſuſpected and hated hereſies of theſe days, is to doubt of the Popiſh affections of our Superiours, eſpecially the King. Well by this doctrine, if the King ſhould chance not to be a Papiſt, he muſt turn to be one, or elſe Popery cannot be caſt out in his time. If ſo he ſhould do, turn Papiſt on purpoſe to prepare, or diſpoſe his Kingdom to turn Antichriſt out, this might be but anſwerable to Gods hiding of truths to that end to help Antichriſt in. But ſhould his Majeſty be ſo malicious as to prove Proteſtant in earneſt, then what would become of that ſure word of Prophecy that ſo many have been perſwaded to depend on, that Antichriſt muſt now be caſt out of this Kingdom, which ſaith the Objecter cannot be, unleſs the people do it while the King bewails. I hope I have ſaid enough of this.

As for the connexion of this obſervation, with the concluſion in hand (though it matter little, now, the obſervation is proved ſo falſe, yet) I ſhall add, that if the people were to do that great feat of caſting out Antichriſt, yet it appears not how liberty of forcible reſiſting their Kings ſhould be a neceſſary requiſite to the work, unleſs the lawful King be the Antichriſt in every country; for otherwiſe it is very poſſible that though they obey their Kings, they may reſiſt Antichriſt; though they love and reverence their lawful Superiour, they may hate and abjure their unlawful. Once more, whereas it is again repeated, that the *knowledge of the ſuppoſed ſubjects liberty would have kept Antichriſt from his throne*, I repeat again, that if it would, God ſure would have revealed it to them of all others, unleſs it appear, that God was more angry with the ſins of Chriſtians in

Tertullians

Tertullians age, and ſo more fought againſt them, than he doth in ours againſt us: For though God may of mercy undeſerved throw down Antichriſt, yet that he ſhould ſo immediately and illuſtriouſly labour to ſet him up, unleſs out of deſerved indignation to a people, is not eaſily reſolved; yet if this may appear *de facto* to be ſo, I ſhall yield; till then, ἐπέχω.

The laſt blot laid on *Tertullian* to obliterate all whatſoever can be fetcht from him, is, that *the authority of* Tertullian, *and the ſubmiſſion of the Chriſtians being both Apocryphal, is too light to weigh againſt the practice of the great Prophet* Eliſha, *&c.* To which I anſwer, that that being ſuppoſed, yet the grounds on which *Tertullian* ſaith the Chriſtians of his time did ſo patiently ſuffer, *viz.* the doctrine of Chriſtian patience and meekneſs, are not Apocryphal, nor inferiour to that of *Eliſha*, though it were ſuppoſed to be argumentative, or concluding for reſiſtance. For any thing elſe added by the Objecter in this buſineſs, as the diſproving of *Tertullians* relations on grounds of Chriſtian doctrine, from the contrary practice of *David* and *Eliſha*, though I might anſwer in one word, that Chriſtians are reſtrained from ſome things which were practiſed without fault in the Old-Teſtament, yet becauſe thoſe Old-Teſtament examples have been fully cleared by many others of our Writers, and indeed are not pertinent to the diſcourſe I was upon when this Objecter firſt met me in the way, and led me this chaſe after him, I ſhall not be ſo impertinent as to add any thing, but conceive my ſelf to have vindicated the teſtimonies of thoſe Fathers from all poſſible objections, and ſo to have joined the practice of Chriſtians, (thoſe ancient Primitive ones) and proved them correſpondent to the example of Chriſt, and ſo to have made good my ſecond argument from the example of Chriſt and Chriſtians.

My third is, from the very making of Chriſtianity, and particularly of the Proteſtant Doctrine. And 1. Of Chriſtianity, which as it differs from the Laws both of *Moſes* and Nature, ſo it conſtantly reforms and perfects thoſe (diſſolves not any thing that was moral in them, nor promiſes impunity for non-performance, but upon repentance and reformation) elevates and raiſes them up to an higher pitch, at leaſt than Jews or natural men had conceived or underſtood themſelves obliged to, which the ancient Fathers generally reſolve to be the meaning of his ἀλλὰ πληρῶσαι, *Matth.* 5. 17. to *fill up* all vacuities in thoſe former Laws, and add unto them that perfection which ſhould be proportionable to that greater meaſure of grace now afforded under the Goſpel. Thus in that Sermon upon the Mount, ἄκρον καὶ κορυφὴ τῆς φιλοσοφίας, that top of practical Divinity, (ſet down by way of particular inſtance of Chriſts purpoſe, οὐ καταλῦσαι τὸν νόμον, ἀλλὰ πληρῶσαι) beſides the third prooemial beatitude, *Bleſſed are the meek*; which certainly though it may contain more, yet excludes not, but principally notes the meek, obedient Subjects under Government, the non-reſiſters, and therefore hath the ſame promiſe annext which the Law had given in the fifth Commandment ('twas there, *That thy days may be long in the Land*; 'tis here, *They ſhall poſſeſs the earth*, τὴν γῆν, which *Pſal.* 37. 11. whence it is cited, refers clearly to the Land of *Canaan*, though improved into an higher ſence now in the Goſpel.) And again, beſides the ſeventh beatitude of the *peacemakers*, or peaceable (εἰρηνοποιοὶ and εἰρηνικοὶ, being equivalent in the Scripture ſtile, *vid. Jam.* 3. 18.) and the eighth, of thoſe that are perſecuted for righteouſneſs ſake, (whence ſure is not excluded the cauſe of Religion and Chriſtianity it ſelf) as alſo of taking up the Croſs (of which I deſign another diſcourſe to ſpeak more largely) which ſure are oppoſite enough to forcible reſiſting of lawful Magiſtrates, eſpecially for Religion: beſides all theſe, I ſay, in the introduction to that Sermon, there is in the body of the Sermon it ſelf, an Ἐγὼ λέγω ὑμῖν μὴ ἀντιστῆναι τῷ πονηρῷ, which ſure prohibits all forcible reſiſting or violence even to the ὁ πονηρὸς, the *injurious* or (πονηρὸς from πόνος) *troubleſome* perſon, which if it ſhould chance to be our King, would not certainly be more lawfully or Chriſtianly reſiſted, than any body elſe; eſpecially, when it is our Religion which is invaded, which of all other things a whole Army of plunderers cannot rob us of, (as they may of the cloke, *ver.* 40.) and therefore needs not our violence to retain it; nor is ever injured, but more illuſtrated by our ſuffering. To this may be added the conſideration of the *depoſitum* left by Chriſt with his Diſciples, *pacem*, peace, *John* 14. 27. (which it ſeems only the beloved Diſciple had recorded) *Peace I leave with you*, external peace, for the *pacem meam*, my peace follows after as a gift perhaps peculiar to them that priſed and kept this legacy; and if it be objected, that Chriſt came not to ſend peace, but a ſword, *Matth.* 10. 34. that ſure refers not to Chriſts prime counſel or purpoſe, but to the event; what he foreſaw it would be, not what he had determined it ought (which manner of ſpeech is very ordinary in all Authors) for the precept is punctual to *Peter* againſt the uſe of the ſword, and to all the Diſciples for preſerving of peace, *Mark* 9. 50. and to that it is thought the mention of ſalt belongs in that place, which among other qualities is, ἑνωτικὸν unitive, *have ſalt in your ſelves, and peace one with another.* On theſe Texts many effectual emphatical deſcants are added by the Apoſtles, *Rom.* 12. 18. *If it be poſſible, as much as in you lyeth, live peaceably with all men*, and *Heb.* 12. 14. *follow peace with all men*, διώκετε, an agoniſtical word to run for it as for a prize, or βραβεῖον, and 1 *Theſ.* 4. 11. φιλοτιμεῖσθαι ἡσυχάζειν, we render it, *ſtudy* (it is, be emulous, contend, ſtrive, make it your ambition) *to be quiet*; to which I ſhall only add two places more, *Jam.* 3. 17, 18. *The wiſdom which cometh from above, is firſt pure, then peaceable, &c.* which before, *verſe* 13. he had called meekneſs of wiſdom; then 1 *Pet.* 3. 3. where after direction for the ὑποτασσόμεναι obedience of wives to husbands (and we know the Kingdoms relation to the King is, beſides others, that of a wife to an husband, who is therefore eſpouſed to it with the ring at his Coronation) it is added, ἐν τῷ ἀφθάρτῳ τοῦ πραέως καὶ ἡσυχίου πνεύματος, that her bravery conſiſts in the *ſincerity* (I think it ſhould be rendred) *of a meek and quiet ſpirit, which is in the ſight of God of great price.* If it be objected, that theſe many places of peace are but general wide illations againſt reſiſtance, or however, no more pertinent to the caſe about reſiſting of Magiſtrates, than of any other private man: I anſwer, that though I might thus argue, *à minori*, (and alſo aſſume, that no other reſiſtance is near ſo deſtructive of peace, as that reſiſting of the Supreme power, that being indeed the ſhaking of Government it ſelf, which is the band of peace, and the diſſolving of which returns us to the ſtate of common hoſtility, leaves us a wilderneſs of Bears or Tygers, not a ſociety of men) yet I ſhall confeſs, that I intended not to lay any more weight on this part of the Argument, than any man will acknowledge it able to bear, and that therefore before I infer my concluſion of non-reſiſtance from the making of Chriſtianity, I

muſt

muſt add to theſe places ſo paſſionate for peace, another ſort of places concerning obedience, of which, (without naming the places being ſo known already) I ſhall venture this obſervation, that in the New Teſtament, eſpecially the Epiſtles of the Apoſtles, (which were all written in time of the reign of wicked Heathen bloody adverſaries of Chriſtianity, and can refer to none but thoſe) there is no one Chriſtian vertue, or Article of Faith more clearly delivered, more effectually inforced upon our underſtandings and affections to be acknowledged by the one (againſt all pretence of Chriſtian liberty to the contrary) and ſubmitted to by the other, than that of obedience to Kings, &c. It were moſt eaſie to vindicate thoſe places from all the gloſſes and ſcholia's that the Writers of this year, M. *Goodwin in Anticav.* M. *Bur.* M. *Bridges*, &c. have invented to free themſelves and others from the obedience moſt ſtrictly required there, but I would not again trouble any ingenuous man with ſuch extravagant diſcourſes as even now I learnt by experience would be neceſſary to anſwer ſuch exceptions, which mens wit or ſomewhat worſe hath produced; beſides, thoſe places have been by others vindicated already. I ſhall only ſay, whoſoever can without coloured ſpectacles find ground for the preſent reſiſtance in thoſe places of Scripture, *Rom.* 13. 1 *Pet.* 2. 13, 18, &c. ſo far as to ſettle and quiet a conſcience, I ſhall not conceive my underſtanding fit to duel with his, any more than I would wreſtle with a fiend, or combat with the fire, which *Pythagoras* tells me would avail little; he that can be ſure that *damnation* (*Rom.* 13. 2.) ſignifies not damnation, but ſome temporary Mulct only (if the King ſhould prove able to inflict it) when *verſe* 5. it is added, *we muſt needs be ſubject, not only for wrath, (i.e.* fear of temporary puniſhment) *but alſo for conſcience ſake*, (which when it accuſes, binds over to eternal wrath, or damnation) I profeſs I know not what Camel he may not ſwallow; I ſhall only in the bowels of Chriſt deſire him to conſider, what a ſad condition it would prove, if being on this confidence engaged, and by Gods hand taken away in this War, he ſhould at Gods tribunal hear Saint *Paul* avouch, that by κρῖμα or *damnation* in that place, he did mean no leſs than eternal damnation without repentance: O how would his countenance change, his thoughts trouble him, the joints of his loins be looſed, and his knees ſmite one againſt another, one general σπασμὸς poſſeſs all his faculties, and M. *Bridg.* &c. be unable to ſettle him or give him confidence any longer, when the *Tekel* ſhall come out of the Wall over againſt that interpretation of his, that it is weighed in the balance (of truth and judgment) and found wanting; Of this word κρῖμα I deſign another diſquiſition: only I could not defer to forewarn the Reader of his danger in this place, and now I ſhall not doubt from the making of Chriſtianity to infer my concluſion of non-reſiſtance, not doubting but the premiſſes will bear it.

For the other part of this third Argument from the making of the Proteſtant Doctrine, I would fain be very brief by way of compenſation for my former importunity, and therefore ſhall engage my ſelf not to trouble the Reader with citations or names, which yet might be brought by hundreds of reformed Writers for every *Junius Brutus*, and *Buchanan* that hath appeared for the contrary ſince the Reformation. Though the truth is, ſuch as theſe if they muſt be called Proteſtants, are yet in this ſomewhat more than that title ever imported, I may ſay perfect Jeſuits in their principles, and reſolutions concerning Kings (no Papiſt of any other Order hath gone ſo far) although they differ ſomewhat in the ſeat of that power of making ſuch reſiſtance. That which I deſigned to ſay on this point is only this; That the doctrine of Allegeance to Kings, and of their ſupremacy in all cauſes, hath always been counted a principal head of difference between the Proteſtants and the worſt of Papiſts; and a ſpecial evidence which moſt men have uſed, to conclude the Papacy to be ὁ Ἀντίχριστος the Antichriſt, is this, that the Pope exalteth himſelf above all that is called God, *i.e.* The Kings of the earth; that he in caſe the King be not a Catholick, abſolves Subjects from their Allegiance to him, that he pretends power over them in ſpiritual things, and in temporal in *ordine ad ſpiritualia.* It is not unknown to any that the Oath of Supremacy, if not of Allegiance, among us is principally deſigned to diſcern and diſcover Papiſts, of whom, one of the prayers appointed for the fifth of *November* affirms, that their Religion is Rebellion, that ſure is, that one main difference betwixt Romiſh and Engliſh, Popiſh and Proteſtant Doctrine is that of liberty to Rebel in ſome caſes, particularly in that of Religion: In oppoſition to all which Doctrines or inſinuations of theirs, there is no Church that ever expreſt their ſence in any Article more fully and largely, than ours hath in this particular, witneſs the ſeveral parts of the Homily of Diſobedience and Rebellion, printed in Queen *Elizabeths* time. And if herein all other parts of the Reformed Church have not gone ſo far as we, yet ſhall I not retract my aſſerting this Doctrine purely Proteſtant, 1. Becauſe this Kingdom hath always been eſteemed a prime part of the Reformation, wherein the Papacy was legally caſt out, not by violence or tumults of the people, and ſo nothing rejected but what in ſobriety was neceſſary to be rejected, and therefore our Church hath generally been the *Norma*, or rule by which others have deſired to compoſe themſelves, and never yet any other ſo preferred before us, as that our Anceſtours could think fit to conform to them. 2. Becauſe in many other Countreys the Government is not Regal, or Monarchical, as here it is; *Bodin. l.* 2. *c.* 5. *de rep.* can find none of this nature in *Europe*, but *France* and *Spain*, and *England* and *Scotland* (I conceive *Ireland* he contained under the word *Angliam*) in which, ſaith he, *Reges ſine controverſia jura omnia majeſtatis habent per ſe: Singulis civibus nec univerſis fas eſt* (it ſeems Maſter *Dale* our Embaſſadour, from whom he had received his advertiſements of the ſtate of this Kingdom, had not then heard that our King though *Singulis major* is *univerſis minor*, which certainly had diveſted him of all Soveraignty, it being impoſſible that the Soveraign or Supream of all ſhould be *Minor* than any) *Summi principis vitam, famam aut fortunas in diſcrimen vocare, ſeu vi, ſeu judicio conſtituto id fiat, &c.* As for the Emperour of *Germany*, *Charles* the fifth by name, he ſaith plainly, *Tyrannide cives ac rempublicam oppreſſit, cùm jura majeſtatis non haberet*, which if it be true, will be ſome excuſe to the German Princes in what they did at that time in taking up Arms for Religion, though it is moſt certain what he affirms, that when thoſe Princes conſulted with *M. Luther* about it, *num id jure divino liceret*, whether it were lawful in the ſight of God, *Ille negavit*, he reſolved it utterly unlawful: this anſwer, ſaith *Bodin*, *Luther* gave, *Perinde atque ſi* Carolus *ſummam imperii ſolus haberet*, and therefore much more muſt it be given, when the caſe is

of

of a Monarch indeed, as he concludes; and though he acknowledge that diſtinction, which it ſeems *Luther* did not, betwixt that Emperour and true Monarchs, yet is he fain to paſs a ſad obſervation upon the fact of thoſe Princes in taking up Arms for Religion, againſt *Luther*'s advice, *Ita funeſtum bellum reique publicæ calamitoſum ſuſceptum eſt, cùm ingenti principum ac civium ſtrage, quia juſta cauſa nulla videri poteſt adverſus patriam arma ſumendi.* I would to God thoſe words were Engliſht in every of our hearts: a direful and calamitous War with the ſlaughter of all ſorts; becauſe (though it were for Religion, yet) no cauſe can be counted juſt of taking up Arms againſt one's Countrey. The truth is, what was done there, though, 1. very unhappily, and 2. againſt no Monarch, hath been thought imitable by *Knox* and *Buchanan* in *Scotland*, and from thence infuſed into ſome few into *England*, as *Penry*, &c. but by Gods providence hath formerly been timouſly reſtrained, and not broken out to the defaming of our Proteſtant Profeſſion. It ſeems now our ſins are ripe for ſuch a judgment, the Land divided into two extream ſinful parts; one by their ſins fitted to ſuffer under this Doctrine, others ſinful enough to be permitted to broach and proſecute it. I meekly thank God, that though my ſins are ſtrangely great, yet he hath not given me up to that latter judgment. I conceive I have alſo given ſome hints at leaſt of proving my poſition from the making of the Proteſtant Doctrine.

Now for the laſt Topick, taken from the conſtitution of this Kingdom; Though that be the Lawyers task, very proſperouſly undertaken by others, yet one general notion there is of our Laws, which from my childhood I have imbibed, and therefore conceive common to all others with me; and it is this, That the Laws of this Kingdom put no man (no Papiſts I am ſure) to death for Religion. When Jeſuits and Seminary-Prieſts have ſuffered, every man is ſo perfect in the Law, as to know that it is for Treaſon, by a Statute that makes it ſuch for them to come into this Kingdom. The truth of this, and the conſtant pleading of it againſt all Objecters, hath made me ſwallow it as a principle of our Law, that even Popery ſtrictly taken (and not only as now this laſt year it hath learnt to enlarge its importance) is no capital crime. From whence, I profeſs, I know no impediment to forbid me to conclude, that in the conſtitution of our State no War for Religion is accounted a lawful War; for that it ſhould be lawful to kill whole multitudes without any inditement, yea, and by attempting it, to endanger, at leaſt, our own, *i.e.* many good Proteſtants lives, for that, which if it were proved againſt any ſingle man, would not touch his life in the leaſt degree, is, I muſt acknowledge, one of the *Arcana belli*, which I cannot ſee into. And therefore *Sleidan* tells us of *M. Luther*, that he would not allow a War, though but defenſive, with the Turk himſelf, *com. lib.* 13. *pag.* 403. and though after he had mitigated his opinion upon a new ſtate of the queſtion, and perſwaded the Emperour to it, yet it was with this limitation, *Modò nec vindictæ, nec gloriæ, nec emolumenti causâ ſubeatur*, (three things that are very rarely kept out of War) *ſed tantùm ut ſpurciſſimum latronem, non ex religionis, ſed furti & injuriarum actione aggrediantur.* It ſeems the cauſe of Religion, although it were of Chriſtianity againſt Mahometiſm, was not to * him a ſufficient warrant for a defenſive War. But then 2. For this War to be waged againſt the Prince, (or by any one but the Prince, in a Monarchy, as this is) who whatſoever he hath not, hath certainly the power of the ſword immediately from God, (or elſe muſt be acknowledged not to have it at all, for this power cannot be in any people originally, or any where but in God, and therefore it may be moſt truly ſaid, that though the Regal power were confeſt to be firſt given by the people, yet the power of the ſword, wherewith regality is endowed, would be a ſuperaddition of Gods, never belonging to Regal or whatever other power, till God annext it, in *Gen.* 9. 6. which alſo ſeems to be out of all diſpute in this Kingdom, even at this time, where the univerſal body of the commonalty, even by thoſe that would have the Regal power originally in them, is not yet affirmed to have any aggregate power, any farther than every man ſingle out of Government was preſumed to have over himſelf, which ſure was not power of his own life: for even in nature there is *Felonia de ſe*, and therefore the repreſentative body of the Commons is ſo far from being a Judicature in capital matters, that it cannot adminiſter an Oath) and therefore is not juſtly invaſible by any ſubject, or community of ſubjects, who certainly have not that power, nor pretend to have it, and when they take it, think it neceſſary to excuſe that fact by pretence of neceſſity, which every body knows, is the colour for thoſe things which have no ordinary means of juſtifying them (like that which Divines ſay of ſaving of children and ideots, &c. by ſome extraordinary way.) Nay, 3. For this War to be waged, not againſt Popery, truly ſo called, but againſt the only true Proteſtant Religion, as it ſtands (and by attempting to make new Laws is acknowledged as yet to ſtand) eſtabliſht by the old Laws of the Land, and therefore is fain to be called Popiſh (and our Martyr-reformers not able, by thoſe fiery chariots of theirs, to get out of the confines of *Babylon*) that it may be fit to be deſtroyed: juſt as the Primitive Chriſtians were by the perſecuters put in wild beaſts skins, that in thoſe ſhapes they might be devoured: this I confeſs it is to me a complication of riddles, (and therefore put by ſome Artiſts under that deep-dark-phraſe, and title of Fundamental Laws of the Kingdom) to which certainly no liberty or right of the Subject in *Magna Charta*, no nor legiſlative power, will enable any man to give any intelligible, much leſs legal name: At which I profeſs I am not ill pleaſed, becauſe this I hope will keep it from being recorded to poſterity.

* Vid. Luth in Mat. 13. in poſtillis. *Hîc verò vide, ut maleſani hactenus fuerimus quòd Turcas bello, hæreticos igne, Judæos necis metu & aliis injuriis voluimus ad fidem compellere, & Zizania noſtris viribus evellere, ac ſi nos illi eſſemus quibus poteſtas eſſet in corda & ſpiritus, & in noſtra manu omnes homines ad juſtitiam & pietatem revocare, &c. Obſerve here, how mad we have hitherto been, who would by War compel the Turks to the Faith, Hereticks by fire, the Jews by fear of being put to death, and to pull up the to recal people to*

takes by our own ſtrength, as if we were they who have power over the hearts and ſpirits of men, and as if it were in our hands juſtice and piety.

I have done with my fourth Argument, and am heartily ſorry I have kept my Reader ſo long from his Prayers, which muſt ſet an end to this Controverſie, for ſure Arguments are too blunt to do it; I beſeech God to direct all our hearts to a conſtant uſe of thoſe means (together with faſting and abſtinence, at leaſt from farther provoking ſins) to exorcize that evil ſpirit that hath divided his titles (of ἔχθρος ἄνηρ, Σατανᾶς, διάβολος, καλήγορος τῶν ἀδελφῶν, and now at length, ἀβαδδὼν, & ἀπολλυὼν, among us, and by thoſe means infuſed his mortiferous poyſon into the very veins of this whole Kingdom.

I create the fruit of the lips, peace, peace to him that is far off, &c. and I will heal him.
Thou haſt moved the Land, and divided it; heal the ſores thereof, for it ſhaketh.

Of the Word KPI-MA.

THE word κρῖμα, according to its origination, ſignifies Cenſure, *Judgment*, and in its making hath no intimation, either of the quality of the offence to which that judgment belongs, or of the Judge who inflicts it: that it belongs to humane judgments, or ſentences of temporal puniſhments ſometimes, is apparent by *Luke* 23. 40. where one Thief ſaith to the other, ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ κρίματι εἶ, meaning it ſeems, the ſame ſentence of death, or capital puniſhment, called κρῖμα θανάτου, c. 24. 20. *judgment of death* temporal; and that at other times it ſignifies alſo divine judgment is as apparent, *Acts* 24. 26. τῦ κρίματος τῦ μέλλοντος ἔσεσθαι, *judgment to come*, that is, certainly at the end of this World, at the day of doom; So *Rom.* 2. 2. κρῖμα τῦ Θεῦ, the *judgment of God*, and ſo again, *verſe* 3. which *verſe* 5. is explained to be wrath or puniſhment againſt the day of wrath, &c. ſo *Heb.* 6. 2. *reſurrection of the dead, and eternal judgment*. The truth is, in this ſence it is moſt-what taken in this Book, ſee *Matth.* 23. 14. *Mark* 12. 40. *Luke* 20. 47. *Rom.* 3. 8. and therefore *Heſychius*, the beſt Gloſſary for the new Teſtament, renders it κρῖμα, ἀνταπόδοσις Θεῦ, Gods retribution or payment, or rendring according to Works. It will not be worth while to ſurvey and conſider every place where the word is uſed, he that ſhall do ſo, will perhaps reſolve with me to accept of that gloſſary, and underſtand it conſtantly of Gods judgment; unleſs when the circumſtances of the place ſhall enforce the contrary, as they do in the places firſt mentioned, and 1 *Cor.* 6. 7. But then when the context rather leads to the ſecond ſence, there will be great danger for any man to apply it to humane judgments, for by ſo doing, he may flatter himſelf or others in ſome ſin, and run into that κρῖμα, as it ſignifies eternal judgment, when by that miſ-underſtanding he doth not conceive himſelf in any danger of it. Of places which without all controverſie thus interpret themſelves, I will mention two, 2 *Pet.* 2. 3. οἷς τὸ κρῖμα ἔκ πάλαι οὐκ ἀργεῖ, we render it, *whoſe judgment of a long time lingreth not*: which that it belongs to eternal vengeance, appears by the next words, ἡ ἀπώλεια αὐτῶν οὐ νυστάζει, we render it, *Their damnation*, it is literally, *Their deſtruction ſleepeth not*. The ſecond place is, 1 *Tim.* 3. 6. εἰς κρῖμα ἐμπέσῃ τῦ διαβόλυ, *fall into the condemnation of the Devil*; that is, ſure, into that ſentence that fell upon *Lucifer* for his pride (being caſt out of Heaven, and reſerved to chains of eternal darkneſs) for the perſon ſpoken of here, is the Novice, or new Convert, lifted up with pride, juſt parallel to the Angels newly created, lifted up with pride alſo, the crimes and the perſons parallel, and ſo ſure the puniſhment alſo. Now three places more there are which appear to me by the ſame means of evidence, or rule of interpreting, to belong to the ſame ſence, though I cannot ſay of them as I did before, [without controverſie] for I ſee it is not only doubted by ſome, whether they do belong to this ſence or no, but that it is reſolved they do not: which reſolution ſure muſt be obnoxious to ſome danger, that I ſay no worſe of it. The firſt of theſe places is, *Rom.* 13. 2. οἱ δὲ ἀνθεστηκότες ἑαυτοῖς κρῖμα λήψονται· we render it, *They that reſiſt ſhall receive to themſelves damnation*: But ſay others, it muſt be rendred *judgment*, as that ſignifies ſome temporary puniſhment which the higher powers may inflict, and nothing elſe: and this they labour to make appear by the words following; *For Rulers are a terrour to evil works*, and *he beareth not the ſword in vain*, &c. To which I anſwer, That there is no doubt made by me or any, but that Rulers are to puniſh men for evil works, particularly that of reſiſtance againſt them, and not only that, but alſo crimes againſt our brethren, and God; and in that reſpect it is added, *verſe* 4. Θεῦ διάκονός ἐστιν ἔκδικος εἰς ὀργὴν τῷ τὸ κακὸν πράσσοντι, the *Miniſter* or Officer of God he is, and *executioner for wrath*, that is, puniſhment temporal *to him* (indefinitely) *that doth evil*. But doth it follow from hence, that either he that makes forcible reſiſtance againſt the Superiour or Supreme power, or that commits any other ſin (which the Supreme power is ſet to avenge or puniſh temporally) ſhall incur no eternal puniſhment? If this new Divinity ſhould be entertained, it muſt be priviledge and protection to other ſins, as well as reſiſtance and rebellion, even to all that any judicial Laws have power to puniſh, for in theſe alſo he is the Miniſter of God, ἔκδικος εἰς ὀργὴν, an avenger, or executioner for puniſhment; and there is no avoiding it, but this muſt be extended indefinitely, or univerſally, τῷ τὸ κακὸν πράσσοντι, to any malefactor puniſhable by that power, or that comes under this cognizance; and ſo by this Logick, he that is hanged may not be damned, whatever his crime be, an execution on earth ſhall be as good as a Purgatory to excuſe him from any other puniſhment. But then ſecondly, ſuppoſe a Rebel eſcape the hand of juſtice here below, by flight, &c. nay that he proſper in his rebellion, and get the better of it, that the King be not able to puniſh him; nay, yet farther, that he proceed higher, Depoſe the King, and get into his place, What κρῖμα is he like to receive, if that ſignifie only the Kings wrath or temporal puniſhment? Sure this proſperouſneſs of the crime muſt make it ceaſe to be a crime, make it commence vertue, as the Turks on their principles are wont to reſolve it, ſaith *Busbequius*, *Ep.* 4.---------- *Ex opinione quæ Turcis inſedit ut res quocunque conſilio inſtitutas, ſi bene cadunt, ad Deum Autorem referant, &c.* Or elſe give it, (though it be a ſin never ſo great, and unrepented of) perfect impunity both in this World, and in another; And certainly this is no jeſt, for he that obſerves the behaviours of many men, (the no manner of regrets or reluctancies in their courſe of forcible reſiſtance, (ſave only when they conceive it goes not on ſo proſperouſly as it was wont) and the great weekly induſtry that is uſed to perſwade all men of the continued proſperity of the ſide, as being conceived far more uſeful and inſtrumental to their ends, than the demonſtration of the juſtice of it, mens conſciences being reſolved more by the Diurnal, than the Bible, by the Intelligencer than the Divine, unleſs he turn Intelligencer

alſo,

alſo, I would we had not ſo many of thoſe Pluraliſts:) will have reaſon to reſolve that this Divinity is the principle by which they move; which if it be not yet brought to abſurdities enough, then look a little forward to the concluſion, deduced and inferr'd, *verſe* 5. *Wherefore ye muſt be ſubject, not only for wrath, but alſo for conſcience ſake.* Words by Prophetick Spirit added by the Apoſtle, as it were on purpoſe to contradict *in terminis*, that new interpretation. *Wrath* ſignifies that temporal puniſhment, *verſe* 4. which if it were the all that is meant by κρῖμα, then how can it be true that we muſt be ſubject *not only for wrath*? Certainly he that reſiſts is not ſubject (ἀντιτάσσων is all one with ἀντιτασσόμενοι, and both directly contrary to ὑποτάσσεσθαι, the word uſed both in the third and fifth verſe) and therefore if we muſt be ſubject *not only for wrath*, as that ſignifies temporal puniſhment, then he that reſiſts, ſhall receive more than wrath, as that ſignifies temporal puniſhment, *viz.* κρῖμα, in our rendring, *condemnation*, if he do not prevent it timouſly by repentance: which ſure is the importance of the ἀλλὰ καὶ διὰ τὴν συνείδησιν, *but alſo for conſcience ſake*; that if he do it not, it will be ſin to him, wound his conſcience, bind him over to that puniſhment which belongs to an accuſing conſcience, (which ſure is more than a temporal Mulct) which is farther clear from the firſt verſe of that Chapter, the command of ſubjection. For ſure every Divine or Apoſtolical Command entred into the Canon of Scripture, doth bind conſcience, and the breach of it known and deliberate, is no leſs than a damning ſin, even under the Goſpel, mortiferous and deſtructive without repentance, which is juſt equivalent to the κρῖμα λήψεται, *he ſhall receive damnation* in our way of interpreting it. So much for that firſt place.

The ſecond is, 1 *Cor.* 11. 29. *He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation,* (or as our margent, *judgment*) *to himſelf*, &c. This place I find avouched for the confirming of the former interpretation, *Rom.* 13. That κρῖμα ſignifies only Temporal puniſhment, and thus it is known the Socinians commonly interpret this place, *per* κρῖμα *non ſempiternam damnationem nominatim, ſed ſupplicium in genere intelligendum eſſe.* Volkelius *l.* 9. *de ver. rel. l.* 4. *c.* 22. That which is uſed to perſwade this to be probable, is that which follows, *verſe* 30. *For this cauſe many are weak and ſickly among you, and many ſleep*, which belonging only to Temporal puniſhments, is conceived to be a periphraſis of the κρῖμα *judgment*, which ſhould ſeem conſequently to be ſo alſo: and indeed *Volkelius* hath added other proofs, 1. Becauſe the Apoſtle ſpeaks of any one ſingle act of this ſin of unworthy receiving (not of any habit or cuſtome) which he conceives not actually damning now under the ſecond Covenant. 2. Becauſe it is *verſe* 32. and *when we are judged, we are chaſtened of the Lord that we ſhould not be condemned*, &c. To theſe three (and I know not that there are produced any more) probabilities, I conceive clear ſatisfaction may be given by thoſe who affirm κρῖμα to contain in it eternal puniſhment; Though it were only temporal puniſhment, yet being ſickneſs, *&c.* which are not inflicted by the Magiſtrate, but by the hand of God, it will not come home to that which was by Maſter *Br.* affirmed of the word, in *Rom.* 13. For this muſt be premiſed, that we do not conceive it to ſignifie eternal puniſhments, *excluſivè*, or ſo as to exclude temporal, but eternal and ſometimes Temporal too (for ſo ſure he that for his Rebellion receives damnation, hereafter, is not ſecured from being hang'd, drawn, and quartered here) or elſe eternal if he repent not, and perhaps Temporal though he do. By κρῖμα, as I ſaid, I underſtand with *Heſychius*, ἀνταπόδοσιν Θεοῦ, Gods vengeance whether here, or in another World, but I ſay in this place both of them, (and ſo ordinarily in the former alſo.) This being premiſed, the word κρῖμα may ſtill contain in it eternal puniſhments, *verſe* 29. though many for this cauſe of unworthy receiving did fall ſick and dye, *verſe* 30. for 1. they might both die and be damned too, or if as *Volkelius* ſaith, the word κοιμῶνται, *obdormiſcunt*, ſleep, be never uſed in the new Teſtament, of thoſe that are deſtinied to eternal deſtruction, then ſtill may this be very reconcileable with our interpretation that many for this cauſe are weak and ſickly, and many others ſleep, God chaſtiſing ſome by diſeaſes to reform them, and puniſhing others, who as *Volkelius* acknowledges, were guilty only of ſome ſingle act of the ſin only, with death temporal or ſhortning their days: which certainly hinders not but that God might puniſh others that did cuſtomarily commit this ſin (and perhaps with greater aggravations) with no leſs than eternal death; however that it were juſt for him to do ſo, what ever he did, it is plain by *verſe* 27. which is parallel to the 29. *whoſoever* ſhall *eat and drink unworthily*, ſhall be *guilty of the body and blood* of the Lord, that is in *Volkelius* his own words, *Ipſum Chriſti corpus ac ſanguinem contemnere & ignominiâ afficere, ac quantum in ipſis eſt profanare proculcaréque cenſendi ſunt*, ſhall be thought to contemn and diſgrace, and as much as in them lies to profane, and tread under feet the body and blood of Chriſt, which what is it but to *count the blood of the Covenant an unholy thing*, *Heb.* 10. 29? which yet there is uſed as a main aggravation of that ſin, for which, ſaith the Apoſtle, *there remains no more ſacrifice*, verſe 26. It is apparent that the phraſe ἔνοχοι τοῦ σώματος, *guilty of the body*, &c. is parallel to the Latine, *Reus Majeſtatis*, uſed for a Traytor, and ſure ſignifies no leſs than a guilt of a great injury to Chriſt, which how any man can affirm to be a ſin to which no damnation belongs (ſuppoſing no antidote of invincible ignorance or weakneſs, nor recovery by repentance, nor gracious pardon of God in not imputing ſome ſingle act of it) I profeſs my ſelf not to diſcern, though I think I have weighed impartially all that is ſaid of it. This ſure will keep the firſt proof from being any longer probable; and for the ſecond, (or firſt of *Volkelius*) it is already in effect anſwered too, for though he that is guilty only of ſome one act of this ſin found mercy, yet ſure they that are guilty of the cuſtomary ſin, may ſpeed worſe; and indeed of all indefinitely the Apoſtle ſpeaks according to the ſin; as when he ſaith the drunkard and adulterer ſhall not inherit the kingdom of God: Where yet perhaps he that is guilty only of one ſuch act may find mercy. For the laſt proof, I conceive it ſo far from being a probable one againſt me, that I ſhall reſolve it a convincing one on my ſide, for if thoſe that were ſick, &c. were *chaſtened of the Lord*, that they *ſhould not be condemned*, then ſure if they had not been ſo chaſtened, nor reformed by that chaſtening, they ſhould have been condemned with the World; and ſo their temporal judgments may be a means through the mercy of God in Chriſt to free them from their eternal, but not an argument that eternal was not due to them, but a perfect intimation that it was.

The third place (which is not indeed of much importance in it ſelf, but only is uſed to give countenance to the interpretation in the two former places) is, 1 *Pet.* 4. 17. *the time is come that judgment muſt begin at the houſe of God.* Here, ſay they, κρῖμα *judgment* is that that befals the houſe of God, the godly; therefore but temporal judgments.

To which I anſwer in a word, that here is a miſtake in applying judgment in its latitude to the houſe of God, when only it is affirmed by Saint *Peter* of the τὸ ἄρξασθαι κρῖμα, or τὸ πρῶτον, the beginning or firſt part of judgment: for of the κρῖμα or judgment in this verſe, there are ſpecified two parts, τὸ πρῶτον, the firſt part, and τὸ τέλος the end (or as the word τέλος ſeems to ſound in our Engliſh, the tail) of it, as *Pſal.* 75. 8. the cup of Gods diſpleaſure, or punitive juſtice, is ſuppoſed to conſiſt of two parts, 1. red wine (or ἄκρατον) and 2. mixture of Myrrhe and other poyſonous bitter ſpices, called σύμος, *Apocal.* 4. 10. and χολὴ, *Matth.* 27. 17. and both together, οἶνος ἐσμυρνισμένος *myrrhate* wine, *Mark* 15. 25. Now this cup is poured out, and taſted of indefinitely, by the godly ſome part of it; but the dregs thereof, *i. e.* the myrrhe-bitter part, that goes to the bottom, is left for the wicked to wring out and drink: ſo that only the tolerable, ſupportable, eaſie part of the judgment belongs unto the godly, but the end, the dregs, the unſupportable part to thoſe that obey not the Goſpel of God. Or yet a little further, the beginning or firſt part, τὸ πρῶτον of the judgment, is ἀφ' ἡμῶν from the godly, (and ſo it was ἄρξασθαι ἀπὸ τοῦ οἴκου θεοῦ) intimating that the judgment doth not ſtay upon them, but only take riſe from them, but the τὸ τέλος, the ſecond ſadder part of it, is τῶν ἀπειθούντων of them (or belongs to them) that obey not, &c. So that ſtill in this place alſo κρῖμα ſignifies Gods judgment of this life and another both; not of this life only, to the excluding of the other, but one part in this life, another in that other; and though the godly had their part in it, yet there was ſomewhat in the κρῖμα that the godly never taſted of, but only the ἀπειθοῦντες, they that diſobeyed the Goſpel of God, and this is apparent by *ver.* 18. For if the righteous μόλις σώζεται, we read it, *ſcarcely be ſaved*, it ſignifies (by comparing that place with *Pro.* 11. 31. where inſtead of recompenced on the earth, the Greek Tranſlation reads μόλις σώζεται) be rendred unto, or recompenced, *i. e.* puniſhed in the earth, then *where ſhall the ungodly and ſinners appear?* There are again the two parts of κρῖμα, one ἀνταπόδοσις θεοῦ, Gods retribution to ſin here, wherein the godly have their part, and the other his rendring to the wicked hereafter, and ſo neither of them the puniſhment of the Magiſtrate in this life, as Mr. *Bridg.* out of *Piſcator*, contends to have it, *Rom.* 13. and as it muſt be here alſo, if others ſpeak pertinently, who uſe it to avoid that interpretation, which I confeſs Mr. *Bridg.* doth not.

They that are unlearned and unſtable wreſt the Scriptures to their own deſtruction. Ye therefore beloved ſeeing ye know theſe things before, beware leſt you alſo be led away with the errour of the wicked, and fall from your own ſtedfaſtneſs, 2 Pet. 3. 16, 17.

Of the Zealots among the Jews, and the Liberty taken by them.

* *Eum qui Dominum execratus eſt per nomen alicujus ĭdoli, eum* קנאים *zelotæ, qui occurrerint, interficiunt. Maim. de Idol. c. 2. vid. Joſeph. Albo. & Philo. de Monarchiâ.* Καλὸν ἅπασι τοῖς ζῆλον ἔχουσιν ἀρετῆς ἐν χερσὶν ἀναπράττειν τὰς τιμωρίας, μήτ' εἰς δικαστήριον, μήτ' εἰς βουλευτήριον, μήτε συνόλως ἐπ' ἀρχὴν ἄγοντας, ἀλλὰ τῷ παραχρῆμα μισοπονηρῷ πάθει καὶ φιλοθέῳ καταχρῆσθαι πρὸς τὰς τῶν ἀσεβῶν ἀπαραιτήτους κολάσεις, νομίζοντας αὐτὸς ὑπὲρ τοῦ κοινοῦ τὰ πάντα γεγενῆσθαι βουλευτὰς, δικαστὰς, στρατηγὸς, ἐκκλησιαστὰς, καπήλους, μάρτυρας, νόμους δῆμον, &c.

There was among the * Jews either truly or pretendedly a *judicium Zelotarum*, a peculiar liberty or power of Zealots (*i. e.* of private men led by zeal) to puniſh or execute malefactors, whether with death, or any lower puniſhment. Theſe they ſtile Pious-men inflamed with the zeal of God: and theſe were wont when they found any man in the fact, guilty of ſedition, blaſphemy, or any other crime of the greater ſize, openly and publickly committed, preſently to ſet upon him, to ſmite, and if need were, to kill him, without any proceſs of Law againſt him.

The original of theſe came from the fact of *Phineez*, *Numb.* 25. 7. of whom *Mattathias* in his dying oration to his Sons, hath theſe words, * Φινεὲς ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ἐν τῷ ζηλῶσαι ζῆλον ἔλαβε διαθήκην ἱερωσύνης αἰωνίου, *Phineez our Father* (by zealing the zeal of God, ſaith the vulgar Latine) *by behaving himſelf zealouſly, received the promiſe of an eternal Prieſthood*, 1 *Mac.* 2. 54. Which is alſo affirmed of *Elias*, *verſe* 58. Ἠλίας ἐν τῷ ζηλῶσαι ζῆλον νόμου ἀνελήφθη εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν, *Elias* by zealing the zeal of the Law, or behaving himſelf *zealouſly for the Law, was received up to heaven*, (which belongs to that fact of *Elias* immediately before his aſſumption, when he call'd twice for fire from Heaven on *Ahaziah*'s Meſſengers, 2 *Kings* 1. 10, 12. unleſs you will rather apply it to that fact of his, 1 *Kings* 18. 40. againſt the Prophets of *Baal*, whom he apprehended and ſlew together every man of them) by which examples he there ſtirs up and incites his Sons ζηλῶσαι τῷ νόμῳ, to be *zealous for the Law*, verſe 50. though not to commit any ſuch particular act of that nature, as that, which thoſe had done, or as himſelf before, *verſe* 24. where 'tis ſaid of him, οὕτως ἐζήλωσε, καὶ ἐτρόμησαν οἱ νέφροι αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀνετύναγκε θυμὸν κατὰ τὸ κρῖμα, καὶ ῥομφαῖαν ἔσφαξεν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸν ὦμον. Where you have a *zelotick killing* one *at the Altar*, and the *trembling of his reins*, an evidence of his *fury*.

Teſtimonies of Jewiſh Writers to this purpoſe, Maſter *Selden* hath put together in his book *De jure Natur. & Gent. ad Heb. plac. lib.* 4. *cap.* 4. and given ſome hints of explaining ſome difficulties in the New Teſtament from thence. To this belongs that fact of Chriſt, *John* 2. 15. as appears by the Diſciples; of whom it is ſaid, *verſe* 17. that upon that occaſion they remembred how it was written

written by the Pſalmiſt, *Pſalm* 67. 9. *the zeal of thy houſe*, or for thy houſe, κατέφαγέ με, hath fed on me, or carried me with a kind of Fury.

That Chriſt did not take upon him to be a Magiſtrate or a Judge, or a publick perſon here on earth, is ſufficiently acknowledged; as alſo, that as a private man he neither did, nor attempted any thing contrary to the Laws or Cuſtoms of the *Jews* or *Romans*: Or if he had, that the *Jews* who had a competent meaſure of animoſity againſt him, would not probably have ſuffered him to have done it Scot-free. From all which it will follow undoubtedly, that this was done by Chriſt *jure Zelotarum*, by the power that belonged to the Zealots, for whom only the Law allowed this liberty. The ſame is to be ſaid of that attempt of the *Jews*, *John* 10. 31. ἐβάσταζαν πάλιν λίθους οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἵνα λιθάσωσιν αὐτόν, *The Jews therefore carried ſtones again that they might ſtone him*; no legal proceſs having preceded.

The ſame Maſter *Selden* notes of the ſervant of the high Prieſt that ſtruck Chriſt, *John* 18. 12, whoſe anſwer is a ſeeming argument of it, *verſe* 23. *If I have ſpoken well, why ſmiteſt thou me?* intimating, that if he had ſaid any thing amiſs or irreverently of the high Prieſt, he ſhould not have queſtioned his ſtriking him: And yet the truth is, the phraſe μαρτύρησον περὶ τοῦ κακοῦ, bear witneſs of the evil, ſeems an advertiſement, that if Chriſt had offended, it would have better become the ſervant to have accuſed and witneſſed againſt him, proceeded legally, than thus *jure Zelotarum* to have ſtricken him. On the ſame ground was the fact of *Ananias*, *Acts* 23. 3. though ſitting in the *Sanhedrin* when he appointed *Paul* to be ſmitten, though without any juſt crime alſo. The like proceedings the Scribes were, it ſeems, afraid of, *Luke* 20. 6. *the people will ſtone us*: which muſt have been an act of popular zeal without publick judgment. That Saint *Stephen*, *Acts* 7. 57. was ſtoned after this manner, is obſerved by *Hugo Grotius*, and certainly upon good reaſons: for although he were accuſed of Blaſphemy, *cap.* 6. and falſe witneſſes brought to that purpoſe, yet after that, there was nothing legally paſt againſt him through all the ſeventh Chapter, beſides his Apology for himſelf to the high Prieſt. In the concluſion of which (no ſentence paſſing againſt him) it follows that the people διεπρίοντο ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν καὶ ἔβρυχον τοὺς ὀδόντας ἐπ' αὐτόν, *verſe* 54. which *Heſychius* will help us to render thus, they were very angry, they were madded with fury or zeal againſt him, and gnaſhed their teeth (it ſeems that flame of zeal produced the ſame effect in them that the flames of Hell are ſaid to do, *Matth.* 8. 12.) againſt him, and crying with a loud voice, they ſtopt their ears, and ran with one accord upon him (all which were evidences of a moſt violent zeal) and caſt him out of the City and ſtoned him, which out of doubt was not now lawful for the *Jews* (all power of capital puniſhment being before this taken from them, *John* 8. 31.) nor before legal condemnation ever lawful by the common way of proceeding; no nor after condemnation, to be done thus tumultuouſly by the people; ſave only that by the liberty of Zealots it was permitted. As in the ſtory of *Suſannah*, *Verſe* 60, and 61. the *peoples crying with a loud voice*, and their ἀνίσησαν ἐπὶ τοὺς δύο πρεσβυτέρους, riſing up againſt the two Elders, is by the learned man interpreted to have been in a *ſeditious manner*, *per modum ſeditionis*, and ſo *ex ſpiritu zelotypiæ*, *from the ſpirit of zeal*, as *Stephen* and *James* the Biſhops of *Jeruſalem* were afterwards uſed by them. So *Acts* 14. 19. it befel Saint *Paul* (God in his providence permitting him to be thus dealt with, by way of retaliation for his having a hand in ſtoning Saint *Stephen*, when *Barnabas* met not with the like adventure) certain *Jews* that came from *Antioch*, and *Iconium* having ſtoned *Paul*, &c. by this judgment only of zeal, which we now ſpeak of.

Hitherto perhaps we may refer that of the *Jews*, who brought the Woman taken in Adultery to Chriſt, that ſhe might be ſtoned; not deſiring, as it appears, that Chriſt ſhould give Sentence of death on her by ordinary legal judicature, (for neither was Chriſt a Judge, nor had the *Jews* now power of capital puniſhment) but by the liberty of Zealots, which was thought principally to belong to that caſe of one taken ἐπ' αὐτοφώρῳ in the very fact, as appears by the example of *Phineez*. So *Acts* 23. that Κραυγὴ μεγάλη great cry (ſuch as was obſerved in the ſtory of Saint *Stephen*) was the beginning of the flaming zeal, and *verſe* 10. it follows, that the chief Captain or Tribune ſent Souldiers to reſcue and defend *Paul*, that he might not be taken by that party of Zealots, who *verſe* 12. had bound themſelves under a curſe, that they would neither eat nor drink until they had ſlain *Paul*; who ſure could not have done ſo *impunè*, had it not been thus indulged to them, as Zealots. So when *James* and *John* demand of Chriſt, whether they ſhould command fire from Heaven to deſcend on a Village of the Samaritans, *Luke* 9. 54. this they did by the liberty of Zealots, for the legality of their action taking their pattern from the example of *Elias*, and preſuming of the power to do it becauſe *Elias* had. (In reference to both which we read of πνεῦμα καὶ δύναμις Ἠλίου, *Luke* 1. 17. the *ſpirit and power of Elias*; that ſpirit by which he was incited to that act of zeal, and that power by which he could call for fire from Heaven; whereupon it is *Procopius* his expreſſion of *Elias* that he was θείῳ πυρπολούμενος ζήλῳ, accended with divine zeal, or ſet on fire by it) Now when Chriſt reprehendeth thoſe Diſciples, telling them they knew not, *i. e.* conſidered not, what ſpirit they were of, he advertiſeth them that this practice of Zealots is not agreeable to the ſpirit of the Goſpel, nor generally to the temper which he came to plant among Chriſtians.

And having now among the Apoſtles of Chriſt themſelves found ſome foot-ſteps of the Jewiſh zeal, 'twill not be amiſs to interpoſe a conjecture, that from the ſame original ſprung that bloody fact of *Peter* cutting off *Malchus* his ear, *Matth.* 26. 51. For that this was not lawful for him to do, or juſtifiable by the ordinary rule, may be gueſt by Chriſts anſwer of reproof and vouching the Law, [All they that take the ſword ſhall periſh by the ſword] and yet that it was not a fact very enormous among the Jews, or being compared with their avow'd practices (though clearly forbidden by the Goſpel) *Origen* and *Theophylact* ſeem to intimate. *Origen* on *Matth.* 26. *Unus eorum qui erant cum Jeſu nondum manifeſtè concipiens apud ſe Evangelicam patientiam illam traditam ſibi à Chriſto, nec pacem quam dedit Diſcipulis ſuis, ſed ſecundum poteſtatem datam Judæis per legem de inimicis, extendens manum accepit gladium*, &c. One of them that were with Jeſus having not yet any full clear conception of the Evangelical patience delivered them by Chriſt, nor of that peace which

he

he gave to his Diſciples; but according to the power given the Jews by the Law of enemies, took out his ſword, &c. *Theophylact* yet more clearly in *Matth.* 26. μὴ ἐγκαλῶμεν τῷ Πέτρῳ, ὃ γὰρ ὑπὲρ ἑαυτῦ ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ διδασκάλου ζηλώσας τοῦτο ἐποίησεν, ὁ δὲ κύριος μεταρυθμίζων αὐτὸν εἰς εὐαγγελικὴν πολιτείαν διδάσκει μὴ χρῆσθαι μαχαίρᾳ κἂν ὑπὲρ θεοῦ δόκῃ τις ἐκδικεῖν Let us not find fault with *Peter*; for what he did, he did out of zeal, not for himſelf, but for his Maſter: but the Lord reducing him to the Goſpel-diſcipline, teaches him not to uſe the ſword, though thereby a man ſhould ſeem to defend or vindicate God himſelf. And in another place in *Luke*, Ζηλῶσαι μαθηταὶ καὶ μαχαίρας ἀνασύροντας, the Diſciples are mov'd with zeal and draw ſwords. And in a third place in *Mark*, Ἀποσιωπᾷ τὸ ὄνομα ὁ Μάρκος, ἵνα μὴ δόξῃ ἐπαινῶν τὸν διδάσκαλον αὐτῦ Πέτρον, ὡς ζηλώσαντα ὑπὲρ χριστῦ, intimating, that *Peter* himſelf counted this fact of his a piece of zeal, for which he might be commended.

Thus much was not amiſs to produce in behalf of this conjecture, that what *Peter* did in defence of Chriſt, he did as a Zealot; and yet to ſee Chriſt is ſo far from approving it, that it incurs the ſame reprehenſion, which *James* and *John* before had met with; nay ſomewhat a ſeverer, that all might diſcern, how diſtant the ſpirit of Zealots was, from that other of Diſciples, the Judaical fervour from the meekneſs of the Goſpel: Though the Apoſtles themſelves had not yet perfectly learnt this truth at Chriſts death, nor until the Holy Ghoſt came to teach them all things, and to bring to their remembrance whatſoever he had in perſon being preſent ſaid unto them.

A plain mention of theſe Zealots we find, *Acts* 21.20. where of ſome of the Jews 'tis ſaid, they are all ζηλωταὶ τῦ νόμυ Zealots of the Law, that were like to be very hot, if they ſaw any thing done to the prejudice of the Law; of whom therefore Saint *Paul* is adviſed to beware. So of *Paul* himſelf before his converſion, *Acts* 22. 3. 'tis ſaid he was ζηλωτὴς Θεῦ, a Zealot of Gods, or in God's cauſe, and preſently it follows ἐδίωξα ἄχρι θανάτυ, *I perſecuted to death*, &c. for ſo the Zealots were wont to do. So *Acts* 17. 5. ζηλώσαντες Ἰυδαῖοι, the Zealots of the Jews, or the Jews inflamed with zeal (as the old Tranſlation reads it *Zelantes*, better than the new, *invidiâ commoti*) of whom 'tis added ὀχλοποιήσαντες ἐθορύβυν τὴν πόλιν, took unto themſelves certain lewd fellows of the baſer ſort, and made a tumult, and ſet all the People in an uproar. Of which kind Maſter *Selden* has obſerved, that *Simon* was one, *Luke* 6.15. *Acts* 1.13. called by Saint *Luke* Σίμων ζηλωτὴς, *Simon* the Zealot; but by the other Evangeliſts Saint *Matthew* and Saint *Mark*, Καναίτης, or (as *Schindler* and other learned men are bold to mend it) Καννίτης, which we render the Cananite; but 'tis apparent the word is to be fetcht from the Hebrew קנא *Canna*, which ſignifies Zealot, (in like manner as the *Maccabees* are called, the word מקבי in *Syriack* ſignifying ζηλωτὴς, ſaith *Ferrarius*) and not from the name of the place: and ſo is all one with the Greek Ζηλωτὴς, as perfectly the ſame as Πέτρος and *Cephas*, Δόρκας and *Tabitha*, and many the like. And thus far by Scripture light we have paſt in this diſquiſition.

Now what tumults and riots have been wrought by the rude multitude among the Jews (or thoſe at leaſt who had no lawful power in their hand) under the pretence of the priviledge of Zealots, no man can be ignorant, who is not wholly unacquainted with *Joſephus*'s ſtory. For in his relation there is nothing more ordinary, than to find all things diſturbed by them, the Temple or holy place defiled μεμιασμένοις ποσὶ, by their prophane feet to the reproach of God: chief Prieſts removed and others placed in their room without all reſpect of blood, elected by them either according as they pleaſed, or elſe by lot, (as it was in the election of one *Phannias* the ſon of *Samuel* to the high Prieſt-hood) a man (ſaith *Joſephus*) who ὁ μόνον ἀνάξιος ἀρχιερεύς, ἀλλ' οὐδ' ἐπισάμενος σαφῶς τί ποτ' ἦν ἀρχιερωσύνη διὰ ἀγροικίαν, was not only unworthy to be high Prieſt, but that did not ſo much as know what the high Prieſt-hood was, ſuch was his ruſticity.

Αλω.βιβ.δ. κ. ια.

Κ. ιβ.

Many paſſages we find ſcattered in this Author, in his books of the Captivity, and large ſtories of the ſeditions and uprores and Maſſacres by two ſorts of men among the *Jews*; the one called Σικάριοι, Swordmen or Cutters, (of whom Saint *Luke* makes mention, *Acts* 21.38. we render them *Murtherers*: and it ſeems four thouſand of them got together in a company) the ſecond Ζηλωταὶ, Zealots; of whom he makes relations, eſpecially *lib.* 4. *c.* 11. where he ſaith of them, that they killed many of the chief men of the Nation, and ſtill when they did ſo, boaſted and bragg'd of themſelves ὡς ἐυεργέτας καὶ σωτῆρας τῆς πόλεως γεγενημένους, that they were become the benefactours and preſervers or ſaviours of the City. And by the timidity and baſeneſs of the People concurring with their inſolence, advanced ſo far ὡς ἐπ' αὐτοῖς εἶναι καὶ τὰς χειροτονίας τῶν ἀρχιερέων, that they took to themſelves the election and conſtitution of the high Prieſts. ἄκυρα γῦν τὰ γένη ποιήσαντες ἐξ ὧν κατὰ διαδοχὰς οἱ Ἀρχιερεῖς ἀπεδείκνυντο, καθέσησαν ἀσήμους καὶ ἀγενεῖς, ἵν' ἔχοιεν συνεργοὺς τῶν ἀσεβημάτων and contemning the rules of birth by which the high Prieſts were to ſucceed, they conſtituted ignoble obſcure men in thoſe places, that by that means they might have ſome abetters and partners of their villanies: and *c.* 12. he ſaith the name of Zealots was of their own impoſing, ὡς ἐπ' ἀγαθοῖς ἐπιτηδεύμασιν, ἀλλ' οὐ ζηλώσαντες τὰ κάκιστα τῶν ἔργων καὶ ὑπερβαλλόμενοι, as if all that they did (Murthers, Sacriledges, Prophanations, before mentioned) were by them done in good intentions, and not, as indeed they were, in emulation, and even to the out-ſtripping and exceeding the worſt actions that had been recorded. Thus far *Joſephus*.

That theſe Zealots were a fourth Sect of the *Jews*, (added to Sadduces, Phariſees, Eſſens,) having its original from *Judas Gaulonita* and *Sadduchus*, is the affirmation of *Bonaventura Cornelius Bertramus*, in the end of his book *De polit Jud.* A Sect, ſaith he, *Judæis ipſis omnibus perniciosiſſima, ut quæ Judæorum omnium excidium totiuſque reip. Judaicæ proſtrationem non modo accelerârit, ſed & eam tam miſeram & calamitoſam effecerit*: A Sect moſt ſadly pernicious to the *Jews* themſelves; the deſtruction of all whom, and the proſtration of their whole Common-wealth, it did not only haſten and precipitate, but made it ſo miſerable and calamitous when it came. And to the ſame purpoſe, ſaith *Grotius Annot. in Acts* 7.57. *Iſtorum hominum quos* ζηλωταὶ *Joſephus vocat, creſcens indies audacia, tandem & iram excitavit Romanorum, & Urbi temploque exitium attulit. The boldneſs of thoſe Zealots daily increaſing, at length ſtirr'd up the anger of the Romans, and brought deſtruction both on the City and the Temple.*

Having

Having proceeded thus far by way of narration, it may chance to be worth the pains to present unto the Reader a conjecture upon the twelfth verse of the fourth Chapter of the first Epistle of Saint *Peter*, Μὴ ξενίζεσθε τῇ ἐν ὑμῖν πυρώσει, The vulgar Latine renders it by words utterly unintelligible: *nolite peregrinari in fervore: Beza, ne tanquam peregrini exploratione illâ per ignem percellimini:* as if ξενίζεσθαι signified a strangers being stricken or amazed: and πύρωσις, trial by fire: which whatsoever it may in some other place, it cannot do here; because here is added πρὸς πειρασμὸν γινομένῃ which is befallen for your trial, which word would be superfluous, if πύρωσις noted trial by fire. The more simple and clear rendring will be to set the words so, that πύρωσις may signifie a combustion, or fire, or burning (so both the Vulgar and *Beza*, *Revel.* 8. 9. render καπνὸν πυρώσεως *fumum incendii*, and the smoak of her burning) and ξενίζεσθαι may denote these three things, 1. To wonder: (So the Greek Scholiast, ξενίζεσθαι, θαυμάζειν) 2. To be affrighted: (So *Tertullian*, *ne expaveſcite*) 3. So as it may be all one with ξενοπαθεῖν, to be stricken as with an accident wherewithal we are unacquainted. These three sences each, as all of them, may be allowed their places here. Now the conjecture is, that by the πύρωσις, the combustion or burning, *&c.* should be meant, that notable combustion of the Zealots before mentioned, (for indeed the words are of some affinity, the one coming from πῦρ, fire, the other from ζέω, growing fervently hot or burning.) The grounds of the conjecture are these, 1. Because that last fatal day, the destruction of Jerusalem, is spoken of in that very Chapter, *verse* 7. as that which for some time had been at hand: for I conceive I can make it plain by comparing of places of the new Testament, that τέλος πάντων the end of all things is (not the final period of the world, but) that destruction of *Jerusalem* or the Jewish Common-wealth, and of that it is said, ἤγγικε, it is, or hath for some time been at hand, it was not yet come: but of this πύρωσις or combustion, that it was then, γινομένη, already come; which is directly agreeable to the observation of *Josephus*, and others conversant in the Jewish, who affirm that that raving and rioting of (and sad civil combustion wrought by) the Zealots, was *antecedent and precursory* to the final destruction of the Jews by *Titus*. 2. 'Tis affirmed of this πύρωσις that it was γινομένη ἐν ὑμῖν, *i. e.* among you, in your Land, in the midst of you, (as that phrase frequently signifies in the new Testament) by which is marked out some remarkable thing, which was fallen out among the Jews, at that time when *Peter* wrote, to which time that the raving of the Zealots endured, is apparent by mention of them, *Acts* 21. 20. *Acts* 22. 3. and that by their stirs these Christian Jews of the διασπορᾶ, or the dispersion to whom he writes, had been first scattered abroad, may be conjectured by *Acts* 8. 1. This may suffice for a conjecture, which whether it stand or fall, will not be much concernment to the business which occasioned this παρεργον.

To conclude this historical uneven discourse, I shall only annex these few animadversions by way of corollary.

1. That this law, or power, or custom, or liberty of Zealots, was never of force but among the Jews.

2. That the original and ground of it among them is to be fetcht from hence; that among that People, God immediately prefided, and reserved many things to be manag'd, and ruled by his peculiar and extraordinary incitation and impulsion, not by any rule of standing publick law; that so the Common-wealth might be truly capable of that title which *Josephus* bestowed on it, none of the kinds of humane Governments, but θεοκρατεία the government of God.

3. That it follows not from hence, that all things which were by the Jews themselves done under pretence of this right, and passed unpunished, were therefore well done; but only those which were undertaken by men truly incited by God, (such as *Phineez* and *Elias*) for that priviledge is not therefore stil'd *zeli privati*, of private zeal, because private men by their own incitation (ἰδίᾳ ἐπιλύσει, as that is opposed to Gods) did what they did; but because they did it without legal process, or publick judicature. And though I should be so sceptical, as not to dare peremptorily to affirm, that nothing was well done or justifiable in that kind, but what they did who were truly and immediately incited to it by God: yet should I not be so cowardly as to doubt, but that all those Jews were so bound to observe those examples of *Phineez* and *Elias*, that if they were not immediately incited by God, yet they should not dare to exceed the limits of those patterns commended by God, either in respect of the manner of doing, or matter of the action. In one of which you shall find all the examples mentioned in the New Testament, except that of Christ, to have miscarried. And therefore I hope no man will be so unjust to the charitable design of this Paper, so treacherous to his Readers, so unkind to his own Soul; as to borrow from these premisses new hints of arguments to sustain a desperate cause by his pretence of zeal: for that would be to extract Roseacre out of Treacle, poison from that which was designed for antidote. And he must withal resolve, that if the practice of Christ first mentioned, be his precedent, he must also prescribe to Christ's power; or if any of the other New Testament examples, he must be content to fall under their condemnation, for not one of them I ever yet heard of, was excused by any.

4. That this Sect of Zealots when they thus got together into a body was by the Jews themselves (among whom the priviledge of Zealots was yet in force) taken for the most unlawful, yea pernicious and fatal, most eminently destructive to the Commonwealth (as appears by *Josephus* and *Bertram*) and that those things which they did under pretence of law and colour of Zeal, were violations of Law and meer Sacrilege.

5. That all use of this liberty, all imitation of that Jewish priviledge of Zealots in the Old Testament, is clearly interdicted all Christians; First, because the written word is the only Oracle wherein God constantly reveals himself to Christians now under the New Testament, neither are any other incitations to be expected from God, but what in the Gospel or New Testament the διακονία πνεύματος, the administration of the Spirit (as preaching the Gospel is call'd) both yield or afford us; what is more than this, yea though it come to us from the Pulpit, savours of enthusiasms and seducing spirits; Secondly, because Christ hath both by his doctrine and example commended to his Disciples all manner of meekness (and Saint *Peter* the meek and quiet spirit, as most precious in God's sight under the Gospel, and this a grace most directly contrary to that spirit of Zealots)

yea

yea and hath forbidden all private revenge of injuries (done not only to our ſelves, but God) referring all to the Magiſtrate (whom Saint *Paul* calls Θεῦ διάκονον ἔκδικον εἰς ὀργήν, *Rom.* 13. 4. the *Miniſter of God to execute wrath*; or an executioner for wrath) and therefore himſelf medled not with the Woman taken in Adultery; Thirdly, becauſe he interdicted *James* and *John* the uſe of this power, adding a reprehenſion, and words emphatical to this purpoſe, he turned and rebuked them, ſaying, *you know not what ſpirit you are of*; intimating, the Chriſtian ſpirit to be very diſtant from that of the Zealots among the Jews.

I ſhall add no more, but my prayer, that as many as have zeal, may have it according to knowledge, and that knowledge according to the directions of the Goſpel.

Of taking up the Croſs.

MAny places of the New Teſtament there are that require this duty of a Chriſtian, (of which I think I may truly ſay, that 'tis a duty never ſo much as in kind required before by God in the Old Teſtament, nor by the Laws of Nature, or Canons of any other Religion, and ſo a peculiar Chriſtian duty) the chief places are theſe, *Matth.* 16. 24. *If any man will come after me, let him deny himſelf and take up his Croſs*, &c. and in the ſame words in the parallel places *Mark* 8. 34. and *Luke* 9. 23. So again, to him who deſired to be put in a courſe by Chriſt to inherit eternal life, *Mark* 10. 12. in the cloſe, Come, *take up the Croſs, and follow me.* In all theſe places 'tis a duty of plain command; yet ſomewhat farther, *Matth.* 10. 38. *He that taketh not his Croſs and followeth not after me, is not worthy of me*; and in *Luke* 14. 27. the words are moſt punctual, and of unlimited extent, from whence 'twill be hard for any man to obtain any diſpenſation, or excuſe, ὅστις οὐ βαστάζει-----*whoſoever doth not bear his Croſs* and come after me, *cannot be my Diſciple.* No man will be exempted from the ὅστις οὐ-----and no Chriſtian it ſeems can be without it; for that is the meaning of [my Diſciple] not only thoſe peculiar twelve of his, and their Succeſſours in the Miniſtery, for that Relation belongs to them conſidered under another notion as Apoſtles ſent out after by Chriſt, anſwerable to the שליחים among the Jews under the Temple, but the Diſciples are all true followers of Chriſt, all ſincere Chriſtians, and ſo the Doctrine is moſt plain, that whoſoever doth not bear (which as from thoſe other former places appears, implies a taking up) the Croſs of Chriſt, cannot be a true Chriſtian.

Now the ἀράτω σαυρὸν, taking up the Croſs will be eaſily explain'd what its full importance extends to, the voluntary embracing of ſhame, contumely, (for the Croſs was a contumelious death, *Heb.* 12. 2.) and conſequently all other loſs of goods, liberty, &c. and beyond that, pain of body and death it ſelf: which are ſaid, to be taken up, not when we bring them unneceſſarily upon our own ſhoulders, (for that is to pull the Croſs upon us) but when by the providence of God they are laid, or permitted to lye in our way to Chriſt, or Chriſtian obedience, ſo that we cannot ſerve Chriſt perfectly, but it muſt become detriment or damage to us, then voluntarily to undergo that detriment, what ever it is, is to take up the Croſs; and patiently and chearfully to bear it, is βαστάζειν, to carry or bear the Croſs of Chriſt, which is the duty, without which a man cannot be a Chriſtian.

There is now one thing to be a little more punctually conſidered, the ſtrict and near dependance and connexion betwixt Chriſtianity and the Croſs, and that from the pleaſure and providence of God, and diſpenſation of things under the Goſpel, ſo ordering it generally that we ſhould not ſerve the Lord our God of *that that coſt us nothing*, but that true Chriſtian piety ſhould bring endurances and ſufferings upon us. This very thing may ſeem to be it (and to that the context inclines it) which *Wiſd.* 2. 22. is called *the myſtery of Godlineſs*, viz. Gods Counſel of bringing pious men, or Chriſtians by ſufferings to glory (quite contrary to the opinion of the *Atheiſtical* world, *verſe* 20, 21.) and you will the rather acknowledge this, if you compare with it, *Col.* 1. where ἀνταναπλήρωσις, *the filling up (by way of correſpondence and antitype) in our fleſh the remainders or reliques of Chriſt's ſufferings*, verſe 24. ſeems to be called the *Myſtery which had been hid*, &c. 26. Thus it is plain in Chriſt our elder Brother; the diſcharge of the office he had undertaken, brought him to the Croſs, and that Croſs was the only way to his conſecration to the Office of high Prieſt, to which at his reſurrection he was inaugurate; *vid. Heb.* 2. 10. it became him, &c. *i. e.* God, πολλοὺς υἱοὺς εἰς δόξαν ἀγαγόντα (not in bringing, but) *bringing*, (or being about that moſt gracious and mighty deſign of bringing) *many ſons unto glory*, τὸν ἀρχηγὸν τῆς σωτηρίας αὐτῶν διὰ παθημάτων τελειῶσαι *by ſufferings to conſecrate* or inaugurate, (for ſo τελειῦν critically ſignifies, being the word ſolemnly uſed by the Septuagint to ſignifie the legal conſecration of the Prieſts under the Law) *the Captain of our ſalvation*, that is Chriſt, who τελειωθεὶς, being ſo conſecrated, became the Authour of eternal ſalvation, &c. *Heb.* 5. 6. From hence, without more places it would follow, that we Chriſtians are to expect our τελείωσις (whether conſecration to our βασίλειον ἱεράτευμα our dignity of being Kings and Prieſts, *i. e.* Chriſtians here; or conſummation and crowning hereafter, as τελείωσις alſo ſignifies (τελείωσις ἀγάπης, *Nyſſ.*) by the ſame method and means that our Captain had his, which is διὰ παθημάτων by ſufferings: which courſe of divine Oeconomy is ſo general and without exception, (2 *Tim.* 3. 12. *yea, and all that will be godly in this world*, διωχθήσονται, ſhall be perſecuted) that *Heb.* 12. 6, 7, 8. the words are very

very remarkable, Whom God loveth, he chaſteneth, and ſcourgeth *every* Son whom he receiveth: if you endure chaſtening, God dealeth with you as with Sons, for *what ſon* is he whom the father chaſteneth not? but if you be without chaſtiſement whereof *all* are partakers, then are you baſtards, and not ſons. Words of a large unlimited latitude, which I cannot diſcern any way in the world to ſoften, ſo as they may be ſupportable to him, that (as the Pſalmiſt ſaith) hath no changes, hath enjoyed an age of an uninterrupted continued proſperity, without ever having the Croſs on his ſhoulders. I confeſs I would fain find out ſome μαλακτικὸν or mollifying diſtinction, as that of the *animus martyrii*, the preparation to ſuffer, though God never ſend occaſion, that that might ſuffice for his qualification, who hath no other; but ſure that will not be able to allay or take off the force of [and chaſteneth *every* ſon, &c.] and if ye *be* without, not only if you be not prepared to bear, but if you be without chaſtiſement, then are you Baſtards, &c. which when it is ſet down as an aphoriſm of divine obſervation under the Kingdom of Chriſt, an Axiom of Gods Goſpel-providence, there will be no ſafety in diſputing or labouring to avoid the literal importance of it. To that purpoſe I conceive thoſe words tend, *Rom.* 8. 28. where to prove the concluſion premiſed, verſe 28. that all things tend to the good of them that love God, (and what thoſe *all things* are, is ſpecified, verſe 35. tribulation, diſtreſs, perſecution, famine, nakedneſs, danger, ſword,) the Apoſtle thus argues: *For whom he hath fore-known, i. e.* fore-appointed, the lovers of God premiſed, thoſe he hath *alſo predeſtin'd to be conformable to the image of his Son, i. e.* in ſuffering; and whom he hath *predeſtined, thoſe he hath alſo called*; to wit, to that conformity to which he hath predeſtined them, (as 1 *Pet.* 2. 21. the phraſe is uſed, εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ἐκλήθητε, *for to this ye were called, i. e.* to this ſuffering as Chriſt did, and v. 3. 9. ye are thereunto *called*, that you ſhould inherit εὐλογίαν, bleſſing (not as we render it a bleſſing) *i. e.* that ye ſhould bleſs enemies as Chriſt did, and ſo inherit that exemplary grace of his, which as a grace may as properly be ſaid to be inherited; thus the context ſeems to inforce it [not rendring evil for evil, but bleſſing, knowing that you are thereunto called, that you ſhould inherit bleſſing, &c. *i. e.* poſſeſs that grace after him, ſo eminently diſcernible in him] and whom he hath thus *called*, he *juſtified* and *glorified*. Where the firſt and ſecond propoſition muſt be acknowledged univerſal, that all whom he hath foreknown, all lovers of God, are thus predeſtined, and all that are predeſtined, called (by their very title or profeſſion of Chriſtians) to this conformity with Chriſt in ſufferings. Add to theſe 1 *Pet.* 4. 18. *if the righteous hardly be ſaved*; which muſt be underſtood by the ſence of the Hebrew Phraſe, *Prov.* 11. 30. rendred by the LXXII. Εἰ δίκαιος μόλις σώζεται, and here retained by St. *Peter*, and then the ſence will be [and if the righteous be recompenced, *i. e.* by an *Hebraiſm*, puniſht in the earth, &c. or more literally to the Greek, If he eſcape hardly or with difficulty.] (as 1 *Cor.* 3. 15. ζημιωθήσεται, σωθήσεται δὲ, he ſhall be mulcted or ſuffer loſs, but ſhall eſcape) which Interpretation the former verſe in St. *Peter* confirms ὅτι ὁ καιρὸς τοῦ ἄρξασθαι τὸ κρῖμα ἀπὸ τοῦ οἴκου θεοῦ [for it is the ſeaſon of that act of divine diſpenſation, *viz.* of judgments beginning from the houſe of God, *i. e.* of Gods inflicting judgments of this life (which are the beginning or firſt part (τὸ πρῶτον as it follows) of Gods retribution for ſin) on the godly] which ſignifies that the ſtate of the Goſpel is that ſeaſon, though the Law was not: and to the ſame purpoſe, the Verſe following alſo, οἵ τε πάσχοντες κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ, &c. They that ſuffer according to the will of God. It ſeems by all put together, that the μόλις σώζεται [ſcarcely ſaved] is ſpoken of ſuffering, and the will or providence of God is that that diſpoſeth it ſo, and ſo the concluſion from thence is clear, and univerſal. The righteous ſhall be puniſh'd in the earth. 'Tis true indeed, under the Old Teſtament we find not any ſuch œconomy, but promiſes of a long and happy life, in a temporal *Canaan* to the obedient ſervants of God (though ſometimes God was pleaſed to interpoſe ſome variety in this kind, many troubles of the righteous in *Davids* time) but under the Goſpel 'tis quite contrary, even thoſe duties which are promiſed a reward on this earth, as mercifulneſs or alms-giving, are yet to expect the payment of this reward with ſome mixture (like *Homers* good cup poured out always with a daſh of the bad) the hundred-fold which ſuch men are promiſed to receive ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τούτῳ--------*in this time*, this firſt infeſtour harveſt of retributions, though they be ſecular bleſſings, houſes and lands, &c. yet muſt they be *with perſecutions*, *Mark* 10. 30. Which particular, though neither S. *Matthew*, nor S. *Luke* records, yet S. *Peter* (who had moſt reaſon punctually to obſerve thoſe words of Chriſt, being an anſwer directed to a queſtion of his propoſing, as all the three Evangeliſts acknowledge) remembred them, and ſo we find them in S. *Marks* Goſpel, which is reſolved to have been dictated by S. *Peter*. And therefore as 'tis *Origens Allegory*, that by the *Baptiſm of Fire* with which Chriſt ſhould baptize, are meant Perſecutions; So St. *Auguſtine* obſerves, that till after the coming of the Holy Ghoſt, (to which that *Baptiſm* is annext) no man was a Martyr for Chriſt; but after they came in ſholes; and therefore perhaps he is called the *Comforter*, as he that doth not *deliver* from the *Croſs*, but comforts under it.

Having thus far in the paſſage briefly pointed at this piece of Goſpel-Providence, 'twill not be amiſs as briefly to gueſs at the ends of this divine Oeconomy. 1. To adminiſter occaſion of the practice and exerciſe of many Chriſtian duties, and graces, as of patience, meekneſs, waiting on Chriſt, of loving our enemies, of the μὴ ἀντιστῆναι τῷ πονηρῷ, the non-reſiſting evil, we render it, or not uſing any violence againſt him that moleſts us, (rendring [τῷ πονηρῷ] of the Perſon, &c.) which if we have in ſeed or habit, 'tis certainly a great felicity to us, to meet with opportunities to actuate them, both in reſpect of the evidencing the ſincerity of them to God, to our brethren, to our own ſouls; and in reſpect of that reward, or Crown promiſed, the great degree of glory, *Matth.* 5. 12. that is proportioned to the τὸ ἔργον according to his work, *Pſal.* 62. 12. 2 *Cor.* 5. 10. ἵνα κομίσηται πρὸς ἃ ἔπραξε, according to the nature and number of the Acts, or operations of thoſe gifts or graces, as on the other ſide, a greater portion of the Torments of Hell is allotted to the more multiplied acts of wilful ſin. 2. To help to mortifie any remainders of ſin in us, which by continued proſperity are ready and apt to take root, and reflouriſh in us. 3. To aſſimilate, or make us like to Chriſt, to conform us to the Image of his Son, *Rev.* 8. 29. that is, the Image of the crucified Saviour, as was ſaid, *that he might be the firſt born of many brethren*, that is, might have a Church or Family, a multitude of brethren like himſelf, all ſufferers as he was. 4. That our ſins being puniſhed here, there might remain

no arrear to be paid in another world; having had all our Purgatory here, there might remain nothing but heaven hereafter; which the Apoſtle expreſſeth, 1 *Cor.* 11.32. *We are chaſtened of the Lord, that we ſhould not be condemned with the world*: to which Father *Abraham* refers, *Luke* 16.25. *Lazarus received his evil things* in this life time, and *now he is comforted.*

Theſe and ſuch like being the deſigns of this act of God's Goſpel-Providence; It is next obſervable what a character the Spirit of God ſets upon the Croſs, *i.e.* Tribulation or affliction here, that it is the happieſt, bleſſedeſt eſtate, the moſt comfortable joyful condition that a Chriſtian can meet with. This riddle and paradox, or prodigy to carnal reaſon, is become the moſt ordinary beaten acknowledged truth in the New Teſtament. 'Tis the cloſe of the beatitudes in that inſtitution of Chriſtians, the Sermon in the Mount, *Matth.* 5.10. *Bleſſed are they that are perſecuted*, and *v.* 11. reviled: and the exhortation in this caſe χαίρετε καὶ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε, *rejoyce, and be exceeding glad*, ſo *Luke* 6. 22. (which there is ſome reaſon to think was ſpoken by Chriſt at another time) *bleſſed are you when men ſhall hate you*, and ſeparate you, and reproach you, and caſt you out, *&c.* χαίρετε καὶ σκιρτήσατε, rejoyce ye in that day, and leap for joy, *&c.* Saint *Paul* had learnt this, *Col.* 1.24. who now rejoyce in my ſufferings, yea, and glory too. 2 *Cor.* 11. 30. 12. 5. 9. And the former of thoſe places will be worth reviewing, *Col.* 1.24. *I rejoyce in my ſufferings for you*, καὶ ἀνταναπληρῶ τὰ ὑστερήματα τῶν θλίψεων τοῦ χριστοῦ ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ μου ὑπὲρ τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ, &c. The word ὑστερήματα ſignifies ſometimes in the ſacred Dialect, *neceſſaries*, or neceſſities, ſometimes, which is, *congruous, profitable*, 2 *Cor.* 9.12. ὑστερήματα τῶν ἁγίων, the *neceſſities of the Saints*, *Ezra* 6.9. ὃ ἂν ὑστέρημα, *that which they have need of*. The word חשח there uſed ſignifies in *Chaldee* (in which that Chapter is written) *neceſſe habuit, indiguit*, but in *Syriack* (which is the *New Teſtament Dialect*) *aptum, commodum, congruens fuit, profuit*, ſaith *Schindler*, which being applied to the word in this place, the importance of the Verſe will run thus, I am a *Chriſtian*, ſo called becauſe a Member, and Servant of Chriſt. Chriſt ſuffered for his *Church*, yea, and ἔδει παθεῖν, *he ought ſo to ſuffer*, *Luke* 24.46. *i.e.* it was very *congruous* and profitable, and in reſpect of God's *decree* and the *Prophecies*, *neceſſary*, that he ſhould ſo ſuffer. Conſequently it is alſo very *congruous*, yea and decreed by God (and therefore in ſo doing *I fulfil God's Word*, v.25. So as 1 *Mac.* 2.55. πληρῶσαι λόγον, is, *doing what he was bid to do*) that I ſhould ſuffer for you, who are the *body of Chriſt*. That I now do, *I make up, or fulfil in my fleſh, that which is wanting of the ſufferings of Chriſt*, or thoſe *neceſſary ſufferings of Chriſt*, and *take pleaſure, rejoyce* in ſo doing.

To the ſame purpoſe Saint *James* his exhortation is remarkable in the front of his *Ep.* 1. 2. *My Brethren, count it all joy when ye fall into divers temptations*, πᾶσαν χαρὰν, all joy, *i.e.* the moſt joyous accident poſſible, and *v.* 12. *Bleſſed is the man that endureth Temptation*, &c. *& cap.* 5. 11. ἰδοὺ μακαρίζομεν τὺς ὑπομείναντας, *behold we count them happy*, we render it; it ſignifies more; behold we account them as a kind of Saints in Heaven, (for ſo ὁ μάκαρ uſually ſignifies) and *Ariſtotle* ſpeaking of ſome heroical ſuper-humane excellencies, οὐκ ἐπαινοῦμεν ſaith he, ἀλλὰ μακαρίζομεν) it ſeems that of ſuffering, a moſt bleſſed condition. To theſe add St. *Peter*, 1 *Ep.* 3.15. *but ſanctifie the Lord God in your hearts*; where the word ἁγιάζειν is to ſanctifie, as that is all one with glorifying or hallowing, or praiſing; a conſequent of the general rule, verſe 14. *if ye ſuffer for righteouſneſs ſake, happy are ye*; and perfectly oppoſite to [being afraid of their terrour, and being troubled,] in the end of that Verſe, and ſo is an expreſſion of this duty of praiſing, thanking, bleſſing God for our ſufferings in this life. So again, 1 *Ep.* 4. 13. μὴ ξενίζεσθε, verſe 12. be not frighted or ſtricken, *&c.* but rejoyce in as much as you are partakers of Chriſts ſufferings, and *v.* 14. if ye be reproached for the name of Chriſt, happy are you, *&c.* and verſe 16. if any ſuffer as a Chriſtian (not as a murtherer, a thief, an evil doer, a buſie-body in other mens matters, verſe 15. no great joy or comfort in any of thoſe ſufferings) let him not be aſhamed but let him glorifie God on this behalf, ὅτι ὁ καιρὸς τοῦ ἄρξασθαι τὸ κρῖμα, that it is the ſeaſon for judgment to begin, or of judgments beginning, at the houſe of God, as hath been explained, 'tis ſeaſonable that the τὸ πρῶτον, the firſt part of Gods ἀνταπόδοσις retribution to ſin, that which is in this life, ſhould befal the houſe of God, Chriſtians, and the moſt obedient of them; and being ſo, this is matter of rejoycing, and glorifying God. Other places ye will obſerve eaſily to the ſame purpoſe, as when St. *Paul*, *Gal.* 6.17. ſpeaks of his afflictions (in the height at that time it ſeems) he expreſſes it thus, στίγματα τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ ἐν τῷ σώματί μου βαστάζω· *I bear in my body the marks of the Lord Jeſus.*] where the word στίγματα though it ſignifie brands of infamy, yet are here ſet, ſaith S. *Chryſoſtome*, for * τροπαῖα, *trophaes*, and marks of triumph, which therefore he is ſaid βαστάζειν, to *carry triumphantly*, and not φέρειν ſimply to carry, as acts of contumely; and ſo 2 *Cor.* 12. 9. *I will glory in my weakneſſes*] *i.e. afflictions, that the power of God may dwell upon me.* So *Gal.* 14. after he had ſpoken of ſome that had circumciſed their *Proſelytes*, only that they might not be *perſecuted or purſued by the Croſs of Chriſt*, ἵνα μὴ τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ χριστοῦ διώκωνται, *i.e.* that they might avoid perſecution from the Jews, and ſo glory in their Flock, *i.e.* brag that they help their Diſciples to carnal advantages which others have not, to wit, eaſe and quiet, *&c.* In defiance and oppoſition to ſuch he cries out, and diſclaims all kind of *glorying* but this one, in the *Croſs of Chriſt*, *i.e. Afflictions*, &c. So *Phil.* 1. 29. ὑμῖν ἐχαρίσθη, To you it is *granted* as a grace, and vouchſafement of Gods ſpecial favour, to *ſuffer for Chriſt*. Let theſe for the preſent ſuffice, to ſoften this carnal paradox.

* So *Ignatius* mentioning his δεσμὰ, *bonds*, *Epiſt. ad Epheſ.* calls them, πνευματικὰς μαργαρίτας, *Spiritual jewels*, and adds his wiſh, ἐν οἷς γένοιτό μοι τελειωθῆναι, *God grant that in, or by them I may be conſummate* or crown'd: And anon, ἀξιώθην φορέσαι ταύτας τὰς ἁλύσεις, *I have been vouchſafed, or thought worthy to bear theſe chains.* And in his *Epiſtle ad Magneſ.* he ſaith, ἀξιωθεὶς ὀνόματος θεοῦ καὶ πίστεως ἐν οἷς περιφέρω δεσμοῖς, ᾄδω, &c. *Being thought worthy of the divine and precious name of God, in or by thoſe chains which I carry about with me,* (*carry about* as enſigns of honour, matter of glory and rejoycing) *I ſing*, &c.

But now having proceeded thus far in a matter, to him that is converſant in the New Teſtament, ſo obvious and vulgar, that I ſhall preſume it matter of wonder to him, what ſhould move me to ſo ſuperfluous and unneceſſary an undertaking; I muſt now take confidence to proceed to that which *Arrian* calls the ἐφαρμογὴ προλήψεως ταῖς ἐπὶ μέρους ὑσίαις, the applying of κοιναὶ ἔννοιαι known and granted principles, to particular perſons, or caſes, or practices. For therein, as that excellent Philoſopher obſerves, conſiſts the ground and beginning of all ſtrife and difficulty, and difference, betwixt men, no man having any conſiderable Temptation, to keep him from conſenting to the truth of a general propoſition ſufficiently aſſerted, as long as he appears not concern'd in it, and yet every man almoſt

almoſt having ſome irreconcileable quarrel to it, when his actions are required to be ruled by it; hence is it, that the ſpeculative part of knowledge is far eaſier than the practical; and as *Ariſtotle* ſaith, the Mathematicks which are the moſt abſtruſe Science, are moſt eaſie to be learnt by a young man, or a diſſolute, of any the moſt untamed affections, ſo he have but an ordinary natural capacity, (and 'tis evident by his *Organon*, that he ſuppoſed children to have learnt Geometry before they came to Logick) whereas of the precepts of Morality, ſuch are utterly uncapable, λέγουσιν ἀ πίστανται, they can recite them by rote, but believe not a word of them.

I wiſh it were now uncharitable to affirm the ſame, of many that have taken upon them, to be the beſt, and moſt reforming Chriſtians amongſt us; that it continued ſtill to be but our jealouſie, what is now proved our ſence, that ſome of thoſe who have hitherto been admitted for our ſtricteſt Chriſtians, have at length confeſt themſelves fartheſt from the merit, and true deſert of that title, if the doctrine of the Croſs, which hitherto we have laid down for acknowledged truth, do not at laſt prove a fable.

The Apoſtle *Phil.* 3. 18. tells us even weeping, that there are many walkers, (I think he means by that phraſe πολλοὶ περιπατοῦσι, Chriſtian profeſſors (whom judging by their actions, he cannot chuſe but call ἐχθροὺς τοῦ σταυροῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ) of whom it ſeems he had oft admoniſhed them, ἔλεγον πολλάκις ὑμῖν λέγω) *enemies of the Croß of Chriſt*; what thoſe were in the Apoſtles time will not be pertinent now to examine, I ſhall only with a ſad heart (not deſiring to judge my brother, but if it were poſſible, to direct him to prejudge, or at leaſt examine himſelf, and ſo either anticipate and prevent, or elſe prepare himſelf to approach with confidence Gods judgment, and withal, to help to undeceive others whom we find ductile to ſome modern ſins, much-what upon that dangerous prepoſſeſſion which the Apoſtle calls *having mens perſons in admiration*) make theſe few quære's, and leave every mans own ſoul to anſwer them.

1. Suppoſing our grounds laid to be true, I demand whether it be the temper of a true Chriſtian, and not rather of an enemy of the Croſs of Chriſt, inſtead of rejoycing to repine and murmur under the Croſs, and evidence that, by ſpeaking evil of thoſe powers who have laid it on our ſhoulders?

2. To be more refractory after ſuch ſufferings (inſtead of being more meek and more humble) more violent in matters of indifferency (by our own continued practice acknowledged to be ſo in our account, till after ſuch ſufferings our judgments or rather our practice altered) and more reſolved not to yield obedience in them, than before we thought our ſelves bound to be.

3. To plot and project, and to that purpoſe to hold correſpondence with other men, (whom we conceive already moved with diſcontents, or our ſelves have labour'd ſo to move) to find out the moſt probable way of delivering us from the Croſs, whatſoever that way be, beſide our addreſſes to God in prayer to remove it, if he ſee it beſt for us in all reſpects.

4. To make uſe of any means to this purpoſe, which we are not aſſured is adminiſtred and offered unto us by God, of which we can no way poſſibly be aſſured but by the evident goodneſs and juſtifiableneſs, at leaſt lawfulneſs, in all reſpects of that means which we thus deſign to make uſe of.

5. To move or ſtir the quiet and peace of one or more Kingdoms (though not principally yet collaterally, or at all) in this contemplation that we ſhall get the Croſs off from our own ſhoulders, come to a more proſperous condition, yea though it be but to a more peaceable enjoying of our manner of Religion, than hitherto we have attained to.

6. To venture on, and (though not primarily to deſign, if it may be done without it, yet if it may not, then ſecondarily and conſequently) to reſolve on the ſhedding of any one man's bloud, which we know would not otherwiſe be ſhed, eſpecially if it proceed further to the waging or but occaſioning of a war, in which (whether offenſive or defenſive on our parts) it cannot be hoped but a great effuſion of Chriſtian and Proteſtant bloud will follow.

7. To attempt or deſire the removing of the Land-marks, the altering of the Government of Church and State, the working of any conſiderable change in either (which we can have no revelation to aſſure us may not prove authour of ſome inconvenience which we foreſee not) the better to ſecure our ſelves or others that the Croſs ſhall not return to our ſhoulders again.

8. To think it juſt and reaſonable (and our ſelves injur'd if it be not ſo) that we ſhould have the greater portion of ſecular dignities for the future in regard of ſome former ſufferings of ours: which if it ſhould befal us, would be parallel to that curſe, *Mat.* 6. *mercedem habent*, they have their reward, in this life.

9. To endeavour to lay this Croſs on other mens ſhoulders of which we have freed our own, whether thoſe other men be ſuch as were not guilty of our former ſufferings, but perhaps pitied and mourned, and prayed for us, (for that were rewarding good with evil) or whether they be our greateſt perſecutors (for that will be rendring evil for evil) moſt perfectly contrary to Chriſts Doctrine, *Matth.* 6. 44. *Rom.* 12. 17, 19, 20, 21.

Secondly, ſuppoſing things to be as now they are in this Kingdom, my queſtion is, Firſt, whether we have not great reaſon to believe, that (the doctrine of the Croſs being not ſo well laid to heart by thoſe who three years ſince conceived themſelves the principal Scholars in that School) God is now pleaſed to call another ſort of men into that form, to try whether they will prove better proficients than their Predeceſſors have done; Secondly, whether thoſe on whom that lot is now faln, be not moſt eminently bound to glorifie God in this behalf, 1 *Pet.* 4. 16. Thirdly, whether by the experience of other mens failings in this kind, they have not reaſon to be earneſt in prayer to God, and diligent in uſing and improving all Gods directions for the due Chriſtian diſcharging of ſo glorious, and withal, ſo difficult a task, that when they are proved to the utmoſt, are brought forth to reſiſt to blood, they may be found faithful. Fourthly, whether the obtaining of this grace from God be not more highly conducible to every mans own individual intereſts, than the removing of the Croſs from us, though wrought moſt directly, and by means adminiſtred undoubtedly

by God himself. Fifthly, whether it can become a Christian to make use of any means which he is not on sure grounds satisfied to be purely and perfectly lawful (*i.e.* agreeable first to the Gospel-rule of obedience to Christ in every particular, and secondly to the lawful commands of our undoubted Superiours not contradicted by any Law or power higher than they) to get now either totally or in part from this Cross, *i.e.* from any pressure which in the discharge of a good conscience God shall permit to fall on any of us.

When every man in this broken State, and Church, most sadly militant, of what perswasions soever he be, hath laid the several parts of these two Quære's to his heart, and examined himself by them (which truly I should not have laid thus plainly before him, had I had any other thought or aim, but this one of making it impossible for him to be blind in judging himself) I shall hope he will pardon his Monitor, and save this paper the labour of proceeding further to bear witness against him at any other tribunal than this of his own conscience.

The Lord prosper this short Discourse to the end to which it is designed.

V. de supra p. 304

A Vindication of Christ's reprehending Saint *Peter*, from the Exceptions of Mr. MARSHAL.

THere is nothing more unjust and uningenuous, than M. *Marshall*'s dealing about Christ's reprehension of Saint *Peters* using the Sword; whilst he labours to answer the Objection, which from thence is brought against the use of Arms, though but defensive, taken up against a lawful Magistrate. The Argument is briefly this: Saint *Peter*, in defence of his Master (Christ himself) drew his Sword, and cut off the Ear of *Malchus*, one of the High Priests Servants, sent by commission from their Masters, to apprehend Jesus: and our Saviour commands him to put up his sword; adding by way of reason, *for they that take the Sword* (take it, not when 'tis put into their hands by God or the supreme Magistrate, or any Delegate of his, who hath the power of the Sword; but *take* it, usurp it, without legal authority or concession giving or permitting it to them) *shall perish by the Sword*. Which reason or backing of Christs reprehension is brought to infer, that 'tis a sin for any to use the Sword against the supreme Magistrate, though for defence of Christ or Christian Religion. To this Master *Marshall*'s answer is threefold; 1. *That the speech of Christ to* Peter, *is not a reproof of the sword taken for a just defence; but of the sword taken for unjust oppression, and a comfort to those who are oppressed with it. For* Origen, Theophylact, Titus, Euthymius, *interpret the meaning to be, that Christ doth not rebuke* Peter *for using defensive Arms; but to let* Peter *know that he need not snatch Gods work out of his hands: for God would in time punish those with the sword, that came thus with the sword against him. And that these words are a prophecy of the punishment which the Roman sword should exact of the bloudy Jewish nation, according with the like expression,* Revel. 13. 10. *He that kills with the sword, must be killed with the sword: here is the patience and faith of the Saints,* i. e. *this may comfort the Saints in their persecutions, that God will take vengeance for them:* and for all this the Margin advises the Reader to consult *Grotius de jure belli, l.* 1. *c.* 3. *n.* 3. This is the place at length in Mr. *Marshal* his Letter to a friend, which (being of some concernment and importance to the present controversie of the times, though not to confirm his cause by this exposition, yet to dispatch one of his special adversaries out of the way) I shall now beg leave to examine; and of all together, observe these four things; First, that the ancient Writers, vouched by him, are not vouched from his own reading, but taken upon trust from *Grotius*, as also the observation of the Roman Sword, and the place in the *Revelations*; Secondly, that the interpretation, asserted by him out of them, is not asserted by them; Thirdly, that it is not asserted by *Grotius*; Fourthly, that *Grotius* to whom he owes all this seeming aid to his cause, is the most declared enemy of this whole cause of his, in behalf of defensive resistance of the Magistrate, that he could possibly have faln on; and upon occasion of these words of Christ to *Peter* hath said as much against it. If these four things be made good; I cannot guess what could be further added to prove the injustice and uningenuousness, I shall add the untowardness and unluckiness of this answer. And for the particulars, I shall but require a Reader with eyes in his head, and suppose him not possest with a belief of an absolute infallibility in Master *Marshal*, and then I shall be confident to demonstrate them.

For the first, the proof will be short, if you please but to look on *Grotius* in the place directed to in his Annotations on the Gospels, *pag.* 465. almost *verbatim* transcribing what he had before published *de jure belli*; you shall in each find every of the particulars mentioned: but for this I would not charge M. *Marshal*, I wish he would always glean out of so good Writers. The only fault here is, that having borrowed so much from him and digested it into nourishment of his own errour, he did not also take the pains to borrow what was present to be had, a most soveraign antidote for his own poison, means of rectifying his mistake; but like the man in *Gellius*, that had eat so much poison, and therewith so invenom'd his bloud, that he could poison the Flea that came to bite him: so, he the *Grotius* that came to prick and wound; or, if he had pleased, to convert, to bring him to repentance.

For the second, I shall not expect to evince it against so great an authority of Master *Marshal*, without transcribing the very words of those writers in this matter. *Origen* upon the place in *Matth.*

Matth. 26. *tr.* 35. *p.* 118. explains the whole period in theſe words. (I ſhall omit no word that is pertinent to the matter in hand:) *Unus eorum qui erant cum Jeſu, nondum manifeſtè concipiens apud ſe Evangelicam patientiam illam traditam ſibi à Chriſto nec pacem quam dedit diſcipulis ſuis, ſed ſecundum poteſtatem datam Judæis per legem de inimicis, extendens manum accepit gladium,* &c. *Peter* it ſeems had not perfectly learned the Doctrine of Chriſtian patience, and the peace which Chriſt commended to his Diſciples, but proceeded according to the Jewiſh law of dealing with enemies. This concludes *Peters* act contrary to Chriſtian patience and peaceableneſs, and ſo makes him capable of Chriſts reproof, which Mr. *Marſhal* will wholly divert from him, and caſt upon the Jews. Then he goes on, *Mox Jeſus ad eum, converte gladium in locum ſuum: Eſt ergo gladii locus aliquis, ex quo non licet accipere eum, qui non vult perire maximè in gladio.* (This clearly of Saint *Peter* again, and not the Jews, that he muſt not take the ſword out of its place, unleſs he will be content to periſh by the ſword:) *Pacificos enim vult eſſe Jeſus diſcipulos ſuos, ut bellicum gladium hunc deponentes,* (O that Maſter *Marſhal* would remember this; and after ſo fair an admonition, put the military ſword out of his mouth alſo.) *alterum pontificium accipiant gladium, quem dicit Scriptura gladium Spiritûs. Simile autem mihi videtur quod dicit, Omnes qui accipiunt,* &c. *i. e. omnes qui non pacifici, ſed belli concitatores ſunt, in eo bello peribunt quod concitant,* &c. *Et puto quòd omnes tumultuoſi & concitatores bellorum, & conturbantes animas hominum, maximè Eccleſiarum, accipiunt gladium, in quo & ipſi peribunt.* Excellent ſeaſonable Doctrine for theſe times if it might be laid to heart; but no way excuſing Saint *Peter*. Again, *Qui accipiunt gladium,* &c. *cavere nos convenit, ut* ne occaſione Militiæ *vel vindictæ propriarum injuriarum* (remember not for revenge of ones own injuries) *eximamus gladium, aut ob aliquam occaſionem, quam omnem abominatur hæc Chriſti doctrina, præcipiens ut implcamus quod ſcriptum eſt, Cum his qui oderunt pacem, eram pacificus. Si ergo cum odientibus pacem debemus eſſe pacifici; adverſus neminem gladio uti debemus.* Theſe are the words of *Origen*; out of which, he that ſhall infer that *Origen* conceived the meaning of the Scripture to be, that Chriſt did not rebuke *Peter* for uſing defenſive Arms againſt *Malchus*; I ſhall reſolve he hath gotten the Philoſophers ſtone, is Alchymiſt enough to extract fire out of water; any the moſt contrary ſence out of any words. Not ſo much as one word here of the Jews or the Roman ſword that ſhould give them their payment: but all of *Peters* Sword, and the miſcarriages of that: and ſo much for *Origen*.

What if a man ſhould conſtrue this (*not on occaſion of the Militia.*

Then for *Theophylact*; he is alſo punctual enough to this purpoſe. Μὴ ἐγκαλῶμεν τῷ Πέτρῳ, ὑπὲρ ἑαυτῷ γὰρ ὑπὲρ τοῦ διδασκάλου ζηλώσας τοῦτο ἐποίησεν· *Let us not find fault with* Peter (make not too much haſte, Maſter *Marſhal*, to catch that, till you ſee the conſequents) *for he did this not for himſelf, but in zeal for his Maſter.* Herein I ſhall interpoſe my conjecture that *Theophylact* might think *Peter* did this, as a Zealot; as *James* and *John* would have deſtroyed the Village of the Samaritans, *jure Zelotarum*: ſo his words alſo ſound on *Luke p.* 518. Ζηλῶσι μαθηταὶ ἢ μαχαίρας ἀνασύροντας: and then though that were unlawful for a Chriſtian, a piece of Judaiſm out-dated by Chriſt; yet in *Peter*, as a Jew, not perfectly illuminate or inſtructed in the Chriſtian Doctrine (as *Origen* before obſerv'd) it was not ſo blameable yet, till after the coming of the Holy Ghoſt, who was to bring all things to their remembrance which Chriſt had taught them. And therefore perhaps it is, that, although Saint *Auguſtine* calls this of *Peter*, *carnalem amorem*, yet *amorem Magiſtri* ſtill. The ſame Author upon Saint *Mark* hath theſe words upon this ſame occaſion, Ἀποσιωπᾷ τὸ ὄνομα ὁ Μάρκος, ἵνα μὴ λύπῃ ἐπαινῶν τὸν διδάσκαλον ἀντὶ Πέτρου, ὡς ζηλώσαντα ὑπὲρ Χρίστου, counting this zeal, as in a Jew, rather a commendable thing. If all this be yielded, yet will it be no juſtification of the like in a Chriſtian: becauſe now Chriſt hath reformed that Law, and checkt that *Peter*. And therefore, the ſame *Theophylact* goes on; that though we ſhould not aggravate *Peters* fault, nor chide him for it; ὁ δὲ Κύριος μετατρυθμίζων αὐτὸν εἰς εὐαγγελικὴν πολιτείαν διδάσκει μὴ χρῆσθαι μαχαίρᾳ κἂν ὑπὲρ θεοῦ δοκῇ τὶς ἐκδικεῖν, *yet Chriſt reforms him, turns him to the Goſpel-diſcipline, and teaches him not to uſe the ſword, though by ſo doing he ſeems to* defend or *vindicate God himſelf*. Could any man have ſpoken more expreſly or prophetically againſt Maſter *Marſhal* his doctrine, than this Father doth? (So likewiſe in other places upon Saint *Lukes* Goſpel, *pag.* 518. Ζηλῶσι δ' οἱ μαθηταὶ, &c. ἐπιτιμᾶται δὲ ὁ θερμὸς Πέτρος ὡς παρὰ τὸ σκόπιμον τοῦ καιροῦ ζῆλῳ χρησάμενος: he confeſſes *Peter* was chid for his zeal. And on St. *Johns* Goſpel, Ἀλλ' ὁ Κύριος καταπαύει μὲν τὸν Πέτρον, καὶ ἀπειλήσας, βάλε, φησὶ, &c. *The Lord reprehends* Peter, *and threatning ſaith, put up*, &c. threatning *whom*? ſure that perſon, in *Theophylacts* opinion, to whom he ſaid *put up*: and that ſure was *Peter*, not the Jews.) But to ſhew you the occaſion of Maſter *Marſhal* his miſtake; It follows indeed in *Theophylact* on *Matthew*, Αἰνίσσεται δὲ ὅτι διὰ τῆς Ῥωμαίων μαχαίρας ἀναιρεθήσονται οἱ κατ' ἀυτὸν λαβόντες τὴν μαχαίραν Ἰουδαῖοι· *Inſinuat autem*, as *Oecolampadius* renders it, *Chriſt inſinuates* that by the Romans ſword, the Jews that took the ſword againſt him, ſhall be deſtroyed. This acknowledged truth, (that the Romans ſhould deſtroy the Jews, the apprehenders and crucifiers of Chriſt, *i. e.* that were guilty of crucifying him,) was, ſaith he, inſinuated in thoſe words of Chriſt, wherein, as before we ſhewed out of *Theophylacts* words, he reproved St. *Peter*. Now we know that *αἰνίσσεσθαι*, or inſinuating, or intimating, ſignifies a ſecundary or allegorical ſence of a Scripture, as it is frequent in that Author. Speaking of the cutting off *Malchus* his ear, αἰνίσσεται γὰρ, ſaith he, he *inſinuates*, ὅτι παρήκοοι ἦσαν καὶ ἀπειθεῖς, that the Jews did not *hear* and *obey* the Scripture, as they ſhould: a meer allegorical interpretation. So when Chriſt bids him *that had no ſword, ſell his garment and buy one*, *Luke* 22. 36. πολέμους αἰνίσσεται, &c. he ſpeaks ænigmatically, and tells them by way of inſinuation, what wars and dangers ſhould betide them. Which inſinuated or ænigmatical ſence, though it be acknowledged true, will not evacuate that other literal. For I hope in Mr. *Marſhal* his own judgment, that 'tis lawful to uſe a ſword in ones own defence in time of war and danger, and that that lawfulneſs is authorized by Chriſt in thoſe words: which I ſhall not doubt to acknowledge with him, if it be not againſt the lawful Magiſtrate.

In *Matt.* p. 163.

The product then of *Theophylacts* interpretation will be this; that by theſe words, [*for all they that take the ſword, ſhall periſh by the ſword*] Chriſt reprehends and chides *Peter* for drawing his ſword, and uſing it, as he did: and withal inſinuates ænigmatically the deſtruction of the Jews by the

the Romans. Which if it be acknowledged true in both sences, 'twill no way prejudice us, or serve Mr. *Marshal*, whose cause depends upon rejecting of the former sence, not on asserting the latter: and doth not only affirm that it is a reproof of the sword taken for unjust oppression, but also that it is not a reproof of the sword taken for just defence: which is absolutely false in *Theophylacts* opinion, if defending of Christ be just defence, or chiding be reproving: or if teaching not to use the sword, though one seem to defend God himself, be rebuking *Peter* for using defensive Arms for Christ. The short is, though *Theophylacts* interpretation bring the Jews under Christs threatning and reprehension, yet doth it no way free *Peter* from the same; but primarily subjects him to it: the contrary to which is the only thing would be for Mr. *Marshal* his purpose. 'Tis true indeed in his *Scholia* on Saint *John*, he saith, *Christ comforted Peter*, which seems opposite to *rebuking*; but that was not in these words, *For they that take the sword*, &c. but in those, *the cup*, &c. (παραμυθῆται δὲ ἐν τῷ εἰπεῖν τὸ ποτήριον, &c.) which Saint *John* immediately adds, omitting the words of the threatning out of the Law. And so much for *Theophylact* also.

Now that which hath been thus largely set down out of *Theophylact* will sufficiently clear this whole business without proceeding to examine what may be found in *Titus Bostrensis*, or *Euthymius*, to this purpose. The former of these, in his Exposition of Saint *Luke* in the *Bibliotheca patrum Grec.* hath not the least word sounding that way, but rather contrary; interpreting Christs command of buying a sword as a designation only of the Jews preparation against him, Καὶ ὅτι μέλλουσιν αὐτὸν συλλαμβάνειν, and that they were about to apprehend him: which (as *Theophylact* did, so) he calls αἴνιγμα μαχαίρας, the intimation of the sword, and saith, that therefore Christ adds, that the things written of him must be fulfilled. And again, that if Christ would have had his Disciples use any humane help at his apprehension, a hundred swords would not have been sufficient, εἰ δὲ μὴ τοῦτο, καὶ δύο περιττὰι, and if he would not, even these two would be too many. But all this he saith upon the passage of the two swords. The truth is, in the exposition of the Gospel, he saith nothing of this reprehension of *Peter*, but passes it over in silence: And for his notes on St. *Matthew*, as also for *Euthymius* his, though I confess, that I have them not by me, yet (besides that I find nothing that way in those *Excerpta* that *Lucas Brugensis* hath out of them, who would not probably have omitted the mention of such a rarity if it were there,) I think I may take upon me at a venture to say, that he that examines those books, shall not possibly meet with more than out of *Theophylact* was cited: These three Expositors running generally on the same notions, and all of them for the most part gleaning from *Chrysostome* (*Euthymius* being his Scholar, *Titus* his profest Epitomator) who I am sure hath nothing in favour of this Exposition. Out of him, as the *Homer* of those after-Expositors, I shall transcribe these few passages, πρὸς δόξιν in his Homil. 54. on *Matthew*, c. 26. Why did he bid buy a sword? to give them assurance that he should be betrayed: ἐχ ἵνα ἀπλίσωνται, (ἄπαγε) ἀλλὰ τὴν παράδοσιν δηλῶν: not that they should be armed on that occasion (away with that) but to signifie his betraying. Then that their having those two weapons at that time was upon occasion of killing the Lamb for the Passeover, and the Disciples then coming from Supper, and hearing that some would come to apprehend him, took them out from thence with them, ὡς πολεμήσοντες ὑπὲρ τοῦ διδασκάλου, meaning to fight for their Master, ὃ τῆς ἐκείνων γνώμης ἦν μόνον, which was their opinion only, not Christs intention: διὸ ἐπετιμᾶται ὁ Πετρὸς αὐτῇ χρησάμενος, wherefore *Peter* is chid for using of it: καὶ μετὰ σφοδρᾶς ἀπειλῆς, and that with a sound threat; which what can it be, but that about which we now contend, *they that take the sword*, &c. upon the hearing of which words, saith he, he straight obeyed and did so no more. Again, citing the passage in St. *Luke*, τῷ μαθητῇ ἐπετίμησε καὶ ἠπείλησεν ἵνα πείσῃ, he chid and threatned the Disciples into obedience; and then sets down the words of the threat, πάντες γὰρ, &c. *for all that take*, &c. And yet after all these plain words of reprehending and threatning *Peter* in those words (*all they that take the sword, shall perish by it*) he yet adds that he *comforted* his Disciples by two things, first the punishment of the betrayers, applying to that the same speech in a Parenthesis (*They that take*, &c.) and that he suffer'd not unwillingly. All which together signifie clearly the same that we found in *Theophylact* (and presume the utmost either of *Titus* or *Euthymius* their exposition) that in that threatning of *Peter* is intimated also or insinuated ænigmatically a threat of those other sword-men that came out with swords and staves to take *Jesus*: which will not be denied by any, or disputed of by me; so the other be granted, *viz.* that *Peter* was here reprehended and threatned, which is the only thing we quarrel in Mr. *M.* And so much for the second undertaking.

Now, that in the third place, *Grotius* himself who cites these four ancients, and is here cited by Mr. *M. de jure belli*, *l.* 1. *c.* 3. *n.* 3. doth not in this place, or any other of his writings, assert this interpretation; I shall thus prove. The thing that in that place he hath in hand is to inquire, Whether all use of the sword for a mans own defence, be unlawful under the Gospel? And he resolves, that in case of one private mans being invaded by another, 'tis lawful by the Law of Christ (not necessary, but lawful; a man is only not obliged to the contrary) or notwithstanding the prescribed rules of Christian patience, to kill another in defence of my own life. Against this, 3. objections he mentions out of the New Testament, *Matth.* 5. 39. *Rom.* 12. 19. and the saying of Christ to *Peter*, *put up thy sword*, &c. *For all they that take the sword*, &c. To these 3. he answers.

1. By opposing some other places of Scripture, that of Christ to his followers, *Luke* 22. 36. that to buy a sword they should sell a coat. In which company of his auditors there were, saith he, at that time none but his Disciples, and although, saith he, it be a proverbial speech, signifying the great dangers approaching; yet it referr'd to the ordinary use of swords at that time, for private mens defence in time of danger, not there prohibited by him: applying that of *Cicero*, *Gladios habere certè non liceret, si uti illis nullo pacto liceret*: We might not be allowed to have swords, if 'twere in no case lawful to use them. Which still confirms his point in hand, that in some case, the use of the private sword is lawful.

2. He proceeds to the particular places, saith, in the μὴ ἀντιστῆναι τῷ πονηρῷ, there is some exception allowed, that it binds only in tolerable injuries; such as the box on the cheek, *&c.* there mentioned: in the μὴ ἀδικηθέντες ἑαυτοὺς, ἀδικεῖν signifies not defence, but revenge. Then for that of *Peter*, it contains,

tains, ſaith he, a prohibition of uſing the ſword, but not in caſe of defence: for he needed not defend himſelf; for Chriſt had ſaid, let theſe go; *Joh.* 18. 8. nor Chriſt, for he would not be defended, *&c.* Beſides, ſaith he, *Peter* took up the ſword (*in eos qui nomine publicarum poteſtatum adventabant, quibus an ullo caſu reſiſtere liceat, peculiaris eſt quæſtio, infrà à nobis peculiariter tractanda,*) againſt thoſe that came in the name of the publick powers, againſt whom, whether it be lawful to make reſiſtance in any caſe, is a peculiar queſtion, to be handled afterward peculiarly. (And, let me pawn my faith for it, Stated negatively.) As for that which Chriſt adds; All they that take the ſword, *&c.* that is, either a Proverb, or (which is the opinion of *Origen*, *Theophylact*, *Titus*, and *Euthymius*,) *indicat*, it ſhews or intimates, that we ſhould not ſnatch revenge out of God's hands; and to this applies the place in the *Revel.* a place in *Tertullian*, *adeò idoneus patientiæ ſequeſter Deus*, &c. and adds, *Simúlque his Chriſti verbis vaticinium videtur ineſſe de pœnis, quas à ſanguinariis Judæis erat exacturus gladius Romanus.* And alſo in the words there ſeems to be included a Prophecy of the puniſhment that the Roman ſword ſhould exact of the bloudy Jews. From all which put together this will be the utmoſt that Mr. *Marſhal* can conclude, that *Grotius* conceived, that the ſpeech of Chriſt to *Peter* prohibited not all uſe of the ſword, for private defence (no man ſaith it did; or that all ſuch defence is unlawful; our caſe is only of reſiſting Magiſtrates) that *Origen*, *Theophylact*, &c. owned an expoſition of it, that thereby we ſhould be taught, not to take God's office of revenging out of his hand, (which we alſo make a ſpecial part of the importance of that ſpeech, both there, and in the *Revel.* and ſo a plain check of *Peter*, who did take it) and that withal in theſe words a Prophecy ſeems to be implied of the revenge of Chriſts death, wrought by *Titus* upon the Jews, (And we can acknowledge the Scripture, ſo rich a mine of variety, that it may have this prophetick ſence alſo: though by the way, *Grotius* cites not this out of thoſe four Writers, (nor could he, for in *Origen* we find it not) but as from himſelf, *ſimulque vaticinium videtur ineſſe*, &c.) But for the literal ſence, that *Peter* ſhould not be rebuked by Chriſt, for uſing defenſive arms againſt the Magiſtrate, (when with the uſe of thoſe the leaving vengeance to God is utterly unreconcileable) (and Chriſtians conceive themſelves bound not to uſe thoſe arms againſt the Magiſtrate for this very cauſe, becauſe he is *avenged by God & puniſhable, revengeable* by God alone:) and yet be rebuked for ſnatching Gods work out of his hand: Or that theſe words ſhould not belong in the prime ſence to *Peter*'s fact, as well as in a ſecundary prophetical ſeeming one to the Jews, there is not any appearances of ſound of any word in *Grotius* there, or in any other place in that Book, or his large annotations on the Goſpels: which if Mr. *Marſhal* had read with his own eyes, he would confeſs with me. And ſo much for his citation of *Grotius*.

Now in the laſt place, for the opinion of this learned man *Grotius*, (an excellent Caſuiſt, exactly diſtinguiſhing the ſeveral obligations of Nature, of *Moſes*, and of Chriſt, a Proteſtant, and, if an Arminian, far from deſerving that part of the cenſure which Mr. *Cheynel* lays on ſuch, of being as lawleſs as that faction at *Munſter*, (whoſe Law it was *Magiſtratibus ac Principibus nullus ſubjiciatur*) in the buſineſs of taking up Arms againſt a King for juſt defence, I ſhall refer you to his firſt Book, *de jure belli*, &c. *cap.* 4. (Not that I can hope you will be moved with his authority when he appears againſt you, that is not the manner of men now a days to be content to be tried by your own witneſſes: but for the ſatisfaction to conſcience which this Authours reaſons, and perſpicuity will yield any Chriſtian Reader) the very place whereto he referr'd the Reader even now for his reſolution in that point; and the ſtate of this queſtion being ſet (*An aut privatis aut publicis perſonis bellum gerere liceat in eos quorum imperio ſubſunt*) whether any private or publick perſons may lawfully wage War againſt them, under whoſe command they are, he defines, that by the very Law of Nature (ſo much now talkt of) 'tis not lawful. 2. That by the Law of the Jews it was not allowed. 3. That it was leſs allowed, but become more unlawful by the Evangelical Law, *Rom.* 13. 1. and 1 *Pet.* 2. 12, *&c.* and practice of ancient Chriſtians. 4. Confutes the opinion of thoſe that affirm it lawful for inferiour Magiſtrates to wage War againſt the Supreme, by reaſons and Scriptures. 5. Propoſes the caſe of extreme and inevitable neceſſity, when the King goes to take away a mans life unjuſtly: and (whatſoever might from nature or practice of the Jews, as of *David*, or of the Maccabees be brought to aſſert reſiſtance in this caſe) he defines from the Chriſtian Law, (which commands ſo oft to take up the Croſs) an exacter degree of patience, and particularly when for Religion our Superiours go about to kill us, though he will allow flight to ſome ſort of men, yet to no man more than flight; but rather rejoycing when we ſuffer as Chriſtians: This, ſaith he, was the courſe that brought Chriſtian religion to ſuch a height in the World: and reſolves it the greateſt injury that can be done to the ancient Chriſtians, to ſay, that it was want of ſtrength, not of inclinations that way, that they defended not themſelves in time of moſt certain danger of death. *Tertullian*, ſaith he, had been imprudent and impudent, if in a writing preſented to the Emperours (who could not be ignorant of the truth) he had dared to lie ſo confidently, when he ſaith *Non deeſſet nobis vis numerorum*, &c. moſt admirable paſſages out of ancient Writers he there cites for a leaf together to the ſame purpoſe of dying for the truth of Religion; and never defending themſelves by Arms againſt the illegal will of the lawful Magiſtrates. (I beſeech Mr. *Marſhal* to ſend to the ſhop and read the paſſages, and conſider how far he hath departed from the primitiveneſs, and Chriſtianity of thoſe examples. And to conclude, Though *Grotius* (according to his manner, which is to ſay all that can be wiſht in any Subject) mentions ſome caſes wherein a King may be reſiſted, yet if you read them, you will find little joy in any of them: As in caſe a King ſhall abdicate his Kingdom, and manifeſtly relinquiſh his power, then he turns private man, and ſo may be dealt with as any other ſuch. And ſome other the like.

Of *Socin.* p. 53.

Well, I have ſaid enough of *Grotius* in the buſineſs, and ſhould add no more; but I remember I promiſed to ſhew that on occaſion of theſe words of Chriſt to St. *Peter*, he hath as much againſt the expoſition pretended to be his, and the whole doctrine of reſiſtance, as the Kings friends could deſire; and that is in his Annotations on the place, *Matth.* 26. 52. Οἱ λαβόντες μαχαίραν, &c. *Neque vero ad* Petrum *tantùm admonitio iſta pertinet; ſed & ad Chriſtianos omnes qui à publicis poteſtatibus ad pœnam expetuntur ob pietatis profeſſionem:* The admonition belongs not to *Peter* only, but to all Chriſtians,

In Luke, p. 464.

ſtians, when they are called by the Magiſtrate to ſuffer for the profeſſion of piety; and ſets the rule in that caſe, παρατίθεσθαι τὰς ψυχὰς τῷ κτίστῃ, to commit our ſouls to God, to expend our lives in his cauſe that gave us them; alledging to this purpoſe what this *Peter* had learned from this Maſter, 1 *Pet.* 4. 16. 19. and anſwering the common frivolous objection fetcht from the Law of natural defence or ſelf-preſervation, ſhewing the difference between the uſe of that liberty againſt thieves, *&c.* (againſt which the Laws and Magiſtrates give us the liberty) and againſt the commands of the Supreme Magiſtrate; whom if in any caſe of injury, *&c.* private men may have permiſſion to reſiſt, or repel force with force, *omnia erunt tumultuum plena; nulla legum, nulla judiciorum authoritas:* the perfect image of our Kingdom at this time when the words are Engliſhed, as God knows the ſence is: and then he concludes with the caſe of Religion, wherein there is no place of reſiſting the higher powers, be their violence never ſo unjuſt.

I have undoubtedly made good my four undertakings in this buſineſs: and ſhall beſeech Mr. *Marſhal* hereafter to write more cautiouſly, leſt he provoke men to put him and the world in mind of other unjuſtifiable paſſages in his writings, to tell him of (that which in meer charity to him I deſire he ſhould know men do take notice of) his dealing in a Sermon of his about *Joſiah*'s reformation preacht before the Houſe of Commons long ſince: and of the applying of the curſe that fell on the Inhabitants of *Meroz*, *Jud.* 5. (for not helping their Soveraign, namely *Deborah*, againſt a foreign Enemy, *Jabin*) to thoſe that will not joyn with himſelf againſt his Soveraign and his Cavaliers, *i.e.* thoſe forces raiſed by him. I wiſh heartily that Mr. *Marſhal* having gotten ſo much authority, as to be the *Auguſtine*, the truly polemical Divine of our times, would be ſo charitable to his Diſciples, as to imitate him, in retracting ſo many of his miſadventures, as he cannot chuſe but know to be ſuch, and not to impoſe too intolerably on their credulity: or ſo tender of his own reputation, as to acknowledge thoſe himſelf, which every man that hath eyes doth diſcern in his books, and would, were it not for meer pity, and the duty of loving enemies, give a large account of.

But I muſt remember, that Mr. *Marſhal* adds two appearances of anſwer more to that allegation from Chriſt to St. *Peter:* a word or two of thoſe. Secondly, ſaith he, *ſuppoſing it was a reproof of* Peters *uſing the ſword, then the plain meaning is to condemn* Peters *raſhneſs who drew his ſword and never ſtaid to know his Maſters mind whether he ſhould ſtrike or not, and ſo reproves thoſe who raſhly, unlawfully, or doubtingly uſe the ſword.* But I pray Sir, are thoſe the words of Chriſt, *They only that take the ſword without asking, or knowing my mind, ſhall periſh,* &c. Or have we any reaſon to think that Chriſt would have then diſpenced with a known law, if he had asked him, and not rather have referred him to be regulated by it, as you ſee he doth, *for all that take,* &c.

2. To ſee the unluckineſs of it again; the Text *Luke* 22. 49. ſaith expreſly that they did ask him, ſaid unto him, *Lord ſhall we ſmite with the ſword?* ſo that the queſtion was askt before he ſmote: and ſure if it had been Chriſts pleaſure they ſhould ſmite, one ſyllable would have expreſt it and juſtified them; and that might have intervened before his ſtriking: and that it did not intervene is no argument of the lawfulneſs of that ſtriking in him, or the like in us: eſpecially when ſo ſharp a reprehenſion immediately follows.

3. I ſhall grant the meaning is to condemn *Peters raſhneſs* in doing a thing ſo unlawful, without any commiſſion; eſpecially, when it was denied by Chriſt upon asking: but not that the matter of the fact was perfectly juſtifiable if abſtracted from that raſhneſs: or that now Chriſts judgment being declared by his anſwer to him, it ſhould be more juſtifiable in us, who have his example for our document.

4. I ſhall ask Maſter *Marſhal* whether he hath asked and received knowledge of his Maſters mind or no: he muſt not mean any of his great earthly Maſters (that joyn with him in the war againſt the ſupreme: for ſure if ſuch tell us we may, or be ſo minded, that doth not prove that 'tis lawful; for then I muſt ask them what Maſter they asked, and ſo, if they have none, conclude them in the number of the *raſh* ſmiters) but Chriſt (for ſure he was *Peters* Maſter) or ſome taught by him in his Word, who may give him aſſurance of the mind of Chriſt: and if this be produc'd we will be his diſciples alſo. For, for his Supreme Maſter on earth, the meer-humane Chriſt, the Lords anointed, I believe he means not that he ſhould be asked, whether he may be, and ſhould be reſiſted: and as little reaſon is there for us to be ſatisfied by being told by any others inferiour to him (eſpecially by the chief reſiſters) that we may lawfully reſiſt.

3. Maſter *Marſhal* adds a conſideration, that *now was the hour come of Chriſts ſuffering, and not of his Apoſtles fighting, wherein Chriſt would not be reſcued, no not by twelve legions of Angels, much leſs then by the ſword of man: therefore he ſaith to* Peter, put up, &c. *but intended not, that it ſhould always be unlawful for his people to uſe the ſword in their juſt defence againſt unjuſt violence: for then he would never have commanded them but a little before, that he that hath two coats, let him ſell one and buy a ſword.* To this I anſwer, 1. That Chriſt might ſuffer, though *Peter* did reſiſt; as we know he did, and conſequently the hour of his ſuffering being come, could not make it in him a crime to reſiſt, if otherwiſe it were not. It might make Chriſt refuſe the help of his ſword, but not produce the Text proper to man-ſlayers againſt him, unleſs the fact in it ſelf were of that nature. 2. This patient manner of Chriſts ſuffering and prohibiting reſiſtance in his juſt defence, though it were then peculiar and by decree neceſſary to Chriſt, yet is it ſince become matter of example and neceſſary imitation to us, by force of that obſervation paſt upon it by Saint *Peter*, and entred into the Canon of our Scripture, 1 *Pet.* 2. 21. *Chriſt ſuffered for us, leaving us an example that we ſhould follow his ſteps, &c.* And this uſed as an argument to enforce on us that duty, *verſe* 18. of being ſubject not only to good and gentle, but alſo to froward Maſters. So that now thirdly, though that check had been peculiar to Saint *Peters* act cloathed with thoſe circumſtances, of being done when 'twas Chriſts hour of ſuffering; yet it will be obliging to us alſo, who are hereunto called, *verſe* 21. to ſuffer as patiently as Chriſt did. But then fourthly, we conclude not from any or all of this, that it ſhould be always unlawful for Chriſtians to uſe the ſword in their juſt defence: nor indeed, that it was unlawful then. Kings may and might ſubdue by the ſword their rebellious ſubjects: and private men might defend themſelves from private invaders, and beſides the proverbial

bial meaning of that ſpeech (*of ſelling a coat and buying a ſword*, whereby, ſay the Fathers, he foretold them the dangers impendent over their heads, ἵνα ἵνα ὁπλίσωνται (ἄπαγε) *Chryſ.* and adviſed them to provide for their own ſecurity) I ſhall not doubt to acknowledge that this liberty of private defenſive reſiſtance is authorized by that ſame Scripture: But the reſiſting of the Magiſtrate by the Subject is the thing that from Chriſts words to *Peter* we undertake to ſhew unlawful, and not any other reſiſtance, and that the ſwords were appointed by Chriſt to be bought to that purpoſe, is not attempted to be proved by Mr. *Marſhal*; and to ſuppoſe it without proof, is to affirm, that no man could invade, or be fit to be killed but Magiſtrates. The truth is, here is ſome art uſed, either by Maſter *Marſhal*, or ſome other artificer (intereſt, prejudice, or the like:) By Maſter *Marſhal* to deceive the Reader; or by that other to deceive the compoſer by uſing the phraſe of juſt defence againſt unjuſt violence (which every man grants lawful among private men) and concluding that not to be made unlawful by this Text (which we do not affirm) whereas all the diſpute is of reſiſting (not ſimply any man, but peculiarly) the Magiſtrate (and thoſe that come with authority from him) which we do affirm to be the very thing exemplified and rebuked in this Text, and ſo ſtill ſtands (by that reprehenſion of Chriſt) forbidden to us, in deſpight of Maſter *Marſhal*'s evaſions.

'Twill be now matter of wonder to any that all this Paper ſhould be ſpent in defence of this one Argument ſo briefly confuted and diſpatcht by Maſter *Marſhal*; but I ſhall anſwer that wonder too; Firſt, that at the entring on this examination of thoſe few, the neceſſity of this length of words was not foreſeen; Secondly, that though the eſcaping the force of this place would not be matter of triumph to Maſter *Marſhal*, becauſe there be other places of the New Teſtament produced by his Adverſaries, yet unanſwered; and one is enough to eſtabliſh a Chriſtian truth: yet the vindicating and clearing of this one from all exceptions, is the abſolute carrying the cauſe againſt him by that one: And therefore if this may be compaſſed, (which I am confident is by this diſcourſe) we may ſpare all further travel in this buſineſs: and command the Subjects ſword taken out (though upon ſuppoſition of juſt defence, how unjuſtly ſoever that be pretended) againſt the lawful Magiſtrate, to return to its ſheath again. I wiſh to GOD it would obey the command.

Tu verò diſcipuli & amorem pium & humilitatem conſidera: alterum enim ex diligendi fervore; alterum ex obedientiâ fecerat. Nam cùm audiſſet, Mitte gladium tuum in vaginam, ſtatim obtemperavit, & nuſquam poſtea iſtud fecit. Titus Boſtr. *in* Matth.

Non ſe ſed magiſtrum eſt ultus; præterea nondum perfectæ & conſummatæ virtutis erat. Quod ſi vis Petri *ſapientiam intelligere, videbis poſtea cæſum & ſexcentas injurias paſſum, nullis malis, nullis calamitatibus perturbatum, ſed manſuetè omnia tolerantem.* Euthym. *in* Johan.

Ille utitur gladio, qui nullâ ſuperiori ac legitimâ poteſtate vel jubente vel concedente, in ſanguinem alicujus armatur. Nam utique dominus juſſerat, ut ferrum diſcipuli ejus ferrent, ſed non juſſerat, ut ferirent. Quod ergo incongruum, ſi Petrus *poſt hoc peccatum factus eſt paſtor Eccleſiæ: ſicut* Moyſes *poſt percuſſum Ægyptium factus eſt rector iſtius Synagogæ? uterque enim non deteſtabili immanitate, ſed emendabili animoſitate juſtitiæ regulam exceſſit, uterque odio improbitatis alienæ; ſed ille fraterno, iſte Dominico, licet adhuc carnali, tamen amore peccavit.* Aug. *l.* 22. *cont.* Fauſt. Man. *c.* 70.

FINIS.

TO THE RIGHT HONOURABLE THE LORD FAIRFAX AND HIS Council of War, THE Humble Addreſs of HENRY HAMMOND.

My Lord, and Gentlemen,

HAving by the Weekly occurrences of your proceedings, not only taken notice of the weighty matters which you have of late choſen to be the ſubject of your Debates, ſuch as never any Council in this Kingdom are known to have taken into their cognizance, or conſideration; but withal, diſcern'd the chearful and hoſpitable reception of one mean Perſons advice, which pretended to have received ſome Counſel from God to communicate to you: And having alſo as ſincere a deſire and zeal to your good, (teſtified by my daily prayers to God, that he will incline your hearts to thoughts of true Chriſtian meekneſs and charity) and conſequently, as deep an intereſt in the due management of your affairs, as any others; and as great an aſſurance, that what I ſhall ſay to you, proceeds from a peaceable, and an humble ſpirit; and which tends more immediately to your welfare, and honour, both before God and man, than any thing which is known of late to have been repreſented to you; And laſtly, having among you ſome of the neareſt of my blood, whoſe eternal weal muſt needs be very dear and precious to me; I am in the fear of God, and the proſecution and diſcharge of my duty and conſcience, deſirous to make this ſhort addreſs to you, to deſire you, in the name, and in the bowels of *Jeſus Chriſt*, and by all the obligations of Chriſtian duty and Charity, to review ſome of the Principles by which you ſeem to be acted, and whereon to ground the high enterpriſes which you have now in hand.

And 1. whereas you ſeem to believe, that *God by his Spirit hath put it into your hearts to do what hitherto you have done, and what now you profeſs to deliberate to do further againſt His MAJESTY, and all others, who are now fallen into your hands*; I beſeech you to conſider, in the preſence of that God, to whoſe directions and Spirit you pretend, what ſafe ground you have for ſo doing: for, I ſhall ſuppoſe that the plain words of Scripture are not that voice of *the Spirit* which is your only guide in this matter; or if it be, I deſire that Charity from you for my ſelf and others, that you will point us out thoſe Scriptures: and I muſt profeſs to believe you bound in duty to God, and man, and to your ſelves, to ſatisfie this deſire, to produce that voice of *the Spirit* in the received Scriptures of God, which may ſay that to other Chriſtians alſo which it appears to do to you: But if *Gods Spirit* be by you conceived to have ſpoken to you any other way than in, or by ſome part of *the written Word*; Then my ſecond requeſt is, that you will declare to others the ground of this your perſwaſion, that you have received any ſuch Revelation from God; that ſo *that pretended Spirit* may according to *the rules preſcribed by God in his* acknowledged *Word* be tryed and examined regularly, *Whether it be of God or no*, before the ſubject-matter of ſuch Revelation be believed infallible, or accordingly built upon by you as your warrant or principle of acting any thing: For, there are *evil ſpirits* that come into the World, and which many times are by God permitted to ſeduce men, and that they may do ſo the better, they conſtantly *pretend* to come from God, and *aſſume* divine Authority to recommend and authorize their deluſions; (a thing ſo ordinary in all Ages, that the *Poet* that would expreſs the Imbroyling of a Kingdom, thinks he cannot do it better than by bringing in *Alecto, a Fury, with a Meſſage from Heaven, to avenge ſuch, or ſuch an injury*) And of theſe our *Saviour* forewarns us, and tells us, that *we ſhall know them by their fruits*; and ſo directs us to judge of the truth of their pretenſions by the goodneſs and commendableneſs, at leaſt, juſtifiableneſs of their *actions*, and not to judge of their *actions* by their *pretences*. And beſides theſe *evil ſpirits* from without, there is alſo an *evil ſpirit* within, a great deal of diſguiſed wickedneſs in the *heart* of man,

man, which when it remains unmortified in thoſe who believe themſelves to be *Gods choſen Saints, and taught by him*, is very apt to be miſtaken for an inclination of *Gods Spirit*, and *a flame of zeal*, when it is really the moſt contrary to it; and becauſe there is ſo much danger, that what is not fetcht from the acknowledged Word of God, may thus flow from one of theſe contrary principles, My next requeſt is, that it be conſidered, Whether when *an Angel from Heaven*, in caſe he ſhould *teach any other Doctrine, than what had been by Saint* PAUL *preached* to his *Galathians*, were to be *anathematized*, and when the judgments are ſo fearful, which are pronounced againſt them which *ſhall add to the words of that Prophecy*, which we now retain under the Title of the *Apocalyps* or *Revelation*, (which being the laſt Writing which is known to be *dictated by the Spirit*, may very probably contain a ſevere *denunciation* againſt all thoſe, who pretend to any *Revelation* or *Prophecy* after that, concerning the Chriſtian Church) whether, I ſay, it be not a matter of fear and juſt apprehenſion, to all thoſe, who ſhall affix, or impoſe upon *the Spirit of God* (or *pretend to be revealed* to them from that) any matter of Doctrine or Practice which acknowledges *not the Spirit of God* ſpeaking in the Scripture for its only warrant or foundation? Or laſtly, if from the Scriptures you conceive it may be proved, that any part of the *Unction* mentioned there ſo far belongs to you, that it ſhall ſurely *lead you into all truth*; then firſt, I beſeech you to conſider, whether you do not oblige your ſelves by the ſame, or ſome other Scripture to prove to others (and not only your ſelves to be perſwaded) that *you are thoſe ſpecial Saints of God*, to whom that priviledge peculiarly belongs, and as clearly to demonſtrate that all others who conceive that *that Unction* teaches them directly the contrary to that which you profeſs to be taught by it, are impious Perſons poſſeſt with that deluding Spirit, which I now deſire you to beware of. And ſecondly, to examine whether this differencing of your ſelves from others, this *bearing witneſs to your ſelves*, and *judging others* (beſide that it will look like an act of moſt *Phariſaical* Preſumption, and the very thing, which from *Simon Magus* downward, hath been obſerved in all Hereticks, calling themſelves *the Spiritual*, and all others *Animal, carnal Men)* will not be alſo a great injuſtice at this time toward them who pretend not to learn any thing from this Unction, but what they receive from the Doctrine of the Goſpel, in thoſe Books, which have in effect, and in the laſt reſult, the teſtimony of God from Heaven, that they are his true infallible Word, and dictate of his Spirit, and which deſire to make no other uſe of this to their own advantage, but only to preſerve them in a quiet poſſeſſion of what by Law belongs to them, and a capacity of making good their Allegiance to Him, to whom they have often by Law been required to ſwear it.

A ſecond Principle which I muſt deſire you to review, is that, upon which you conclude *that God hath born teſtimony to your cauſe by the many Victories which he hath given you*; This concluding of yours, firſt, proceeds upon a premiſe directly falſe in matter of fact: for, you ſay, *that the KING by taking up Arms* made *His appeal to Heaven*; which 'tis moſt certain that he never did, (but only uſed a ſtrength which God put in his hands to repel them, whom He looked on as His Subjects declining their duty to Him, and invading the ſetled Laws, and never referred the right of the Cauſe to be judged by the ſucceſs of His Arms) nor indeed could rationally have occaſion to do ſo, any more than any one of you would make ſuch appeal, when a violent Perſon ſhould invade, what you conceive to be your undoubted right: nor could He religiouſly, or Chriſtianly have done this, when thoſe Laws that allowed of ſuch appeals by *Ordeale*, or *Duel*, and the like, have been juſtly cenſured *as unchriſtian and barbarous*. Nay ſecondly, this concluding of yours will by the ſame reaſon infer that Chriſtianity is not, and that Mahumetiſm is the true Religion, becauſe when the Turks aſſerted one, and the Greek Church the other, and that difference begat a War betwixt them, 'tis clear that the Turks were ſucceſsful, and the Greek Church was moſt ſadly waſted and ſubdued by them, and ſo remaineth to this hour in that unreturn'd Captivity. Which will therefore be a fit opportunity to make you revert to the trying of that Spirit (which inclines you thus to argue) by this touch-ſtone, 1. by conſidering and examining whether in the written Word any thing be more frequent and viſible than *the ſufferings of Gods people*, the *ſhedding the blood of the Saints*, the faſtning all kind of contumelies on ſuch, particularly that reproach of [*thou bloody man*] upon *David*, who was a *King after Gods heart*, the *ſending* or permitting *an Hoſt againſt the daily ſacrifice to caſt down the truth to the ground, and to practiſe and proſper*. 2. Whether it were not *Rabſhekeh*'s Argument againſt the Peoples adhering to their lawful King *Hezekiah*, that his Maſters Arms had been invincible? 3. Whether that ſaddeſt fate of *Nebuchadnezzar*, who for conquering of God's People, and others, was by God ſtiled [*his Hammer, and Battleaxe of the whole earth,*] may not be expected the final lot of others alſo; firſt, *to deſtroy men*, and then to *be caſt out into the field, to inhabit among Beaſts?* 4. Whether it were not a crime complained of by the People of God, in thoſe, which, when God was a *little diſpleaſed*, did as Adverſaries *help forward this affliction?* And 5. Whether the Pſalmiſt lay not the like ill character on all, who *perſecute thoſe whom God hath ſmitten*, and *talk how they may vex them whom God hath wounded?* By all which it is moſt evident, (without any neceſſity of *defining* or *demonſtrating* any thing of *the juſtice of the Cauſe*) that moſt commonly *the proſperity of Arms* hath not been *the lot of the* moſt *righteous*, but that either the *chaſtiſement* of *the Sword* is thought fit to be *their diſcipline*, or *the comforts of Peace* (and not the triumphs of War) their *bleſſing in this life*.

The third Principle is, your perſwaſion *that the community of the People is the ſupreme power, and that the KING is inferiour to them, and to them accountable for his breach of Truſt, of which you now affirm Him guilty*. In this procedure of yours, there be many things worthy of your ſerious pondering: As whether, 1. *by Scripture?* or 2. *by Reaſon?* or 3. *by Story of times, it can be concluded, that the Supream Power was ever by God put into the hands of the community of the People?* For the firſt way of concluding it, (the teſtimony of Scripture) I cannot but take notice of one place, which hath been produced to that purpoſe, 1 *Pet.* 2. 13. *Be ſubject to every humane Ordinance, or Creature, or Creation*, &c. This place I have ſome reaſon to believe to carry ſome weight with you, becauſe it was ſix years ſince for the juſtifying the Cauſe againſt the *KING'S Party*, produced by a Perſon of great dexterity, That very Perſon, who hath *now undertaken to juſtifie your late proceedings* ſo far as

not only *to clear them from all blame*, but alſo to pretend to *demonſtrate the honour and worth of them*, and to lift them up to an high pitch, not only, 1. of a *bleſſed victory* (the higheſt that Chriſtians are appointed to aſpire to) *of overcoming evil by doing good:* But 2. *of calling to mens minds the unparallelable example of the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, who went down into the Chambers of death, from thence to bring up with him a loſt world:* And 3. *of being a lineament of the face of Divine goodneſs, in the doing good to ſo many, as well Enemies, as Friends:* And 4. *deſerving that place at the Table of Honour*, which the Roman Orator ſaith, *all Nations beſtowed on the Aſſertors of their Countries liberties, even next to the immortal Gods themſelves*: And 5. *of imitating the method of the warfare of Heaven, and ſeeking to reconcile a Nation to themſelves by not imputing their unthankfulneſs.* The largeneſs and exorbitancy of theſe expreſſions I was my ſelf ſo amaz'd at, that I cannot but mention them to you (by the way) as matters of horrour, which like the Peoples acclamation to *Herod*, or the *Lycaonians* to *Paul* and *Barnabas*, if they beget *not* in you a juſt indignation with the latter, may very probably bring the juſt fate of the former upon you, *to be eaten up with Worms*, (after you have been thus *deified*) now, that you have no other viſible Enemy but your ſelves, and ſuch Flatterers, (that I ſay no worſe) to appear againſt you. Having craved your pardon for this not unſeaſonable excurſion, I return now to the view of that Scripture, produced from Saint *Peter*, to prove *Kings* to be *a creation, or creature of men*, and *ſo their power to be derived from the People*. To which I Anſwer, 1. That there is a ſignal character in that very Text, that keeps it from concluding *the Supreme power to be originally in the People*, not only by calling *the King* in the end of that verſe, *Supreme*; ſuch as in Saint *Paul*'s divinity, *Rom.* 13. are affirmed to be *ordained of God*, and ſo no *humane Ordinance*: but alſo by diſtinguiſhing *the Governours*, verſe 14. from *the King* or *Supreme*, verſe 13. by this, *that the Governours are ſent by* (*i.e.* have Commiſſion from) *the King*, which might in like manner alſo be affirmed of *the King*, that he were ſent by the *People*, if He were the Creature, or creation of them, but is not ſo much as intimated by that Apoſtle; but on the contrary, *ſupremacy* affixt to Him, and *ſubjection* commanded to be paid Him (not for the *Peoples*, but for the *Lords ſake*) as ſubordination to, and *miſſion* from the *King*, is affirm'd of all other *Magiſtrates*. But then 2. to take away all colour of plea for *populacy* from this Text, it is to be obſerved what is the meaning of the Greek word in the New Teſtament, which is there rendred * *ordinance*, or *creature*, or *creation*. That word when it is ſet in its largeneſs without any reſtraint, ſignifies generally, *all mankind*, Gentiles, as well as Jews. Thus [*the creation*] and [*the world*] are all one and [*all the creation*] (or *every creature*) Mark 16. 15. the ſame with [*the whole world*] in the beginning of that Verſe, and [*all Nations*] in the parallel places of Saint *Matthew* and Saint *Luke*. And thus *Rom.* 8. 19. [*the expectation of the creature*, or *creation*] is the hope which the *heathen world* had, that at the *revelation* of the gracious priviledges of the *Meſſias*, they (*i.e.* the *Gentiles*) alſo ſhould be *freed from the ſlavery of corruption* (their villainous heathen ſins) *unto the liberty*, &c. that true liberty not from obedience to Superiours, but from ſlavery to luſts and paſſions, which Chriſt came to beſtow upon us; And ſo when *verſe* 22. 'tis added, that the *whole creation groans*, &c. the clear meaning is, that the *Gentiles* as well as *Jews*, did thus, as might be evidenced at large. Agreeable to this notion of the *whole creation*, or *every creature*, is the ſame phraſe (with the addition of *humane*, to take off all reſtraint, and to extend it as far as all mankind) to be underſtood, and ſo the meaning of the precept of Saint *Peter* to his *Jew-Chriſtians* is clearly this, and no more, that they muſt be *obedient* not only to *Chriſtian* Magiſtrates, but to *Gentiles*, *Heathen* alſo, (ſuch as they ſhould fall under in all their *diſperſions*) *i.e.* to all whatſoever they were, and that *for the Lords ſake* who conſtituted thoſe Heathens alſo, as Saint *Paul* ſaith. If to this it ſhall be objected, that by this way of interpreting, the precept will be extended ſo, as to ſubject us to *all Heathens*, and not only to *Magiſtrates*: I anſwer, that this, which is the only objection againſt this interpretation, is of little force, and is anſwered, 1. by obſerving the word [*be ſubject*] which relating to *Magiſtrates*, will require our obedience to none but thoſe, as *verſe* 17. when he commands to *honour all*, it muſt be underſtood, all to whom *honour belongs*; Superiours, not Inferiours: or as, when *chap.* 5. 5. he commands them to be *ſubject to one another*, it muſt not be underſtood, that the *Superiour* muſt be ſubject to the *Inferiour*, as the *Inferiour* to the *Superiour*, but as the nature of the duty inforces to interpret, the *Inferiour* to be ſubject to the *Superiour* only: and 2. by the Apoſtles expreſs enumeration of thoſe to whom this obedience muſt be paid in the end of the Verſe, *to the King as Supreme*, and then *verſe* 14. to *Governours*, as inferiour Magiſtrates *ſent by Him*. That this is the full importance of that place, may (if there be any need) farther appear by the occaſion of the Apoſtles diſcourſe, which was confuting of the vile Sect of Chriſtians then calling themſelves *Gnoſticks*, (as a title of great perfection of *knowledge in the Myſteries of Heaven*) who taught the doctrine of *liberty and manumiſſion to Chriſtian Subjects or Servants*, from Heathen (yea and *Chriſtian*) *Maſters* and *Kings*; To which falſe doctrine of theirs this Exhortation thus interpreted is directly contrary (and cannot otherwiſe be pertinent to it) and very coherent to that Admonition in the 12. *verſe* immediately preceding, of *having their converſation good among the Gentiles, that they might not ſpeak ill of them as evil Doers*; which they would be juſtly apt to do, in caſe they ſhould withdraw their *obedience to their lawful Princes*, as ſoon *as they were become Chriſtians*; which, by the way, lays a very ill character upon thoſe, who by pretence of *Chriſtianity or Piety*, ſeek, or claim to themſelves any other *liberty* than what by the *Laws* under which they are born, doth confeſtly belong unto them.

* Κτίσις.

Having thus far enlarged to clear that teſtimony of Scripture, and not knowing of any other which is thought favourable to your pretenſion, I ſhall, inſtead of retorting the multitude of plain places directly oppoſite, which will abundantly take away all force from this, proceed next to the ſecond plea, that of *Reaſon*. And there I ſhall deſire you to conſider, 1. Whether if *Adam* had never fallen, and his Poſterity remained in the ſame *innocence*, they would not yet have been capable of *poſitive precepts* in order to civil life; and conſequently, whether in reaſon ſome one or more men ſhould not have had ſuperiority over all others, Parents over Children, and the like; and to this purpoſe, whether the divers Orders, and ſubordination of the Angels, that never fell, be not an evidence that even in ſtate of innocence, God deſigned ſuperiority, not equality. But then 2.

The

The paſſions of men being by ſin grown irregular, and ſo needing Rules and Laws, and Rulers and Law-makers, it was both reaſonable, that God ſhould, and is moſt certain that he did deſign and appoint Government (as appears by what is ſaid by God to the firſt Woman, and ſecond Man, to *Eve*, *Gen.* 3. 16. and to *Cain*, *Gen.* 4. 7.) and ſo gave not all men that freedom which is the ſuppoſed foundation of that Doctrine, which places *Supreme power in the People*. And of any rational Perſon, that yet thinks he did give this freedom to all mankind, I ſhould but ask this one Queſtion, *Whether ever any man were by God or nature inveſted with power of his own Life?* I mean, *with power to take away his own Life, or to kill himſelf?* in every thing elſe Man may be believed to have a power over himſelf, over his Body, to cut or lance it, when that is for his turn, and particularly over that *freedom* which naturally belongs to him; whatever the degree of that be, a man may by act of his own will, part with it irreverſibly. Thus might the *Jew* under Gods own Government give himſelf up wholly into the power of his *Maſter*, and by having his *Ear bored thorow*, become from a *Freeman*, a *Slave for ever*; and generally thorow the whole World the courſe hath been the ſame, that he which is moſt free hath power over his own liberty ſo to deveſt himſelf of it, as that it ſhall never revert to him again; and our *Saviour* that is thought to have brought *liberty* into the World, doth yet, by the quality of moſt of his *precepts*, given to Chriſtians by himſelf and his Apoſtles, mark out this condition of *ſubjection* to them, as that under which they were generally to live, and from which the *Chriſtian Profeſſion* ſhould be ſo far from freeing them, that the ſtrict practice of *obedience* to Heathen Rulers or Maſters, is oft preſcribed as a ſpecial means to advance Chriſts main end, to magnifie and promote the Goſpel. But for power over a mans own *life* no man can be believed to be born with it, for if he were, he might then as lawfully *kill himſelf* (and if he might do it *lawfully*, there are many caſes which might make it *prudent* for him to do it at ſome times) as *pulling out an aking Tooth*, or diſpoſe of his Liberty or Eſtate out of his own Poſſeſſion; a thing which no Chriſtian hath ever thought lawful, but made this *felonia de ſe*, this ſelf-murther, or felony againſt ones ſelf, a crime, as contrary to the ſixth Commandment, as *the killing of any other man*. Having proceeded thus far, I ſhall now take that for granted, which, that I know of, is denied by none, I am ſure, which is not denied in the publiſh'd ſcheme of the deſigned *Repreſentative*, *viz. that the Supreme power includes the Power of Life* (I mean not ſuch an *Arbitrary power of killing whom they pleaſe without ſin*, but *a power of putting capital Malefactors to death*, and ſo a power over every (call it *Subjects* or *Freemans*) *life* in caſe of *Capital crime:*) And the granting of this (as 'tis too viſible that it is by you a granted *truth*) being added to the former, doth to me irrefragably conclude, that *the Supreme power* neither is, nor can be in the *community of the People*, or in their *Repreſentative*, by force meerly of *their original*, or *natural liberty*; The inference is clear, becauſe *the power of life* which is part of *the Supremacy*, is not part of *that natural liberty*, and therefore is neither inherent naturally in that *Community of men*, (which is but, in other words, ſo many particular men together, indowed with that *power* (and no more) which every man hath *ſingly* over himſelf) nor conſequently by them communicable to any *Repreſentative*. And by this alſo it appears, that *ſupreme Magiſtracy*, whereſoever 'tis truly placed, is the *Ordinance*, and *creation of God*, (who alone hath *power* of all mens *lives*) and not of *man*, who hath no *power* of his *own*, much leſs of any others life, any farther than he is a *Repreſentative*, or *Proxy*, or *Deputy of God*, (who hath that *Power*) not of *the People*, who have it *not*. For it is poſſible I may put you in mind of an evident truth, which perhaps you have not taken notice of; That, as the *original* of *Government* in any particular place cannot be imagined to be by any more than two ways, Either by *Gods deſignment*; or, *the Peoples act*; ſo in either of thoſe two caſes 'tis *God* only, and not the *People*, that gives the *power of the Sword*, or *power of Life* to the *Governour:* when *God himſelf* ſets a *King* over men 'tis ſo clear that *He* thus impowers *that King*, that *that* need not be proved; and when the *community of a People* (ſuppoſe in the *Original*, ten men in the *freedom of nature*) *chuſe* one of themſelves, or more to rule over them, 'tis clear, they do not inveſt Him with more *power* than themſelves had; and that He that was thus choſen by them, hath the *power of Life* over any of them (which they ſingle, or all together in the *community* had not) muſt needs come from ſome other, and not from them; and if you will know *from whom it comes*, I Anſwer, that it comes from *Gods appointment* (for the œconomy of the World) that the *ſupreme Magiſtrate* ſhall as *his Deputy* have *this power from God communicated to Him*, as an endowment neceſſary *to that power* which is deſigned *to protect, and govern others*. And in caſe it were the act of the *People*, and not of *God* immediately, that *deſigns* or *nominates* the *Perſon* to that Office, yet doth not this *nomination* beſtow this *power*, but *God* who alone *hath* that power, beſtows it on him who is thus *nominated*. In this caſe all that the *People* beſtow, or part with by their act is their *own liberty*, or that part of it of which they voluntarily deveſt themſelves, that they may by *obedience* empower Him, whom they have ſet over them; and that they may reaſonably part with for that greater benefit of *protection from him*, which, while *he is obeyed by all*, he may by their united *obedience* to his commands be able to afford them, and could not probably without it; now this giving up their *liberties* to one, or more, makes that man, or men a *Ruler* over them; and being a *Ruler*, to him belongs (derived from *God*, not from *them*) that *power of life, and death*, which Gods forementioned decree hath enſtated on the *Supreme power*, or *Ruler*; who is therefore in that relation (of *Avenger for wrath*, or puniſhment) ſtiled by the *Apoſtle*, *The Miniſter of God*, *Rom.* 13. and not of the *People*. By this it appears that (for the original of power) the utmoſt that comes from the *People*, is that of which they have the *power*, till by ſome act of Gods, or their own, they have parted with it, the liberty or power of their *Perſons* (or in ſome ſort and degree, as they ſhall part with it, of their *bodies*, or *poſſeſſions* in like manner) but not of their *lives*; For that other is of an higher origination; and therefore, ſuppoſing the *power* they had parted with, ſhould, upon any emergent, revert to them again, yet the *power of life and death*, or of the *Sword* can never revert, becauſe it never proceeded from them; but as the *ſoul* that came from *God* doth, at the falling of the *body* back to its elements, or earth, from which it was firſt taken, *return to the hands of God that gave it*; ſo the *power of life*, the *prerogative* firſt, and then *the gift* or inveſtiture of *God*, muſt at the diſſolution of any Government,

and

and the ſuppoſed *reverting* to its principles again, return to its proper fountain, to *God*, and none but him. And to imagine it to devolve to the community of the People, is the ſame unreaſonable, as to conceive the *immortal ſoul*, that one beam of *divinity* (as this *power of Life and Death* is another) to accompany the Carkaſe to the Grave alſo. I have inſiſted the longer on this to make the *miſtake* the more palpable, and the more impoſſible not to be diſcerned by you; and if I could foreſee any colour of reaſon, that could poſſibly pretend againſt this evidence, I ſhould yet enlarge yours, and my own trouble, to diſcover it; but being, I profeſs, unable to mention any thing, which the grounds, which are already laid, have not prevented, I ſhall now proceed to the third and laſt way of examining this truth,

By the Hiſtory of times, and there I ſhall be forced to retract, at leaſt to ſuſpend the acknowledging of that, which that I might examine it by reaſon, I was willing to *ſuppoſe*, but not *grant*, and ſhall now demand,

1. Whether by any authentick *ſtory* it appears, that there ever were any Nation or People in the World, who can be preſumed or proved to have had this *Supreme power* veſted in the *whole community originally*, or from their firſt coming together? or if ſo, whether *Gods* judgment ſo viſibly interpoſed, and the example of his inſtituting of *Judges*, and of *Kings*, (neither of them accountable to the People) be not to be preferred before all ſuch precedents?

2. If 'twere granted, that in ſome *one*, or more places the *power* hath been *originally* in the People, yet it will never appear by the originals of *all*, or of *this* Kingdom, that in *all* or in *this* it was ſo; or if men will ſtill *opiniate*, and affirm againſt the evidence of the *Laws*, and *conſtitution* of this Kingdom, and againſt thoſe *Oaths* which have for ſo many years acknowledged the ſeat of *the Supremacy in the King*, and *not in the People*; yet that, which is ſo falſe in matter of fact, being taken for truth alſo, there will again be matter of enquiry, in point of *reaſon*, which will deſerve your farther moſt ſerious pondering:

1. Whether, after that the *People* have upon deliberation, and from *choice* intruſted ſome *one* or *more* Perſons, (in any certain courſe *of ſucceſſion* by *Law* deſigned) to *Rule over them*, and after the *Law* hath declared the *perſon* of that *Supreme Magiſtrate* not to be *accountable*, but his *Miniſters* only, (which may be a *prudence* of State, more advantagious to a peoples peace, than poſſibly is well underſtood) whether, I ſay, in this caſe any number of men whatſoever, can, upon any pretence, *recall* that *Truſt*, and *void* that *Law*, by which that KING, and His Heirs for ever, were conſtituted the *Ruler* of them? or if they might, whether this were not moſt contrary to the *end* of all Government, *quiet, and peace*, and probably the parent of all *confuſion* in the World, which is much worſe than the *hardeſt ſubjection*?

Nay 2. if it ſhould be granted ſtill, that the *community of people* have power to *recal*, or void *that truſt*, yet 'twill be matter of more than doubt again, whether at *this* time in *this* Kingdom there be any way for the *whole community* to act, or whether it can by any man be reaſonably believed, that what is *now* done, is *acted* by the *community of the People*.

For if (to that purpoſe) it be conceived, that the *Houſe of Commons* is (or that the two Houſes together are) the *Repreſentative* of *all* the *People*; Then firſt, it is to be conſidered that there is a great number of men in this *Kingdom*, that are *not* repreſented by *theſe*, and who never put (nor can by any interpretation be thought to have put) into their hands that *power*, which is ſuppoſed to be in every *Free Commoner* in this Kingdom. 2. That you your ſelves have expreſt your opinion, that this, which now is, is an *unequal Repreſentative*, and have on that Conſideration thought your ſelves obliged to *propound* another Form. 3. 'Tis ſure, that (whatever *poſſibly might* have been) yet they, that have ever till this time choſen *Knights* or *Burgeſſes* to the *Parliament*, did never actually put into their hands, as into their *Repreſentatives*, *all* that *power*, which (in this caſe of the *Peoples* being the *Supreme Power*) is naturally ſuppoſed to be veſted in them, but only a power of *doing* thoſe things, for which the Writ (ſent out under the *Broad Seal*) did command them to be returned, *i.e. to conſult with the KING of the difficult affairs of the Kingdom*, not to *ſettle any part of it without, or againſt Him.* And 4. 'Tis clear, that in ſuch an acknowledged conjuncture of time as this is, a *ſmall* (far leſs) *part* of thoſe that were *returned* by the Countries, cannot be ſaid to be that entire company, or body, by which the *whole community* is repreſented: Or if it be ſaid, that the *godly People of the Land*, who by *Petitions* to the *General*, the *Lord Fairfax*, have expreſt their deſires, that *Juſtice* be executed upon thoſe, whom they call *Delinquents*, are to be reputed as the *community of the People*; then firſt, it will be clear, that thoſe that have ſo *Petitioned* (beſide, that they are moſt of the body of the *Army*) are not the thouſandth part of the people of this *Kingdom*, and therefore cannot by any rule of Judgment or Eſtimation be reputed as the whole *Community*; and if this *precedent* might be admitted, that a *few* perſons, under the title of the *Godly*, may pretend to the right of the *whole*, 'tis very well worth foreſeeing, how *dangerous* ſuch *examples* may prove to the *peace* of Poſterity. 2. All the evidence of their *godlineſs* that we can perceive, is only the deſiring *liberty* for themſelves and others, and therefore *Juſtice* on thoſe who ſtand in their way to that *liberty*; and I conceive it demonſtrable that a quiet *ſubmiſſion* and *obedience*, and a deſire not to caſt off their *duty*, but ſtill to continue under it, rather than to be their own *carvers*, or contrivers of *liberty*, is a far ſurer ſign of *true godlineſs*. And thirdly, there hath yet been no fair indifferent means uſed to know whether there be not far greater numbers of ſuch *godly* meek men, who would rather deſire that the KING ſhould be reſtored to His Government, than that any courſe ſhould be taken by any, *without* or *againſt the* KING. And the plain truth is, that if you will go on in the courſe you are in, and yet deſire freely to appear, and be accounted the *Conſervers*, and not *Conquerours* of the *liberty* of your Country-men, if you will not impoſe upon the People, as you ſay *Kings* have done; Nothing can be more ſutable to thoſe *pretences*, than to *declare moſt publickly*, that it ſhall be free for every man to *ſubſcribe*, whether he doth deſire this total *change* by you tendred in the draught of your *Repreſentative*, or the continuance of the preſent eſtabliſhed Government, (with an aſſurance of your ſubmiſſion thereunto.) 4. 'Tis (upon ſuppoſition that all *power is originally* in the *People*) moſt undeniable and clear, that nothing but the *conſent* of each

perſon

perſon (at leaſt of a *major part* of the whole being convoked together) can devеſt any one, or more men of that their ſuppoſed *Original right*; and conſequently, that other mens ſaying that they are not *Godly*, and that themſelves are ſo, can never exclude them from their *Birthright*; By which it will infallibly be concluded, that all thoſe that have adhered to the KING all this time, or that favour'd the *Votes of the two Houſes*, which reſolved the KING's late Conceſſions at *Newport* to be a fit ground of peace (whatſoever cenſure or brand is by you ſet upon them) are as much to be conſidered to the making up the *community* of the *People*, as any others. And if ſo, Let it then be conſidered by all equal minded men, what a *violation* it is of thoſe *Rights*, which you pretend to vindicate, what an invaſion of the *natural freedom* of your Brethren (by you acknowledged, the *inheritance* of *each* man) to force them againſt their *wills*, with their very great incommodation and detriment, to *revert* to that *liberty*, which is by you ſuppoſed to belong to all *naturally*, but without which we of this Nation have happily lived, under the far greater advantages of *Regal government*. And yet ſo contrary to this *principle* have you now proceeded, that when you have thus thrown us back into our firſt *chaos* again, only that you may reduce our *liberty*, you then immediately by your *Repreſentative* ſo bind us up, that we are not permitted, upon whatſoever emergency, to caſt our ſelves into any *new form*, although the exchange ſhould appear never ſo advantagious, and gainful to us; which, beſides, that it is an evidence of your inward *fear*, that the change now deſigned will be ſoon repented of again, is certainly ſo far from being an *enlarging*, that it is the *retrenching* of our *liberty*, and denying us that *freedom*, of which the moſt *barbarous* and the moſt *civilized* People have been equally partakers, when ſubjection ſeemed better for their turns. As beſide the examples of the *Servants* in *Exodus*, which are there ſuppoſed ſometimes to prefer their ſervitude to their Maiters before the priviledge of the *Sabbatick year*, we find practiſed by the *Campanians*, who voluntarily caſt themſelves at the feet, and ſurrendred themſelves into the power of the *Romans*, to purchaſe thereby that right of being *protected* by them; and by many *Barbarians* in *Appian*, who ſent *Embaſſadours* to *Rome* on purpoſe to petition the favour of being receiv'd into the number of their *ſubjects*.

I have inſiſted the longer upon this, in obedience to your own *invitation*; which was alſo a great *motive* and *encouragement* to make this whole *addreſs* to you, and gives me aſſurance of your kind *reception* of it.

The laſt principle to be review'd is this, That there having been much *blood* ſpilt in this Kingdom in the late Wars, there muſt now be ſome *ſacrifice* offer'd to *God* (*i. e.* ſome more *blood* ſhed) for the *expiation* of that ſin of *blood-guiltineſs*, before *God* can be *pacified*, or *reconciled* to the *Land*. On which particular, it will firſt be worth your ſerious enquiry, how it ſhould appear that that great iſſue of *blood*, let out in the late Wars (which hath with great reaſon been lookt on, as the ſharpeſt of *Gods plagues*, and the ſaddeſt part of *puniſhment* of the former ſins of this Nation) is now the main, and only, *ſin* of the Land, with which God is not *reconciled*: Or 2. if it were ſuppoſed to be ſo, yet how it can be thought that a *general Reformation* of that ſin, an *humiliation* before God for it, through the whole Land, and a *reſolution* never to *ſpill one drop* more, were not a more *Chriſtian* probable means to *pacifie God*, than the proceeding in cold blood to the *effuſion* of *more*: The *blood* of *men* being never thought a fit ſacrifice for any, but the evil Spirit; and *peaceable-mindedneſs*, and *charity*, and the *contrite heart* being the ſpecial, if not only *ſacrifices*, which we find mention'd in the Goſpel. Or 3. how it can appear that if *God* require any ſuch *ſacrifice*, you, or any but thoſe whom the known Laws of the Land have placed in a Tribunal (and that legally erected for ſuch *cognizances*) have any right to put your ſelves into the office of *Gentile Prieſts*, as the only Perſons appointed to *ſlay that ſacrifice*. Nay 4. it will be worth your Obſerving, that *Chriſt* diſclaimed the *office* of a *Judge*, and thereby rendred it very unfit for any of you to put your ſelves into that *office* by vertue of no other title, but that of being his *Diſciples*. And laſtly, it is worth your ſaddeſt thoughts, whether by your preſent *Counſels*, and the *neceſſity* by you ſuppoſed of *changing* the *former Government*, it do not now appear, that the *defence* of the *eſtabliſhed Laws* was on the KING's part the occaſion of His taking *Arms*, and on *Your* parts, the deſign of *altering* thoſe *Laws*, and introducing *others* more ſutable to your inclinations. And if now by a *civil* or *martial* courſe, in an *arbitrary* way of trial, contrary to the *Laws* eſtabliſhed, it ſhould be by you thought fit to proceed to *blood* againſt thoſe whoſe engagements have been for the *defence* of thoſe *eſtabliſht Laws*, Let it be conſider'd, how *impolitick* this may be, and what matter of *diſcouragement* to all that ſhall be intruſted with the managery, or *defence* of future *Government*: Which ſingle conſideration will, I hope, abate much of your deſigned *ſeverity*. But if *God* would permit you to go on undiſturb'd to the *ſhedding* of *more blood*, as the *Jews* did from other lower acts to the *crucifying their King*, How poſſible were it, not only that this ſhould prove the provoking of *God* to *deliver you up for ever to your own hearts* luſts, but be to the whole *Nation* a *filling up the meaſure of your iniquities*, and the fore-runner of all the *calamities*, that can befall a People.

Having mention'd the *weakneſs*, and *fallibleneſs* of theſe few *principles*, I ſhall leave you to the farther conſideration of the *frailneſs*, and *danger* of thoſe *ſuperſtructures*, which ſhall be erected on any, or all of theſe. And if there were never a *God* in the world to avenge them, yet the experience now before your eyes, how eaſie it is for *principles* taken up for mens preſent *advantages* to prove within a while moſt *diſadvantageous*, and pernicious to them (as the *weapons* of a *diſarmed man* turn'd into his *own breaſt*) may infuſe into you that *fear* and *temper*, that *caution* and *moderation*, and timely *wiſdom*, which the Authour of this Addreſs may be otherwiſe too unskilful to *impreſs* on you: Who yet, if he might any way be uſeful to you, doth profeſs to be ready to contribute his utmoſt endeavour to your ſervice, if it be but thereby to demonſtrate to you, how *juſt* it is for him (and what a *duty*, and *obligation* of *charity* toward you) to intercede daily at the *throne of grace*, that *God* would *mollifie* your hearts toward the KING, and all His *conſcientious faithful* Subjects, or elſe interpoſe his *hand*, to reſcue his *Royal Perſon* out of your *power*; believing confi-

dently,

dently, that, if God have any remainders of *mercy* for this *Kingdom*, or the true *Proteſtant profeſſion* in it, he will in his good time hear and anſwer this prayer of all true *Engliſhmen*, and among them of

Your Lordſhips humble Servant,

Jan. 15. 1648.

H. HAMMOND.

FINIS.

A VINDICATION OF Dr. *HAMMOND'S* Addreſs.

THE late Authour of the *Original, and End of Civil Power*, under the name of *Eutactus Philodemius*, hath thought fit to queſtion two things ſet down by Doctor *Hammond* in his *Addreſs to the General, and Council of War*. The firſt is this Affirmation, *That the Jew under Gods own Government might wholly give up himſelf, and his Freedom to his Maſters will (the power of life being only exempted) and by having his ear bored, might of a Free-man become a Slave for ever.*

§. 2. The ſecond is this Queſtion, *Whether ever any man was by God or Nature inveſted with power over his own Life*, i. e. *to take away his own life, or to kill himſelf?*

§. 3. This *Affirmation*, and this *Queſtion*, he willingly acknowledges, and is content that the *Queſtion* ſhall be interpreted a down-right *Negation*, *That never any man was by God or Nature inveſted with power over his own life, or power to kill himſelf.* And having thus confeſt the citation, as far as concerns him, it remains that I proceed to juſtifie both parts of it. And to that end, I ſhall think my ſelf ſufficiently fortified by two advantages, which that *Author* hath been pleaſed to allow me in this matter.

§. 4. Firſt, that it is not any opinion of Doctor *Hammond*, but the plain words of *Scripture*, which are, under his name, thus oppoſed by this Author in both places. The former is *in terminis*, *Exod.* 21. at the beginning. *If the ſervant ſhall plainly ſay, I love my Maſter, &c. I will not go out free, Then his Maſter ſhall bring him to the Judges, &c. And his Maſter ſhall bore his ear thorow with an awle, and he ſhall ſerve him for ever.* And again, *Deut.* 15. 16. *And it ſhall be, if he,* (i. e. *the ſervant ſet free at the Sabbatick year*) *ſay unto thee, I will not go away from thee, &c. Then thou ſhalt take an awle, and thruſt it thorow his ear unto the door, and he ſhall be thy ſervant for ever; and alſo to thy hand-maid thou ſhalt do likewiſe.*

§. 5. That a plain place of *Scripture* ſhould be thus miſtaken for an Aſſertion of Doctor *Hammond*, I am not permitted to ſuſpect, becauſe that *Author* hath to his mention of the Doctors Name added the teſtimony of *Gen.* 21. which, though it be a miſtake, I ſuppoſe, of the Printer, for *Exod.* 21. will yet be a competent teſtimony of that *Authors* opinion, that Doctor *Hammond* had *Moſes* on his ſide, and conſequently, that both were to be involv'd by him in the ſame condemnation.

§. 6. The ſame, I ſuppoſe, I may aſſume of the other *Negation* queſtioned by him, and 'tis in Doctor *Hammond*, but the repeating of the fixth Commandment [*Thou ſhalt not kill*] according to the latitude wherein all Jewiſh and Chriſtian Writers have interpreted it to the prohibition of *ſelf-murther*, as hath been ſhewed by him at large in another place.

Pract. Cat. l. 2. ſect. 5.

§. 7. Having mentioned this firſt *advantage* againſt this *Author*, ſufficient certainly to ſecure Doctor *Hammond* from his blame, and to make any *Apologie* for him unneceſſary, and well-nigh ſcandalous, (the *Word* of *God* being able to plead its own cauſe, without the aſſiſtance of any humane *Advocate*) I have yet the benefit of a ſecond kindneſs allowed me by this unknown adverſary; which, though *Scripture* were not of Authority with him, would encourage the Doctor not to fear the falling under his diſpleaſure. That is, the unreconcileableneſs of thoſe two opinions (the one with the other) which he is pleaſed to confront to Doctor *Hammond*, *viz.* that it ſhould be *unlawful* for a *Jew* to give up his *Freedom*, (and that *ſervitude* ſhould be, as he calls it, an *unnatural ſervitude*) and

and yet that it ſhould be put in his power by *God* and *Nature* (for that is to affirm it *lawful*, and agreeable to *Nature*) to take away his own *Life*, or to kill himſelf. For it being by *Job* mentioned as an *Aphoriſm* of common Nature, that a man will *for his life give all he hath*; and in the accounts and practices of all men, that of *Liberty* being part of that *all*; It will conſequently be unreaſonable, and impoſſible for him that hath once affirmed the parting with ones freedom to be an *unnatural ſervitude*, to deny the *killing of himſelf* to be an *unnatural murther*: And therefore, having ſo fair advantages before me, not only the *Scripture in terminis* on my ſide, but this *Adverſary*, by ſo eaſie a conſequence, become my *Second* alſo, I am (not unwillingly) perſwaded to tender a brief reply to thoſe reaſons, which ſeem to have drawn this Author into this caſual diſpute; and to endeavour the preventing of thoſe Errours, to which, a *Philodemius*, or *popular* Diſputer may in ſuch an Age of *Licentiouſneſs* betray others.

§. 8. To the caſe of the *Jewiſh Servant*, giving up his *freedom* to his *Maſter*, (which was by the Doctor mentioned out of *Moſes*) the Author hath framed three *Anſwers*.

§. 9. The firſt, *That it cannot be affirmed upon good and pregnant grounds, that from Nature the Jew had any ſuch power, but that God only permitted it to be ſo; and the Jew, by this unnatural ſervitude to his Maſter, was a fit type of that ſlavery that man ſhould be in unto Sin, to obey it in the luſts thereof; for his ſervants we are whom we obey.*

§. 10. To this I anſwer, That the affirmation of *Moſes* in the Scripture, [That this was *permitted by God* to the *Jews*,] is to me a *good and pregnant ground* that the *Jew* had this power under *Gods own Government*, which is all that he affirms to be affirmed by Doctor *Hammond* in that place; and therefore, the putting in thoſe other words [*Of the Jews not having it from Nature*] ſeems to be on purpoſe deſigned to take off from the *clearneſs*, and the *pregnancy* of the probation, and ſo only to darken, but not to invalidate the argument.

§. 11. But then ſecondly, I add, that *Gods permitting* any thing to any man, is a *pregnant* argument, that from *Nature* that man *hath that power*: If by *Power* we mean a *moral power*, or *power* of doing it *without ſin*; And if by *Gods permiſſion* we underſtand his *Approbation*, as of a lawful fact. For, thus it is certain, that *God* never ſo *permits*, as to *approve* (or not prohibit) any thing, which by the *Law of Nature* may not be done *without ſin*. For the *Law of Nature* being the *Law of God*, as truly as any *poſitive Law* of his promulgating; and *God* in all his *Laws* being conſtant to himſelf, ſo far as never to *prohibit*, and *permit* the ſame thing at the ſame time to the ſame men; It is moſt certain, that what *God* thus *permits*, *Nature permits* alſo, *i. e.* leaves it *lawful* to be done, or poſſible without *Sin*.

§. 12. But if by *Permiſſion* this *Author* means no more than diſpenſation, or grant of preſent *Impunity*, ſuch as in the *Jewiſh* Common-wealth was (for the *hardneſs of their hearts*) allowed in the buſineſs of *Divorce*, or (for the multiplying of them) in *Polygamie*, then it will ſure reſt upon him to *prove*, and not only (as he ſaith) to *ſuppoſe*, that God thus (and thus only) permitted it to be ſo: But this I ſhall ſuppoſe impoſſible to be proved, though it cannot lie upon me to demonſtrate the *Negative*, nor ſhall I ſo much fear the probableneſs of his unprov'd groundleſs *ſuppoſition*, as to endeavour it. For indeed, what degree of *likeneſs* is there betwixt thoſe *divorces* and *polygamies*, (which were ſuch inordinate *Liberties*) and this other of diveſting himſelf of *Liberty*? Only the ſame that is betwixt two *Contraries*.

§. 13. I ſhall not need further to inſiſt on this, both for the plain words of *Scripture*, and becauſe it is the acknowledgment of this very Authour, *pag.* 18. *That this may lawfully be done for the obtaining of a greater good*; which being compared with *Rom.* 3. *ver.* 8. makes up a demonſtration, that a man hath this *power*, *i. e.* that he may *lawfully* do it. For 'tis not the intuition of the greateſt *moral good*, much leſs of the greateſt *advantage* to my ſelf or any other, that may make that *lawful* which in it ſelf is *unlawful*, or which by *nature* man hath not *power* to do.

§. 14. And therefore, when he adds, [*That in this the Jew was a fit type of mans ſlavery to ſin*] as 'twill be eaſily granted, that he was (as *type* ſignifies *Image* or *Embleme*) ſo ſure it will not prove that this *ſervitude* of the *Jew* was an *unnatural ſervitude*, any more than any other parts of the *Judaical* Law, (which either in the intention of the *Law-giver*, or by the wit of Man can be made an Image of any preſent ſtate or condition of men) can by that one Argument be proved to be *unnatural*. For, ſure all *types* are not by that one evidence of their being *types* demonſtrated to be *ſinful*, eſpecially when they are inſtituted or permitted by *God*, and by that appear to be agreeable to his *will*, in *oppoſition* to, or *variation* from which, all *ſin* or *obliquity* conſiſts: Or if this charge muſt fall ſingly on this *Type*, but not on all others, (as ſure the *Paſſover*, which was a *type*, was not yet *unnatural*, and ſo of the reſt) then muſt this charge be proved by ſome other *medium*, than by this only, that it is a *Type*; and till that be produced, I muſt think this way of diſcourſe (which firſt ſuppoſes this giving up of the *Jews Liberty* to be a *Type*, and then concludes it *unnatural* for being ſuch) to be the proving of *quidlibet ex quolibet*; the ſame with his, which firſt ſuppoſes a live man to be a Picture, and then ſends him a challenge for being ſuch: Certainly ſuch reaſoning is too very looſe, and light, to ſet any good *Character* on that cauſe that wants ſuch ſupporters.

§. 15. His ſecond anſwer is yet a little more ſtrange, and ſuch as could not yet eaſily have been foreſeen, or expected; That his having his *ear bored*, *was a puniſhment for his contempt of that Liberty*, &c. 'Tis ſufficiently known that this *boring of the ear* was the ceremony of receiving a *Servant* among the *Jews*; and therefore, when *David* ſaith of Chriſt, *But mine ear haſt thou opened*, 'tis acknowledg'd, that thereby was denoted his *taking on him the form of a ſervaut*. This *boring of the ear with an awle* was no very painful thing, ſure not ſo much as *Circumciſion*; and yet 'twould be a little ſtrange, that when a *Proſelyte* was received among the *Jews* with *Circumciſion*, that ſhould be deemed a puniſhment on him for his not continuing a *Gentile*, or that his Converſion to Judaiſm, of which this was the *Ceremony*, ſhould be thereupon counted an unnatural Sin: The *anſwering* ſuch Arguments as theſe, would require a more chearful and pleaſant humour, than the *times*, or *occaſion* of theſe debates will well permit.

§. 16. The laſt *Anſwer* looks a little more demurely, *That his giving himſelf up to be a ſlave for ever, did refer to, and terminate in the year of Jubilee*, &c. *and that he did not make himſelf irrecoverably a ſlave*, &c. [*That this was to terminate in the year of Jubilee*] is ſaid without farther proof, than only of this unteſtified affirmation in a *parentheſis*, *That that was the year of his freedom from that ſervitude which the corruption of his own will had brought upon him:* which is the *proving* a thing by a bare *repeating* of it in other words, and only throwing a little *dirt* upon it. For how doth it appear that it is a piece of *Corruption* (for a man that *loves his Maſter*, as the Text ſaith, and is better pleaſed with his ſervice, than with his former liberty) thus to chooſe that which he likes beſt? Or how comes the *caſting off Liberty* to be a *corruption of the will*, when *caſting off yokes*, and *ſervitude*, is made capable of ſo good a *Character*? Had the words of Saint *Paul*, ſpeaking of ſervants, [*If thou canſt be free, uſe it rather*] been brought to back this *bare Aſſertion*, there had been ſome tolerable excuſe for ſuch a begging of the *queſtion* as this: But thoſe words extend not to a *command*, that every man ſhould be obliged to be *free*, that can, but only to a *permiſſion*, that, if he will rather uſe it (*i. e.* prefer this *Liberty*) he moſt lawfully, and commendably may. But this Authour hath not thought fit to make this interpretation, or account of that place neceſſary to be given him. As for the truth of his *Affirmation*, that this *Bondman with his ear bored, was releaſed at the year of Jubilee*, 'tis that, which, as it doth not well conſiſt with the words of *Moſes*, [*He ſhall ſerve him for ever*] *Exod.* 21. 6. and *Deut.* 15. 17. ſo it is not proved by any other place, or made probable that [*for ever*] is not an *abſolute* [*for ever.*] One place in *Leviticus*, there is, *Chap.* 25. 41. which ſaith, that the *poor Brother* that is ſold to be a *bond-ſervant*, *ſhall be free at the year of Jubilee*, and proportionably the *ſervant* (ſpoken of by me in *Exodus* and *Deuteronomy*) is to be ſet free from that *ſervitude*, to which he was *ſold*, (*i. e.* the *forced* and *conſtrain'd*, not purely *voluntary ſervitude*) in the *ſeventh*, or *ſabbatick* year, and ſo by the ſame reaſon in the *Jubilee*, which is the great *Sabbatick* (made up of ſeven times ſeven) in the place of *Leviticus*.

§. 17. But this Authour muſt mark, that this perſon thus ſet *free*, is not the *Jew* of whom Doctor *Hammond* ſpake, but the other that hath made the *voluntary ſurrender* of his *Liberty*, he that when the *Sabbatick* year comes (or conſequently the year of *Jubilee*, which offers him the ſame releaſe) reſolves, that he will *not go out free*, refuſes to make uſe of the advantage of a *Jubilee*, and ſo hath no more releaſes behind; and conſequently by this act of his is in an *irreverſible eſtate*, remains *a ſervant for ever*. And ſo this more ſpecious *anſwer* appears to have as little of truth, or ſubſtance in it, as the two former.

§. 18. To which, yet I might further add, That in caſe it were granted, that the next year of *Jubilee* gave this man releaſe alſo, yet would not this avoid the concludency of this place for the *lawfulneſs of giving up our liberty* (which is the only point in hand) becauſe he that can do it for *ſeven*, or for *fifty* years, can ſurely do it: and although having done it, he ſhall have *Liberty*, after that number of years, to *retract*, if he pleaſe, yet is this no *obligation* that he *ſhall* retract, but only a priviledge that he *may*; which priviledge he may again as lawfully deny himſelf to make uſe of, as before he did of his firſt *Liberty*.

§. 19. Mean while the *concluſion*, or cloſe of this *Authors* reaſoning is a little more *extraordinary* yet. For having from (the *σόφον φαρμακὸν* of) the *Jubilee*, inferr'd that *he did not make himſelf irrecoverably a ſlave*, he proceeds. [And if ſo (*i. e.* ſure, if he made not himſelf a ſlave *irrecoverably*) *where is the warrant from God, or Nature, for paſſing away his freedom, or Liberty at all? and if ſo, how without recal, and irreverſibly?*] Is it poſſible this Authour could think theſe Concluſions demonſtrated ſo *logically*, as that he ſhould ſet them down by way of *queſtion*, which ſuppoſes them irrefragable at the firſt asking?

§. 20. For the firſt of them, is not the *contrary* moſt demonſtrable? that if he were a *ſlave* till the year of *Jubilee*, (as 'tis confeſt he was, and withal that he was ſo by *Gods permiſſion*) then there is *warrant from God for paſſing away his Liberty in ſome* degree, and for ſome ſpace, though not irrevocably. Doth not he ſerve at all, that ſerves not *eternally*? or is that no warrant at all, which is ſuch for a limited time only? Then ſure are we not at all *permitted* to be men, or *warranted* by *God* or *Nature* to live in this world, becauſe we have our *Jubilee* too, our time of *manumiſſion* from hence.

§. 21. And for the ſecond, what is that but a plain *Circle*, firſt to infer the [*not at all*] from the [*not irrevocably*] and then in the ſame breath, the [*not irrevocably*] from the [*not at all.*] How reconcileable this is with the Authours *popular* title of *Philodemius*, I diſpute not; but reſolve, it is not the particular merit which beſtowed on him that other more *regular* of *Eutactus*.

§. 22. And for the dexterity that is expreſt in the concluſion of the whole ſection, [*That therefore, that abſolute and unreſerved reſignation of a mans native Liberty*, &c. *without any juſt condition, or adequate change*, (which, ſaith he, is hereby pleaded for by the Doctor) *can have no riſe or origination from God, or reaſonable nature*] (impoſing on the *Doctor*, directly againſt his ſence, thoſe words of ſo irrational importance, [*without any juſt condition, or adequate exchange*]) I ſhall ſuppoſe that this was an effect of the neceſſary wants of his cauſe, and a diſcreet proviſion that his Concluſion could not ſubſiſt without ſuch *ſupplies*, which made him venture on ſuch indirect means.

§. 23. For Doctor *Hammond* is not ſuch an enemy to mankind, as to plead for ſuch *irrational* actings, or to become his advocate that makes imprudent, or *unthrifty* bargains, (though by the ſtrength of his *free will to evil*, he may poſſibly do ſo ſometimes, and be obliged by his own act, and juſtly ſuffer the inconveniences, and ſmarts of it) but reſolveth, that both the *Campanians* in their *dedition*, and the *Barbarians* in their requeſt to the *Romans*, that they might have leave to become their *ſervants*; and the *Jew* in *Moſes*'s ſuppoſition, that *loved his maſter*, and preferr'd his *ſervice* before his *manumiſſion*, (I ſhall add my ſelf alſo, who profeſs to prefer (in my choice for my ſelf) *ſubjection* before abſolute *Liberty*, nay before *Soveraignty* it ſelf; and believe it a far more *ſober*, and conſequently *rational* ſpeech in *Saul*, 1 *Sam.* 9. 21. which expreſt ſome averſation to *Samuels* propoſal about *anointing* him, than that other of *Abſoloms*, *O that I were a Judge, or King*, &c.) did all part with their *Liberty* upon *adequate exchanges*, ſuch, as they (which were the fitteſt judges what themſelves

ſelves thought) did conceive to be the full *worth* of the commodity they parted with: And ſuch a *rational* power of parting with abſolute *Liberty* for ſomewhat that I like better, (*i.e.* for *ſubjection* to *Government*, which is, 1. in it ſelf, far removed from *ſlavery*; and 2. is the only way to *ſecure* men from the *danger* of it) is all that that *Addreſs* had occaſion to aſſert, or plead for at that time.

§. 24. One thing more there is, which I may be allowed to add, (having thus far reply'd to all his anſwers) that the concluſion which was in the *Addreſs* inferr'd from that practice of the *Jews*, was farther confirm'd by the practice of diverſe *Heathens*, who can neither be excuſed by the pretence of a *permiſſion*, or ſpecial *diſpenſation* from *God* to do unnatural things (as he thinks may be affirmed of the *Jew*) nor yet were obſerved by the moſt rational *Hiſtorians* to have done any thing contrary to *Reaſon* or *Nature*, in changing abſolute Liberty for ſomewhat which ſeemed better, and more advantagious to them, to wit, for ſecurity, and *protection*, *i.e.* in changing a ſtate of common *hoſtility*, (the unhappieſt lot in nature) for that other (ſet down by the *Apoſtle* as the object of their Chriſtian * *purſuit*, and *emulation*, and ‖ *contention*) a quiet ſetled *peace*. The advantage of which change, he that is not inclined to acknowledge, muſt be of a temper of *mind* or body ſo diſtant from that which *God* hath given me, that I ſhall not wonder, that that which ſeems to me moſt demonſtratively aſſerted, is to him ſo far from being acknowledged ſuch. I ſhall add no more to the vindicating of the firſt propoſition, till I meet with the *temptation* of better, or more dangerous *arguments* againſt it.

* Δίκαια εἰρήνης.

‖ φιλονικίας.

§. 25. I proceed as briefly to the ſecond, which is propoſed in the *Addreſs* by way of *queſtion*, *Whether ever any man was by God, or Nature, inveſted with power of his own Life*, i. e. *with power to take away his own Life, to kill himſelf?* The vindicating of which, I muſt acknowledge a task, to which I did not expect that the Doctor ſhould be call'd; having not, till now, been ſo fully convinced of the danger, and ill conſequences of favouring the exceſſes of thoſe mens wits, who have maintained *paradoxes*, or of the improvidence of thoſe that have tempted others by the publiſhing of them.

§. 26. For certainly about two years ſince, before the time, that the *poſthumous* Βιαθάν. was ſet out, a man might in this Nation have adventur'd to have asked ſo calm a *queſtion* [*whether a man might Lawfully kill himſelf?*] and not have feared a challenge in *print* for this injury, or encroachment upon the liberty of our *Nature*. And I conceive thoſe Laws of our Land, which have look'd on this *ſelf-ſlaughter* as an inhumane crime, and puniſh'd it after *Death*, with the denial of *Chriſtian burial*, and a mark of reproach upon the *grave*, might, when time was, have been able to have come in to the aſſiſtance of ſo known a *truth*; had not the ſacred rites of *Chriſtian burial* been now ſo deſpiſed, and profaned, that the wanting them hath ceaſed to be eſteemed a puniſhment among us; had not the Cuſtom of *killing* other men ſo haraſs'd our conſciences, and obliterated all the remainders of written, and unwritten *Laws*, that we need not be wondred at, if the *ſwords*, which have been ſo fleſht abroad, miſtake their way ſometimes, and return on the owners breaſts. And laſtly, had not the deduction been ſo prone, and eaſie, from the *General*, to the *particulars*, from the *Lawfulneſs* of a *Nations* deſtroying *it ſelf*, to a *ſingle perſons* going and doing likewiſe, from the juſtifying of *civil* inteſtine ſlaughters of the *publick*, to that other more tolerable crime of a *ſingle violence*.

§. 26. As it is, I ſhall not endeavour to perſwade my ſelf (as the *Pyrrhoniam* in *Sextus Empiricus* would teach me to do) that I was in a dream, when I read D. *Hammond* cited, and confuted for thus affirming: I muſt rather provide for the encounter, and haſten to *anſwer* the *arguments*, which this Authour hath offered againſt this branch of the ſixth *Commandment* (as he met with it in the Doctors hands) or elſe 'twill be poſſible this opinion may gather *Proſelytes* alſo in this age, wherein nothing can be ſaid ſo incredible, which ſome men do not make a ſhift to take up, and believe very contentedly.

§. 27. His firſt argument is drawn from the Doctors conceſſion, that *man hath power from God and Nature over his own body to cut and lance it, and over his own freedom to paſs it away*; from whence, if he do any thing, he muſt undertake to conclude, that *therefore he hath power over his life* alſo; And to do that he muſt make good theſe three things:

§. 28. 1. That ſince the confutation of the former propoſition, he hath now chang'd his mind, and agrees with Doctor *Hammond*, that a man hath from *God* or *Nature power* over *his freedom to paſs it away*, (for otherwiſe, though it will be an advantage againſt Doctor *Hammond*, who *confeſt* it, yet will it not be of uſe to himſelf who profeſſeth the contrary) and again, that he hath forgotten what in his very laſt period he had affirmed, [*that God doth not intruſt and allow any man to have power to deſtroy his own image*, i.e. *to take away mans life, but him, or them whom he makes Gods*, i.e. *Magiſtrates to whom he deputes his own place*] for ſure it cannot be thought, that every *private man* in the *community* of *Nature*, is ſuch a *Vicegerent of God*, or *Magiſtrate*.

§. 29. 2. That the *argument*, *à minori ad majus affirmativè*, is valid, againſt all *Logick*, viz. That he that hath power over the *body*, or over *freedom*, is ſuppoſed to have *power over Life alſo*; and ſo that the *Surgeon*, that may ſacrifice the fleſh, or *cut* off an Arm, may therefore as Lawfully *ſlaſh* the throat, and *cut off* the *head* alſo; and in like manner that the Maſter, by being ſuch, is become the *Judge* of his Servant, and hath among *Chriſtians* that *power* of his *Life*, which he hath ſeldom been allowed among the worſt of Heathens.

§. 30. And 3. That *God*, which hath put ſomething in our power, is thereby obliged to reſerve nothing to himſelf; Or that by giving us the *uſus fructus*, or benefits of Life, he hath given us the abſolute *dominion*, and propriety of it alſo.

§. 31. But without either of theſe three more difficult undertakings, the *Authour* hath attempted an eaſier way, by ſuppoſing that neither *cutting of fleſh*, nor *Parting with freedom may be endured by God or Nature, unleſs they refer to ſuch an end, whereby a far greater good is to be enjoyed, and obtained: that cutting or lancing* (*without this neceſſary circumſtance of a greater good*) *is a ſtep or degree toward ſelf-murther*, &c. From whence the *Concluſion*, I ſuppoſe, muſt be, that by the ſame reaſon the *Killing* of ones *ſelf* may then alſo be conceiv'd allowable by *God*, when it is referr'd by me

to ſuch an *end*, whereby a far *greater good is to be enjoyed*, and *obtained*, but never elſe.

§. 32. To which I ſhall make theſe clear Replies, 1. That a thing directly *forbidden* by God, cannot be thought approveable by him, upon the referring of it to a *moral* (much leſs if it be but an *advantagious* or *profitable*) *good* end. *Their damnation is juſt, that ſay, they may do evil that good may come.* And that this is not a *begging* of the *queſtion*; but that, indeed, *ſelf-homicide* is evil, and forbidden by *God*, will be clear by remembring theſe three things, 1. That the command of not *killing* is *indefinite*; and that he that *kills himſelf*, doth certainly *kill*, that he that *ſheds his own blood*, *ſheds* the *blood* of a *Man*: and 2. That the *Image of God* reſiding on him (which is the *ground* of this prohibition in *Moſes*, *Gen.* 9. 6.) is as truly ſo, when 'tis beheld in the *reflexion*, as when in the *direct line*, in my ſelf, as in any other man. 3. That the power of *Life* is *reſerved* a peculiar to *God*, and not communicated to the Creature, (ſave only to his *Vice-gerent*) which may thus appear. *God* as the *Creator* of the World, and ſole donor of *life*, muſt be acknowledged to have the *dominion* over it: This *dominion* conſequently is *communicated* to none but to thoſe to whom by *God* it is *communicated*; To the *Magiſtrate* this *power* is given by that Law of *God*, whereby he preſcribes the putting certain Malefactors to *Death*; and whereby he conſtitutes the *Magiſtrate* his *Vice-gerent* on Earth, and ſo the *executioner* of that *Law*, *an avenger for wrath*, *Rom.* 13. And whoſoever will challenge the like *power*, muſt ſhew the like *charter* and evidence; and if he cannot do that, that is ſufficient to prove that he *hath* it not; As 'tis ſufficient to *convict* any man of the injuſtice of any *his* claim to *my* eſtate, that he cannot ſhew any *deed* whereby it was convey'd to *him* from *me*; And there need no other *Affirmative* proof againſt ſuch an one, than that it was *once* in *me*, and it appears not how it parted from me to any other. And therefore, till ſome *evidence* be produced, (which I ſuppoſe will never be) that *this power* of *life* is made over from *God* to every *private* man, the demonſtration is abundantly clear, that that *power* is not in any *private* man any more over *himſelf* than *others*. And it is obſervable to *this* very purpoſe, that though the *Stoicks*, to teach their Diſciples *apathy*, or courage againſt whatſoever events, did talk of that ſure remedy againſt all temporal preſſures, the *going out*, or *killing themſelves*, (looking on it favourably as a *refuge* or *ſanctuary* from all thoſe things which might otherwiſe be phanſied unſupportable) yet when they conſidered it this other way, (as every thing, they ſaid, had *two handles*) *i. e.* in reſpect of *God*, who placed them here; it was generally reſolved by them, *viz.* by *Seneca*, and the wiſeſt of them, (and the more fooliſh of that Sect are ſeldom found to *practiſe* the contrary) that we muſt not on our own heads *deſert* our *ſtation*, but maintain that ground on which our *General* hath ſet us, and wait with courage and patience, till he think fit to command us off again. As for the other two, power over the *fleſh*, and the *freedom*, the *cutting* of one, and *parting* with the other, they are no degrees toward the taking away *life*, but on the contrary are uſed on purpoſe for the preſerving of it, in its being, or well being, the one by the rules of phyſick, the other of policy; and therefore is the power of thoſe allowed us by God and Nature, becauſe they are thus inſtrumental to that end, and ſubmitted to our diſcretion, becauſe they may be ſo. Thus are ſome things referred to the *Stewards* judgment, and put into his *power*, to *diſpoſe* of for the good of the Family, and yet others *reſerv'd* peculiar, and *ſacred* in the *Maſters* own hands. Thus are my *Writings* put into my *Lawyers* hand, for him to uſe to the preſerving of my *Eſtate*; yet is not my *Eſtate* put into his *power* to diſpoſe of it at his pleaſure for ſome greater end. And the argument would be very infirm, becauſe that *power* which the *Steward* or *Lawyer* hath intruſted to him, ought not to be uſed by him, but in order to ſome *good end*; that therefore, that which is not ſo *entruſted* to him, may be thus aſſumed alſo. Some *rayes* there have always been communicated from Heaven to this Earth of ours; and yet ſome *Flowers* of that celeſtial *Crown*, which have been reſerved as *ſacred*, and *incommunicable*. And ſo there will be no kind of weight or concludency in this preſent way of *arguing*, this *ballancing* of *fleſh* or *liberty* with *Life*, till it appear alſo from the *ſame*, or equal *evidence*, that thoſe are *reſerved* by *God*, as Life appears to be. This certainly, without any more help, is a full ſatisfaction to this argument.

§. 33. But then ſecondly, *& ex abundanti*, the *Killing my ſelf* is no way ordinable to *good*. 'Tis not ordinable to mine own *preſent worldly advantage*, as *lancing*, and *ſubjection* may be; that is clear; and that is a reaſon why *God* ſhould not give us this *Liberty*, (though if we were not able to render *reaſons*, the *wiſdom* of the Law-giver were *reaſon* enough.) And for *future* advantages to *my ſelf*, the *being with Chriſt*, which is *far better*, 1. that cannot be taken notice of by bare *Nature*, till that be *Chriſtianized*: and then, 2. according to the *Chriſtians* rules, we have all reaſon to reſolve that 'twill not be purchas'd by any other way, but by that which *God* hath preſcribed toward it, *i. e.* by lawful unprohibited courſes. It being evident, that the *Crown* which is held in *Gods* hand ſhall not be diſpenced to any, but thoſe which do νομίμως ἀθλεῖν *ſtrive lawfully*; and that *patience* of waiting till *God* calls, is one of the Laws that are thus preſcribed in our ἀγῶνες.

§. 34. As for advantages to *others*, the *Publick-weal*, or *peace*, 'tis not imaginable, how the *killing my ſelf* can be directly, or otherwiſe than by accident, ordinable to that; whatſoever can be conceived of it, will be as ſufficiently *provided* for by the *Magiſtrates* having *power of life*; and that he may have from *God* immediately, as well as he can be ſuppoſed to have it from any act of collation from *me*, if 'twere in my *power*.

§. 35. Laſtly, For any *moral*, or Chriſtian vertue, or yet farther, the *illuſtrating* of the Glory of our *Creator*, (which alone deſerve the title of *good ends*) 'tis not the having an *unlimited power*, that *immediately*, or *directly* contributes to theſe, but the making *uſe* of the *limited powers* we have, the *imploying* the *lives* which he hath given us, according to his *will*, and not the *deſtroying* them *contrary* to it; I ſhall not need to proſecute this. All that is in this place pretended by the Authour to this purpoſe, is only this, that *a man may freely conſent, and willingly expoſe his life to death for a greater, or publicker good.*

§. 36. Where by *conſenting* I ſhall ſuppoſe him to mean a *conſent* of the *will* to that action which immediately follows, *i. e.* to the *expoſing his life to death*, (and if by *conſent* he ſhould mean any thing elſe, as the *conſenting* that the other ſhall *kill* him, or the making it *free* and *lawful* to that other

other to take away his *Life*, then hath he put two very diſtant things together, and ſo 'tis but the ordinary fallacy *plurium interrogationum*; and in that Notion of *Conſenting* I ſhall anon ſhew that man *may not*, i.e. hath not *power* ſo to *Conſent*.) And to the proving of this, it is, that his remaining endeavours (as far as concerns Doctor *Hammond*) are directed. And accordingly he ſaith, *He will be ſo bold as to ſtate the Queſtion as it ought*, i.e. to remove it from the words and ſence wherein Doctor *Hammond* propoſed it (and in which it is that his whole diſcourſe is grounded) to thoſe other words of his own, moſt extreamly diſtant in *ſound* and *ſence*; and in which I am as confident that the truth is on his ſide, (if *Conſent* ſignifie no more than I take it to ſignifie) as I am, that that truth doth not contradict thoſe other truths, which by Doctor *Hammond* are ſuperſtructed on his foundation; or that the *Propoſition*, as 'tis ſtated by the Doctor, is all that is neceſſary to be affirm'd for the founding of the reſt of his diſcourſe.

§. 37. For I deſire to know, whether there be no difference betwixt *killing my ſelf*, and *expoſing my life to death*? If ſo, then it muſt be not only *lawful* ſo to *kill my ſelf*, (which is all the Authour demands) but ſometimes an act of *duty* and *neceſſity* alſo: For ſo certainly, in the aſſiſting my *Sovereign*, or *Country*, to *hazard* and *expoſe* my life, when I am thereto lawfully called; and ſo again, to *ſuffer Martyrdom* in the confeſſion of *Chriſt*, or diſcharge of any Chriſtian duty, is not only *lawful* for me to do, but I *ſin* if I do it not. And yet I do not perceive that this *Authour* hath laid this obligation, or neceſſity on himſelf, or any man elſe in any caſe to *kill* (or lay *violent hands* upon) himſelf, and ſo I ſuppoſe he is ſtill of the Doctors mind, (though he be willing to conceal it) that there is a *difference* between theſe.

§. 38. And if there yet want any farther light to the clearing of this difference between this [*having power of my own life* ſo as to *kill my ſelf*] and that [*having power of my life*, ſo as to *expoſe* it, or venture it in a *good Cauſe*] I ſhall (for the concluding of this Paper) propoſe the plain difference between them.

§. 39. And that may be taken from the nature of the word [*expoſing*] for that we know ſignifies no more, than to ſubmit it to an *hazard*, and ſo to *expoſe* my *Life*, is to *hazard* my Life: In doing ſo, all that can be affirm'd of me, is no more than this, that I am *willing* or *content* (and by my actions expreſs that willingneſs) to loſe my life, if *God* pleaſe to permit it to be taken from me.

§. 40. When my *life* is thus loſt, three things muſt neceſſarily concur to it, 1. The *Violence* of the invader; 2. The *Providence of God* permitting him to invade; and 3. My *not reſiſting*, or my not uſing the means (which were naturally poſſible for me to uſe) to prevent, or avoid the violence of this *invaſion*, as when *Chriſt* might have uſed *Angels* (and another *flight*, and a third *compliance*, and *caution*) but chooſeth not to do ſo. Of theſe three the only *efficient cauſe* of the action (of *killing*) is the malicious violent *invader*; ſure neither the *providence* of *God* in *permitting*, nor my own *meekneſs*, or *obedience* to *Chriſt* in *following* him, though it be to the very *Croſs*.

§. 41. In this caſe, ſuppoſing that it be for a *good End* that I now *expoſe* my life, it is alſo ſuppoſed, that the purſuance of that end is either *duty* in me, a thing that I am abſolutely bound to, as the *Confeſſion* of *Chriſt*, &c. or elſe that 'tis *exceſs* of *Charity*, to which, though it be not under *particular* precept, yet the intuition of ſome great and *glorious* end doth ſo *invite* and incline me, that 'tis *heroical Vertue* in me to do it, and that which (though *God* doth not ſo require it of me, as that I *ſin*, if I do it not, yet) he hath promiſed to *reward abundantly*, whenſoever 'tis done *for his ſake*.

§. 42. In the former of theſe caſes, when the purſuance of that *good end* is *ſtrict duty*, as in caſe I am commanded to *confeſs Chriſt*, or to aſſiſt my *Prince* in protecting my Country, There, as my endeavour is required of me by that *precept*, ſo is my *utmoſt* endeavour, ſuch as I muſt not remit, whatſoever the *danger* be; And if that *danger* prove to be the *utmoſt danger*, even of my *life* it ſelf, yet the *command* of *Conſtancy*, of not *fearing* or *fainting*, and the Character of *perfect love* given by St. *John*, that it *caſts out fear*, and the denunciations againſt the *fearful* or *cowardly*, do all joyn to extend my Obligation to purſue this ſo neceſſary *End* without any receding, and if the *Croſs* it ſelf lie in my way toward this end, to *take it up*, i.e. willingly to ſubmit to *Gods* Providence, which hath thought fit to call me to this *Trial*, if it be even of *reſiſting unto blood*. And ſo ſtill all that I do, is the *conſtant*, *patient*, *chearful ſubmiſſion* to *Gods* Will (in his *providential diſpoſing* of my life, and in *permitting* the injurious to take it from me) and nothing elſe; an abſolute choice of *Obedience*, but not of *Death*; a ſacrificing to duty all *deſire* of *Life*, but not otherwiſe undertaking to diſpoſe of it.

§. 43. Hence is it that my *venturing* of my *Life* doth not clear, or free the *Invader*, from any degree of ſin, or guilt in thus taking it away from me. 'Twas but a *Sarcaſm* or *Trope* in *Julians* Souldiers, to ſay, they did not wrong the *Chriſtians* by *killing* them, but only haſten them to their deſired home: And the *Fathers* were able to anſwer the *Paralogiſm* by the rule in *Ethicks*, diſtinguiſhing betwixt a *mixt*, and *abſolute will*; and ſo concluding their *ſlaughters* to be *Injuries*, though they were willingly embraced; the *Perſecutors* to be *Perſecutors* ſtill, though the other were *Martyrs*.

§. 44. Which is a *demonſtrative* proof, that 'tis the *Invader*, not *Sufferer*, whoſe *act* the killing is ſuppoſed to be, and ſo that I am not in this caſe of *expoſing my Life*, ſuppoſed to give any *Conſent* that he ſhall *kill* me, or conſequently to deveſt my ſelf of the *power* of my *Life*, or indeed to have any ſuch *power* over it. For whatſoever is abſolute in my *power* to *diſpoſe* of, that I may lawfully conſent to part with; That, if I do part with it, *ipſo facto*, and *jure* * becomes his, to whom I part with it (and if there be any error in it, 'tis chargeable on the *giver*, who was thus profuſely liberal above the proportion:) And conſequently for him to take and uſe it, is in *him* no ſin; As that part of my Eſtate which is in my power, may by me be paſt over to another by *gift*, and being ſo, is lawfully *poſſeſt* and enjoy'd by the *receiver*.

* *Data eo ipſo quo dantur, fiunt accipientis.* Juriſt.

§. 45. And therefore, I ſay, if the lawfulneſs of the *expoſing* my Life would conclude me to have a *power* over it, it muſt be as perfectly lawful for the *Tyrant*, into whoſe hands my *Life* (in the *confeſſing* of *Chriſt*) is by me expoſed, to take that *Life* from me, as 'tis for the poor man into whoſe hands my *goods* are by *me* put (in obedience to *Chriſts* command of *mercifulneſs*) to *receive* and *carry* away thoſe *goods*; which being an abſurdity too groſs to be defended by any, will, I ſuppoſe,

incline

incline this Authour to diſcern the diſtance betwixt the queſtions, as the *one* is by him, and as the *other* was by Doctor *Hammond* propoſed.

§. 46. And in like manner alſo, when the End purſued by me, is (though not abſolutely *neceſſary*, yet) *better* and *more excellent*; there the Precept of being *faithful* unto *death*, and the *promiſe* of *reward* made to him that lays down, or *loſes his life for Chriſts ſake*, do as much oblige to *conſtancy*, at leaſt, as much aſſure that ſuch *conſtancy* ſhall be acceptable to *God*, (and that the more by how much greater the *hazards*, and *terrours*, and *temptations* are to the contrary) as when the particular matter of the action was under *precept*. And ſo that other *accidental* difference will make no variation in the main, or make it at all probable, that *expoſing* my life *heroically* was not warranted by *God*, when *expoſing* it *neceſſarily* was ſuppoſed to be ſo: it being as certain that *God* doth *warrant* me to do that which he *commends*, as what he ſtrictly *commands* to me: And therefore what was ſaid in the caſe of *duty*, doth as truly hold (and ſo needs not to be repeated again) in this caſe of [*more excellent*] alſo.

§. 47. Having thus far proceeded, it will now be unneceſſary for me to anſwer the *Arguments* which this *Authour* adds in this matter; becauſe the *Queſtion* being by him changed from that which was propoſed by Doctor *Hammond* (and ſtated *Negatively*) to another, which no man can be more ready to *affirm* and aſſert than that Doctor; It would be an impertinent niceneſs in him to refuſe to have his Opinion confirmed by another mans reaſons; I ſhall rather wiſh that all his proofs were demonſtrative, and *effectual* to conclude, what Doctor *Hammond* affirms with him; and only briefly ſhew, that they are *ineffectual* to prove what that Doctor *denies*, and that will ſoon be done by the moſt curſory mention of them.

§. 48. For firſt, I grant with him that *God permitted his own Son to be put to death by the hands of violent and unjuſt men*; but ſee no *conſequence* from thence, that *Chriſt* as a Man might lawfully have *taken away* his own *Life*: As for the phraſe of *laying down the life for the ſheep*, that ſure ſignifies not the *killing himſelf*, (for the *goodneſs* of the *Shepherd* conſiſts not in that) the cutting his own throat, when the *Wolf* invades the Flock; but the making uſe of his *Life* to the utmoſt, wherein it may be *advantageous* to the *Sheep*, and *venturing* and hazarding it in their defence or quarrel; yea, and contentedly ſuffering (not acting in) his own *death*, that he may be able to avert theirs. For this is the meaning of τιθέναι ψυχὴν, to *lay down* the life, (ἐπικίνδυνον εἶναι, *to venture himſelf voluntarily into danger*, παραβολεύεσθαι τῇ ψυχῇ, in the notion in which the *Greek Gloſſaries* explain the phraſe, from παράβολος, *i. e.* ἀποκινδυνεύων in *Heſychius*, and the *Latine*, *Parabolum animæ ſuæ eſſe*, *i. e.* all one with ἐκβάλλειν) to *expoſe* it, not to be *ſolicitous* for the *defence* of it, as to forgo *duty*, or *charity*, or care of the poor *ſheep* intruſted to him, for the preſerving of it.

§. 49. A ſecond Argument is by this *Authour* touched on, (though not formally urged by him) that the *preſerving whole ſocieties from periſhing*, *is a good and a publick end*; *and that the impunity of offenders being the readieſt way to the diſſolution and deſtruction of ſocieties*, *Nature is ſuppoſed to dictate that one man ſhould rather juſtly die*, *than whole ſocieties unjuſtly periſh*. This Concluſion, and Premiſſes, the Doctor doth, as the Authour fore-ſaw, moſt willingly acknowledge, but withal diſcerns not how it proves that a man hath *power over his own life*: it will be ſufficient if *God* by any other means (as by inſtating it in the *Prince*, &c.) do place that *power of life* in others. The utmoſt which this way of arguing can pretend to conclude, is, 1. That whatſoever any man hath in his *own power*, that 'tis reaſonable for him to deliver up into the *Governors hand*, (thus to make it eaſie or poſſible to diſcharge his *truſt*, and by theſe advantages to contribute to the publick quiet and weal.) Nay 2. that *God* that hath the *power of life*, and ſees how *uſeful* 'tis to have that veſted in *Governours*, ſhould conſequently be ſuppoſed ſo to veſt it, (And that he doth ſo, is the clear acknowledgment of the *Addreſs.*)

§. 50. But ſure it cannot extend ſo far; as to make a man *give* (or *have*) that which he *hath* not, nor to reſtrain *God* from having the ſole *original* power of that, which otherwiſe might be acknowledged to be veſted in him.

§. 51. As for the *ſuppoſition* which the *Authour* here adds on the back of this, [*In caſe ten men in the community of Nature chuſe one to rule over them, and one of them thus ſpontaneouſly ſubjected ſhall murther one of his fellow Subjects*] (whereupon he demands, *whether the Ruler ſo ſet up, may not by his own conſent by vertue of that power he received from him among the reſt, put ſuch a murtherer to death.*) To this I anſwer, that the *Governour* may in this caſe *put the Murtherer to death*, but this not by *virtue of* any *power* or *conſent* of the Murtherer, but by *authority* from *God*, who alone hath the *power of Life*; In relation to which it is that the *Governour* is ſtiled διάκονος Θεοῦ, *a Miniſter of God*, in this very notion, as he is ἔκδικος εἰς ὀργὴν, *an avenger for wrath* or *puniſher* of offenders.

§. 52. That which is in the *Subjects power* the *Governour* may have by the Subjects *conſent*, and by *virtue* of the *power which he received from him*; And therefore it is that the *power* of *violent reſiſting* invaders, the right of *repelling force by force*, which *God* and *Nature* hath given the *ſingle* man in *community* of *Nature*, is now, in caſe of ſubmiſſion to the *Governour*, parted with, and depoſited by him, ſo far as refers to the *Governour*; and though it be founded in *ſelf-defence*, yet he that thus violently reſiſts *the powers*, ſhall *receive to himſelf damnation.*

§. 53. But ſtill that which is not in the *Subjects power*, is not, nay cannot be veſted by the *Subject* in the *Governour*, but flows from an higher principle (from him that really hath the *power*) and comes from the *Subjects conſent*, only as from the *cauſa ſine quâ non*, or by way of *reſultance*; That as *God* communicates not this *power* of life to any but the *Governour*; ſo that mans *Conſent*, that he ſhould be his *Governour*, doth remotely (and by way of *condition*, or *qualifying* of the Subject to a capacity of receiving that *power* from *God*) concur to the veſting of that *power* in that perſon. Thus doth the *temper* of the air contribute to the qualifying the *ſlime*, or putrid matter to receive *influences* from the *Sun*, and then thoſe *influences* beget *life* in it, and endow it with that higher principle, which the *temper* of the *air*, that contributed all it could, (having not thus much in its *power*) could not be affirm'd to *contribute* to it.

§. 54. And

§. 54. And ſo you ſee the Doctors way of ſtating this queſtion doth as fully provide for the *puniſhing of Malefactors*, and *preſerving of communities*, as the ſuppoſing the power *of life to proceed* originally from the *People*, would be able to do; as he that affirms the *Soul* in every birth to be *infuſed* by *God*, makes as ſure a proviſion for *Generation*, and conſequently for the *preſervation* of the humane *ſpecies*, as they that ſuppoſe the *Soul* to be *traduced* from the *Parents*, as well as the *Body*.

§. 55. His laſt Argument is from *Rom.* 5. 7. *For a good man one would dare to die*, i. e. ſaith he, would *with the preſence of a reſolved Spirit dye*; the word [*daring*] ſaith he, noting a *preſence of mind terrified with no dangers*. To this argument again, as far as by the Authour it can be extended, *i. e.* to the acknowledgment, or concluding of the *lawfulneſs of a valiant couragious ſuffering of death*, either for a *publick good*, or for ſome act of eminent *private charity*, I am fully of the *Authours* mind.

§. 56. But the word [*dying*] in that place, ſignifying no more than *ſubmiſſion of the Will*, contentedneſs, or willingneſs to ſuffer *death*, not by his own, but by ſome other *hands*, an ἀντιψυχία, a taking thoſe blows (though never ſo ſharp and mortal) on his *own ſhoulders*, and breaſt, which were meant by the Enemy to another (to the *merciful*, or *good* man in that Text) there is no Logick can conclude from hence, that a man hath any *power* over his own life, to *take* it away from *himſelf* by any act of *force*, (as ἀυθέντης among the Attick Writers is, ſaith *Phrynicus*, uſed ἐπὶ τῦ ἀυτόχειρος φονέως, *He that kills himſelf, takes upon him an Independent Authority over himſelf*) or to give it into another mans hands, ſo that he may without any farther *Authority*, (without any further inveſtiture of the *power* of the *Sword* from *God*) *lawfully* take it from him. I ſhall conclude this with an obſervation of * *Boethius*, that the *love* of *life* is not ſeated in the *will of the Creature*, but in the *principles of Nature*; that ſo our lives may not be ventured on the uncertainties and hazards of our own paſſions, or ſatieties, which may incline the will to prefer death ſometimes, but in the *inſtincts* of that more conſtant immutable Rule, which always preſcribes the preſerving of thoſe treaſures, by God and Nature entruſted to us.

* *Nam ne in animalibus quidem mancndo, amor ex animæ voluntatibus, verum ex naturæ principiis venit; Nam ſæpe mortem cogentibus cauſis, quam natura reformidat, voluntas amplectitur, &c. de conſol.* Phil. l. 3. Proſ. 11.

§. 57. Having made this ſhort, and ſudden return to this Authours reaſonings, Doctor *Hammond* will leave the matter moſt willingly, where this Authour hath placed it, at the feet of all *ingenuous, and unprejudiced Readers*, and will endeavour (as unpaſſionately as any man) to approve himſelf a *Servant of Reaſon*, and embracer or *friend of Truth, whereſoever he meets with it*; upon which ſcore, he is content to acknowledge ſome obligations to this *Authour*, who hath occaſioned this further ſurvey of his former affirmations, and given all other men ſome cauſe to be more *confirmed* in the perſwaſion and aſſurance of the truth of them. And thus much I conceive is ſufficient to have ſaid upon this occaſion.

---

§. 58. BUT it ſeems the *Readers quiet* is not to be obtain'd ſo eaſily; for while that which hath been thus ſaid was under the *Printers* hand, Maſter *John Goodwins* Βελιοσμιχαι came forth, and by the mention of Doctor *Hammonds* Name twice in his Title-page, gave reaſon to delay this *Vindication* ſo long, till it might appear whether 'twould be uſeful to add any thing to it (upon this new occaſion) by way of *Poſt-ſcript*. And herein it hath proved a little unluckily, that this *ſecond Advocate* of the ſame cauſe falling upon this paſſage in the *Addreſs* (the Subject of our preſent diſcourſe) hath yet in his judgment upon it ſo varied from the former Authour, that as he hath yielded the queſtion hitherto debated, and confeſt that *no man hath by nature the power over his own life*; ſo he hath provided a new task for me, by denying the Doctors *conſequence* from hence, [*That then this power cannot be derived to Kings by Men, or from the People.*] This I confeſs is ſomewhat ſtrange, that that ſhould be imagined *derivable by men, or from the people*, which at the ſame time 'tis confeſt *no man hath*. I have lately learn'd a * *Scotch Proverb* from Maſter *Henderſon*, and find by ſearch the meaning of it to be this plain *Engliſh*, That nothing is derivable from any place, which was never there: and Mr. *Goodwin* acknowledges *the ſtrength of that Conſequence to ſtand in the authority of this Maxime*, Nihil dat quod non habet, *Nothing gives that to another which it hath not it ſelf*. And truly, I ſhall never deſire a firmer *baſis* for any Concluſion of mine, than ſuch an acknowledged *Principle* as this. Should I find any part of my poſſeſſions in Mr. *Goodwins* hands, and he juſtifie his Title to it, by pretending the *donation* or *ſale* from *Philodemius* to him, and I produce evidence that this was never in the poſſeſſion of *Philodemius*, would there be any more required of me, to conclude conſequently, that 'twas not *derivable* from *Philodemius* to him? would it not be a ſtrange reply, to ſay, That *this conſequence depended on the Authority of a Topick Maxime?* The word [*Topick*] I ſuppoſe to be here prefixt by him upon a deſign of *diminution*, as *Topical* is equivalent with *probable*, and oppos'd to *demonſtrative*. But I hope this is not thus a *Topick Maxime*. Can any *demonſtration* be more convincing, than that which is built upon a *Principle*, as acknowledg'd as any in the *Mathematicks*, and the contrary of which implies a *contradiction* [*to have, and not to have?*]

Pag. 23.

* That cannot be brought But, that is not the Ben.

§. 59. As for the reaſon of denying this conſequence, which Mr. *Goodwin* renders, becauſe [*though no particular man hath by nature this power over his own Life, yet as a member of a community he hath, not ſimply a power, but a neceſſity lying upon him by way of duty*, &c. *to conſent with others, that his life ſhall be taken from him.*] 1. 'Tis not to be imaginable, that he ſhould have a *neceſſity of duty* lying upon him, who hath not *ſimply a power*, meaning, as here he muſt, a *power* of doing it *lawfully*. And 2. For this *power*, or *neceſſity of conſenting* only (as that differs from *the power of giving*) this will be of no kind of force, unleſs it alſo appear that the *Magiſtrate* derives the *power of life* (which is ſuppos'd to be in him) from this *conſent* of theirs, or that it is this conſent of theirs and nothing

nothing elſe, which gives him that *power*. But this is ſo far from being *proved*, that it is not ſo much as *affirm'd* by Mr. *Goodwin*: And on the other ſide 'tis clear, that the bare *conſenting* that a thing ſhall be taken out of my hands, is very diſtant from the taking upon me to *give* it; the latter pretends and ſuppoſeth a *poſſeſſion* or *inveſtiture* in the *giver*, the former doth not in the *Conſenter*; and ſo, though the latter would be of ſome uſe (if granted) to infer Mr. *Goodwins* concluſion, that the *power is originally from the people*; yet the former will be no way able to infer it.

§. 60. The matter will be very viſible by *example* in any *Truſt*, or *Stewardſhip*. The *Lord* intruſts to his *Steward* the keeping of a ſum of money, after that he aſſigns it over to ſome other man by *Bill of Attorney*, and legally veſts his right in that other. In this caſe the *Steward* formerly intruſted *conſents*, that that other ſhall take what is thus by the *Lord* aſſigned to him, and indeed a neceſſity lies upon him *by way of duty* ſo to do. In this caſe I ſhall ask Mr. *G. from whom* this money is *deriv'd* to this other? from the *Lord*, or from the *Steward*? I hope he will acknowledge from the *Lord*: The ſame again, when the *King* delivers a Caſtle by way of Truſt to be kept by one of his *Subjects*, and after aſſigns it over to his *Son*, and the *Subject* that kept it *conſents* that the *Son* ſhould have it, and ſo the *Son* enters upon the *poſſeſſion*; the caſe is clear, that 'tis not from the *Subject* that the *Son* derives this *poſſeſſion*, (though 'tis as true that the *Subject conſents* to deliver it up) but from the *King* only: and that act of the Subject is no expreſſion of any *right in him, from him conveyable to the Son*, but only of his *Truſt, and ſubordination to the King*. And this is generally the difference betwixt *Inveſtitures* and *Truſts*: what is *veſted* in me, I may *give* or *derive* to another; what is *intruſted* only, I cannot: the Servant cannot diſpoſe of his *Maſters goods*; yet that his *Maſters diſpoſal* may ſtand good, he may and ought to give his *conſent*. This is ſo groſly true, that 'tis pity any longer to inſiſt on it; and yet 'tis the very thing that the whole point in hand depends on, and was therefore, I conceive, ſo induſtriouſly involv'd, and obſcured by Mr. *Goodwin*.

§. 61. After this, Mr. *Goodwin* inſenſibly glides into another piece of artifice; *The power of life*, ſaith he, *is eminently and virtually in the people collectively taken, though not formally*. And again, *A man, and a body of men, having power over their own lives Radically and Virtually, though not formally*. This period of Mr. *Goodwin* ſeems to be a new way of *Anſwer*, by applying diſtinction to the *Antecedent*, as the former was by denying the *Conſequence*. The *Antecedent* was [*That no man hath by nature the power over his own life*, &c.] from whence the *Addreſs* concludes, that therefore [*This power cannot be deriv'd from the people*] To this Mr. *Goodwin* firſt returns his acknowledgment, *That if the conſequence be right, it is a clear caſe, that Regal power is not originally in the people, but conferr'd on the Ruler immediately from God*. This is an acknowledgment in him of the truth of the *Antecedent*, and a doubt only of the *Conſequence*, which accordingly he immediately proceeds to invalidate: And therefore 'tis a little ſtrange (and an argument that his firſt attempt was not very *ſucceſsful* to him) that he ſhould now ſo ſoon return to deny the *Antecedent*, at leaſt to *diſtinguiſh* of it, having before ſo *abſolutely granted it*. But to paſs over this, and allow him this liberty of recalling his bounty, let us examine the force of his *diſtinction*.

§. 62. The force of this *diſtinction* doth not, I conceive, reſpect the *Subject* [*the People*] (as if that might be taken in two notions, either *ſingly*, or *collectively*) becauſe preſently, without that *diſtinction*, he ſpeaks indifferently of [*A man*] and [*A body of men*] but it belongs to the *Copula*, or word [*Is*] and then it muſt be thus diſſolv'd. *The power of life* may be ſaid to be in a man two ways, 1. *Formally*, 2. *Eminently*, and *Virtually*, and *Radically*. The diſtinction of *Formaliter*, and *Eminenter*, hath been apply'd by *Philoſophers* to the *Sun*, and *Heavenly Bodies*: of which it being by them reſolv'd, that they are *ſimple* and free from thoſe mixtures to which our *ſublunary* bodies are ſubject, and yet it being apparent that they warm and heat other things, it is thereupon defined, that they have not heat, or other qualities in them *Formally*, (*i.e.* in that manner, or kind, that *fire* is *hot*, or we are *hot*) but *Virtually* and *Eminently*, *i.e.* that they have ſome other virtue or faculty in them, *higher*, or more *eminent* than that heat which is in *inferiour* bodies; and that that doth enable them to warm other things, though they are themſelves ſuch *pure* creatures, as not to have thoſe groſs qualities in them. Whether this be rightly affirm'd or only *nicely conjectured* by *Philoſophers* (for I ſuppoſe there is little known of thoſe diſtant bodies beyond *conjecture*) I ſhall not now enquire, but only deſire to be taught by Mr. *Goodwin* how this can be made appliable to the matter in hand, *i.e.* to *the power of life and death*. This *power*, we know, is in *God* firſt, and if in any *eminently*, and *radically*, and *virtually*, certainly in *him*: And in the *Supreme* Magiſtrate *formally*, being actually inherent in him, though not *originally*, nor in ſo *eminent* a degree as in *God* it is. But can it thus be ſaid alſo to be *eminently*, &c. in the *people*, *i.e.* that the *people* have in them ſome *higher* and more *eminent virtue* or faculty, than the *power* of every man over his own life; and that that ſupplies the place of that *formal* power, and that by it the *People* beget or produce the *power of life* in the *Supreme Magiſtrate*, as truly, as, if they had it *formally*, they could do? This is the meaning of the diſtinction in the ordinary, and only notion of it, and muſt be it, if it be rightly appliable: but Mr. *Goodwin* interprets his meaning of it ſo far from this, ſo far from importing or concluding the *People* to have ſuch an *higher* power or faculty (to which [*Eminently*] and [*Virtually*] in oppoſition to [*formally*] belongs) that 'tis indeed by him ſet down as much *inferiour* to that power *formally* inherent. For thus he interprets it: *A man, and a body of Men, have power over their own lives Radically, and Virtually; in reſpect whereof, they may render themſelves to a Magiſtrate, and to Laws, which if they violate, they muſt be in hazard of their lives*, &c. By this I diſcern two things: 1. That by this *Eminent, Virtual, Radical power*, Mr. *Goodwin* underſtands that (which is far enough from the meaning of thoſe words, and) which Logicians call a *remote*, or *indirect power*, (as that is oppos'd to an *immediate*, or *direct*) or rather a *power*, to which this effect is merely *accidental*; as if the *Patient* were ſaid to have power to cure himſelf, meaning thereby that he hath power to *ſubmit* himſelf to the *Phyſician*, who is able to cure him. And for Mr. *Goodwin* to aſſume the liberty of ſpeaking thus largely, was not, I ſuppoſe, his want of knowledge in propriety, but his willingneſs to receive advantage from this abuſe of words. And then 2. If this be the only meaning of the four hard words, (*Eminently, Virtually, Radically*, and *Formally*) *viz.* that 'tis *in the power of men* (or the *people* in community of nature)

ture) *to render themſelves to a Magiſtrate, and to Laws; to which rendring 'twill be conſequent, that they ſhall hazard their lives upon violating thoſe Laws*; then, I ſay, are Mr. *Goodwin* and Doctor *Hammond* very well agreed; for this his explication of that diſtinction is very reconcileable with thoſe words of the *Addreſs*. *This giving up their* (*i. e.* the peoples) *Liberties to one, or more, makes that man or men a Ruler over them, and being a Ruler, to him belongs* (*deriv'd from God, not from them*) *the power of Life, which Gods decree hath inſtated in the Supreme power or Ruler, who is therefore in that relation of avenger for wrath or puniſhment, a Miniſter of God, Rom.* 13, *&c.* For whence is it that their rendring themſelves to a *Magiſtrate*, in Mr. *Goodwins* ſtile, brings upon them that *hazard of lives*, in caſe of violation of *Laws*, unleſs it be that he that hath power of their lives, places that *power* in that *Magiſtrate* to whom they have rendred, or ſubjected themſelves? That this is *God*, and not the *People*, I will not conclude to be Mr. *Goodwins* opinion, becauſe 'tis his main deſign to prove the contrary; but that thoſe words of his, and his diſtinction ſo explained will bear that ſence, I mean, that they will be true, and acknowledg'd by him, that acknowledges the *power of Life* to be only in the *Supreme Governour*, deriv'd from God, I conceive ſufficiently manifeſt; and conſequently, that though this power be ſaid to be in the *People remotely, improperly*, and *indirectly*, and ſo in Mr. *Goodwins* notion of *eminently*, &c. yet 'tis not from the *People*, but from *God* only, that the Governour hath it.

§. 63. The reply will be as ready, and eaſie alſo, to all force, or concludency of the next Argument, that which is taken from the Peoples power, to make, or *conſent to the making of Capital Laws*. For 1. Mr. *Goodwin* cannot be ignorant that it hath been ſometimes in the *power of Kings* to make Laws, without the addition of any *conſent of the people*: ſuch were the *Principum placita* among the *Romans*: and after it was thought fit by Princes to lay ſome reſtraint on themſelves, both that they might be better adviſed, and more readily obeyed; then, though the *peoples conſent* hath been deem'd neceſſary, yet doth this belong only to the *regulating* and *modifying* the *exerciſe* of this power: the *Fundamental power* it ſelf *of life*, being in the *Supreme Governour*, before the *making* theſe *Laws*. Now 'tis very eaſie to diſtinguiſh betwixt theſe two, the *power*, and the *Regulating* of the *exerciſe* of that *power*; the *power* in the groſs, and the *determination of that power* to this, or that particular action. The *interpoſition* of man in the latter of theſe, doth no way prejudge the ſole priviledge of *God* in the donation of the former of them: As the *Grace* of *God* is his peculiar, and proper gift; and yet man may give *Directions*, and *Rules*, how we are to act by that *Principle*, what uſe it will beſt become us to make of that precious *talent* entruſted to us. And therefore, for the great *Noon-day-Truth*, which Mr. *Goodwin* induceth from theſe, and the like conſiderations, *viz.* [*That men by nature have ſuch a power over their lives voluntarily, &c. to expoſe them to the ſtroke of publick juſtice, in caſe they ſhall offend*, &c.] This being granted, is of no force againſt Doctor *Hammond*, but doth with him rather ſuppoſe a *Publick Juſtice* able to ſtrike, i. e. a *power of life* already veſted in the *Magiſtrate*, before this *conſent* of the People, or abſtractedly, without reſpect unto it. And ſo ſtill it is not from this *conſent* of *the People*, that this *power* is deriv'd to the *hand of Publick Juſtice*, but from ſome other higher principle, *viz.* that of *God*, to whom ἐκδίκησις the *avenging*, or *puniſhing of offenders*, peculiarly belongs, and no other, but in ſubordination to, and ſubſtitution from him.

§. 64. And what if the *King*, as Mr. *Goodwin* next alledgeth, *have no power to take away the life of his ſubjects without cauſe, or for every cauſe, but only ſuch as by Law are puniſhable with death? what if he cannot command them to be their own Executioners?* Doth it follow from hence, that therefore, he hath the *power of life* from the *People*, not from *God*? Doth the *power of God* ſo conſiſt in doing *cauſleſs*, or *irrational* things, that nothing which is exercis'd *moderately*, or *ordinately*, can be imagin'd to come from him? I ſhall ſuppoſe that *God himſelf* hath perfect *dominion* over the World; and yet that he obſerves rules of *all juſtice*, and *goodneſs* in the *exerciſe*, and *diſpenſing* of that *power*, and hath not *power* of doing any thing contrary to thoſe rules of *eternal juſtice*, which he hath preſcribed to himſelf; which to do, by all wiſe men hath been counted an act of *imbecillity*, not of *power*. And conſequently, how natural is it that he ſhould thus *determine* and *limit* his deputies alſo? give them *power of life* over their *Subjects*, and yet command them to *exerciſe that power* with that juſt temperament, which either *natural*, or *civil*, or *municipal Laws* ſhall dictate, and preſcribe them? And therefore Mr. *Goodwins* arguing is very looſe, and unconcluding [*That if the power which the King hath over the lives of the people, were immediately from God, then he might lawfully execute the ſame, and take away the lives of men, without any mediating direction, or warranty from any Law.*] For ſure the ſame God that gives the *Magiſtrate* the *power of life*, doth command him alſo not to throw away that precious truſt cauſleſly, makes him his *Miniſter for wrath to them that do evil*, and contrariwiſe a *rewarder* to them that do *well*; and though he *ſubject* him not to any earthly *ſuperiour*, but reſerve him to his own ſevere *tribunal*, yet he *ſubjects* him to *reaſon*, and *rules of Juſtice*, and (when he hath undertaken to govern by that Standard) to the *poſitive municipal Laws* of that particular Kingdom alſo, and hath been as particular in preſcribing *Laws* to the *Prince*, to avoid *Oppreſſion* or *acts of Height*, as to *Subjects* to abſtain from *Reſiſtance*.

§. 65. As for that proof which Mr. *Goodwin* produceth to enforce his arguing, *viz.* [*That the execution of no commiſſion immediately iſſued by God, ought to be ſuſpended upon, or determin'd, or regulated by any commiſſion or conſtitution of men.*] It is as far from truth, as it could well have been contriv'd to be: as will appear, if it be conſidered, that the word [*Commiſſion*] 1. ſignifies not an *abſolute* or *poſitive Command*, but only a *power* or *inveſtiture* of *Authority*; or if a *Command*, yet that 2. only an *Affirmative precept*, the nature of which is, that it binds not *ad ſemper*, and ſo conſequently may be *ſuſpended* at ſome time, by the *free will* of him that hath the *Commiſſion*, much more if any weighty *reaſon* interpoſe to *determine* his *will*. 3. That this *Commiſſion* is only *general* and *indefinite*, without application to particular caſes, referring that *application* to the *conjuncture* and *concurrence* of circumſtances, (which ordinarily are humane and political) and conſequently to the *diſcretion* of *Rulers* judging by thoſe *circumſtances*: The intervenience of which circumſtances makes the particular *exerciſe* of that *Commiſſion* convenient, and ſeaſonable in one *place*, and at one

time; and consequently, where they do not intervene, there the exercise of it may be at that *time* and *place* suspended as unseasonable. As when the *shedder of blood* is by *God* commanded to be put to death, and yet some men accidentally and involuntarily fall under that Title; it must be in the *power* of the *Magistrate* to *suspend the execution* of that sentence, or else the *Innocent* must lose the benefit of the *City of refuge*, and run the same fortune with the most *murtherous designer*.

§. 66. After this manner 'tis clear, that *Christ* had a *commission* from Heaven to work *Miracles*, to cure *Diseases*; yet 'tis particularly affirm'd of the *infidelity* of his Countrymen, that that *suspended* the exercise of his power for some time; *He could not do many mighty works there because of their unbelief*; yet, I hope, this will no way be thought to argue, that *Christs commission* issued from his *Countrymen*, from the *belief of men*, (though that were necessary, to the exercise of it) or that *Christ* did ill in *suspending the exercise of his Commission*. In like manner the people of *Israel* had from *God* not only a *commission*, but *command* to put the *nations* to death, *Deut*.20.10. And yet on those of them that were left, 1 *Kings* 9.20. *Solomon suspended the act of that commission*, and only *levied a tribute of bond-service*, ver.21. Once more; I shall suppose a *General* to receive power of *Martial Law* from the Soveraign in any Kingdom; this power he is not willing to exercise, but by a cognizance of each malefactors cause before a *Council of War*: Here 'tis plain that that *Council of War suspends that exercise* of the *Generals power* upon a particular man; but sure it will no way follow from thence, that that *Commission*, which was suppos'd to issue to the *General* from the *Soveraign*, doth now issue not from the *Soveraign*, but that *Council of War*; and then no more will the possibility of suspending the *exercise* of the *Kings Commission* by Law, *&c.* conclude that *Commission* to issue from the *People*, and not from *God*. And therefore in the case which Mr. *Goodwin* hath been confident to refer to Doctor *Hammond* to Arbitrate, [*Whether the King hath any Regular or just power over the lives of men, other than that which is proportion'd*, &c. *by the Laws of the State*] I suppose the Doctor may agree with Mr. *Goodwin*, and yet never be enforc'd, or concluded by that concession, to question the *Original* of the *power from God*, the difference being discernible between the *Power it self*, and every particular *exercise of that power*; and the *suspension* of the *latter*, far from including of the *evacuation*, or *cancelling of the former*.

§. 67. The same answer will clear Master *Goodwins* succeeding Plea, *pag.* 26. That if *the power of Kings over the lives of men, were by immediate derivation from God, then must this power be uniform, &c. in all Kingdoms whatsoever.*] This *consequence* is far from all appearance of truth; Because the power may be from *God*, and yet that *God* that *gives* the power, may leave it in the particular *exercises* of it, to be *determined* either by the arbitration, and free will, and prudence of the *Governor*, where there are no *Laws*, or by the *Regulation of Laws*, where there are such; The *Dimensum*, or *proportion of power over the lives of the Subjects*, which a *Governor* claims, consists not in *indivisibili*, in any certain, or definite point, but is that which may enable him to discharge his office of *Ruler*, *i. e.* to *protect* his people, and restrain their inordinacies. And as far as *Reason*, and (which are supposed to be a branch of that) *particular Laws*, (subordinate to Gods Word) see it fit to extend the *exercise of that power*, so far may that *Ruler* regularly extend it; And whatsoever *proportion* it be, that he is intrusted with by *God*, 'tis not reasonable that he should irrationally extend the *exercise* of it. And this *regulation* of *indefinite* power by such prudent limits as these, (*i.e.* by the *Universal* law of *Reason* and *Justice*, or by the particular conclusions, which the wisdom of *Law-givers* hath thought fit to deduce from thence) cannot justly be quarrell'd, as a *retrenchment of power*, any more, than the infinite goodness of God which permits him not to be able to do any thing which is contrary to that attribute, is a *manacling*, or restraining his *Omnipotence*; but is only a cultivating and dressing of it, a *paring off the excesses*, and exorbitances of it, and leaving it a *form'd* channel, instead of a vast or *unbridled Ocean*.

§. 68. And thus I suppose the nature of *Angels* or men, which have bounds of *Vertue* and *Conscience*, and *Laws* prescribed them, within which they are to move, and not to range unlimited in the desart of their own uncertain proposals, cannot thereby be said to have lost the *liberty* of their *Species*, or to have received *no powers* from *God* in their *creation*, though some *regulations* (it must be acknowledged) they are under, and consequently, *determinations* and *suspensions for the exercise of their powers*. And what inconvenience the affirming of this will bring upon the *Doctor*, what *hazard of blaspheming of God*, *&c.* I must profess my self so tame, as not to fore-see, or imagine, howsoever Master *Goodwins* ἀμετρία ἀνδολχῆς hath helpt him to phansie such invisible *Mormo's*, and *Anakims* in our passage.

§. 69. Next, it is but *affirm'd*, and not at all made probable by Mr. *Goodwin*, That the *Affirming the Kings power over the lives of the people to be by immediate derivation from God, is to smite them with blindness*, *&c.* and *not to discover to them the Dan and Bersheba* (I suppose he means by this *trope*, the *due bounds and limits*) *of such their power*] I am sorry Master *Goodwin* should think it fit that such *popular harangues* should be admitted to supply the place of *reason*, and shall briefly reply, That they that affirm the *power* of the *Sword* to be from *God* derived to *Magistrates*, do at the same time define, and affirm, that those *Magistrates* are to remain *rational creatures*, and to continue under the *Soveraignty* of *Reason*, and all the branches of that, as far as their particulars are concerned in it, *i. e.* to be ruled by the *Universal Laws* of *Justice* and *Equity*, by the Civil Sanctions which tend to preserving of the Societies, and consequently by the *particular Local*, or *municipal Laws* of any Country, which are supposed to have a peculiar *propriety* toward the preserving, and regulating of that *People*.

§. 70. 'Twill now be to little purpose to prove that these two affirmations are reconcileable, the one deriving the *power of life* to the *Ruler* from God, the other acknowledging the *regulation* of this power by these bounds; For there is no kind of repugnance, or contradiction, nothing but accord and amity between them: The very *Hand of God* that confers this power, gives this very *direction* and *Law* for the *exercise* of it, that they that rule other men should themselves be guided by *Reason* in all their actions: And what that *reason* is in each particular emergent, they are not always,

always, or only, the *Judicials of Moſes*, which are fit to direct us, but the wiſdom ſometimes of *Particular Laws*, and *Law-makers*. And ſo there is ſmall danger either of *enſnaring Kings*, or *diſturbing States* (as he ſeems willing to fear) *by this Doctrine*; which though it define the Original of this power to be from *Heaven*, can yet allow the *regulation of this power* for the *Exerciſe* of it to be of an *inferiour*, *Humane*, *Political Origination*.

§. 71. One Argument more Maſter *Goodwin* is pleaſed to take in to diſprove the *immediate derivation of this power of life from God*. Becauſe, ſaith he, that *derivation which is immediate from God, can by no ways be aſſiſted, furthered, or promoted by any creature, or ſecond means: but this derivation of that power of life is at leaſt furthered by the act of the people in electing*, &c. *Ergo*. I ſhall not examine the force of his enſuing probations, which have frailties enough in them, but ſhall be content to ſuppoſe the moſt he can wiſh, or imagine, *viz.* That the people do *elect* or *chooſe* their *King*; In this caſe, ſaith the Doctor, *The people give not the power of their lives to that King, but by giving up their Liberties, &c. to him, nominate him to that office of ſupreme power, which, whereſoever it is, God ſuperinveſts with the power of life.* This is the *Doctors* ſtating of the queſtion in his *Addreſs*, and thereby the ſeparation is evident between the *Act* of the *People* in *Electing the perſon* of the *Ruler*, and the *Act* of *God* in conferring this *power of life*. All that can be ſaid of the former of theſe is, that that *Act* of the People is the means of *determining* the *General decree of God* (that *Rulers* ſhall (as his *Deputies*) have the *power of life*) to this *particular* perſon, not that it is an *aſſiſtent*, or ſocial cauſe in conveying this power to the Ruler, much leſs that it ſhall undertake to wreſt this *power* out of *Gods* hands, and aſſume it into their *own*; but, I ſay, as a *cauſa ſine qua non*, or a previous *preparation* of the ſubject, by their choice qualifying the perſon to be thus *inveſted*, and impower'd by God. And ſo, though the People in this caſe are ſuppoſed to do ſomewhat, *i. e.* to *Elect*, and that *election* to determine this power of *Gods* to this perſon, yet is this power derived ſolely from *God*, as the *Addreſs* hath ſufficiently explain'd, and not from any *Act* of the *People*: And therefore the word [*Furthering*] in Maſter *Goodwins* argument, may be taken (as an equivocal word) in a double ſence, either to denote *actual aſſiſtance*, or contribution of force, or efficacy, toward the production of the effect, *viz.* of the *power of life* in the *Ruler*: And in that ſence it is not true, that the *Act of the People in Electing, doth further this power*, it being the ſole Act of *Gods decree* to give that power, and nothing elſe. Or elſe the word [*Furthering*] may be taken to ſignifie no more than *preparing* or *qualifying* the Subject to a capacity of receiving this *power* from *God*, (as *John Baptiſt* prepared mens hearts for the *receiving* of *Chriſt*, when he came, but had nothing to do in the *miſſion* of him, which was the ſole work of God) and thus indeed, the *Election of the people* may *further* the derivation of this *power* from *God*, to ſuch a particular Ruler; and there is nothing more ordinary than for *Gods* works to be thus *furthered* by ſecond cauſes or means, even his work of *Grace*, which he owns moſt peculiarly. The reſemblance made uſe of in the Addreſs, is very commodious to clear this whole matter. In the *Generation* of a child, the Parents are acknowledged to contribute much, to be not only *furtherers*, but even *efficients* in the production, Yet is it commonly agreed, that *God* creates, infuſes, and inſpires the Soul immediately. I need not examine, or atteſt the truth of the ordinary opinion, that the Soul comes from *Heaven*, not from the *Parents*; becauſe I now uſe it as a reſemblance only, and that it may be allowed to be, though it ſhould not be true; and thus far at leaſt it will be *argumentative*, that the *electing* of the perſon of the *Ruler* by the *people*, doth no more conclude that the *power* of *life* is not ſuper-infuſed and derived to the *Ruler* (ſo choſen) from Heaven, than the Parents begetting of the child is an argument, that the *Soul* is not ſuper-infuſed from *God*. Our *Phænomena* may be all very happily ſolved by this way of ſetting it; and M. *G.* exceptions ſuperſeded, and the concluſion cleared, which was the only one, which the *Addreſs* deſired to infer by this conſideration, *viz.* That *whatſoever were ſuppoſed of the peoples electing their Ruler, yet the Supreme power neither is nor can be in the community of the people by force meerly of their Original, or natural Liberty*, upon this firm ground (not yet ſhaken by M. *G.* or *Philodemius*) that the *power of life*, which is part of the *Supreme Power*, is not part of the *natural Liberty*, nor conſequently either inherent in the *Community of men*, nor by them communicable to any *Repreſentative*. ὅπερ ἔδει δεῖξαι, The only thing, which this Rejoinder (as the former diſcourſe) was deſigned to demonſtrate moſt irrefragably.

§. 72. And having proceeded thus far to make return to Maſter *Goodwins* offers of *reaſon*, I ſhall not endeavour to make payment to his *Scoffs*, pag. 28. or vindicate Doctor *Hammond* from his charge of *overweeningneſs*, *&c.* Though 'tis not at all intelligible to me, how thoſe words in the *Addreſs* [*For it is poſſible that I may put you in mind of an evident Truth, which perhaps you have not taken notice of*] ſhould be chargeable with this εἰρωνεία, or interpretable to any further ſence, than only this, That this truth ſo evident in Doctor *Hammonds* opinion, was not by him conceived to be ſufficiently taken notice of, or laid to heart by them, to whom he then made his *Addreſs*. And if that Doctor were therein miſtaken, or if he be juſtly charged in his next page (together with the reſt of his perſwaſion under the title *of the whole Legion of the Royal Faction*) *as the firſt-born of that evil Generation of Flatterers*, for producing plain Arguments of Reaſon and Scripture, to avert that which appear'd to him a heavy Sin, and Judgment, from a Nation; I muſt then betake my ſelf to my *Prayers*, that *God* will forgive me my more diſcernible ſins, (when innocencies and good offices to mankind are become ſo culpable) and get out of his company as ſoon as I can, who can ſo readily ſhift the diſcourſe from *reaſoning* to *defaming*, and ſupply with *reproaches* what was wanting in *Arguments*.

§. 73. I am now come to an end of this debate concerning the Power of life, but cannot be ſo prudent, or thrifty of my pains, as to diſſemble the other exceptions, which (in this book) M. *Goodwin* hath made to ſome other parts of the *Addreſs*; I ſhall give you as brief an account of them as is poſſible.

§. 74. The firſt, is his diſlike of that *Critick annotation*, as he ſtiles it, *of the Royal Doctor, taking notice* [*that the Supreme Power, or Ruler, is ſtiled by the Apoſtle*, Rom. 13. *the Miniſter of God, and not of the people.*] How this comes to be ſtiled a *Critick annotation*, (which ſuppoſes it a

Vi. Moſcho-pul. Gram. Gr. *Grammatical* one, (as τεχνικὴ, ἐξηγητικὴ, κριτικὴ, are the parts *diviſive* of γραμματικὴ) where there is no uſe made of *Grammar* to deduce it, nor indeed of any thing but of the plain words, as they lie in the Text) I have not the skill, or ſagacity to divine. All that Doctor *Hammond* affirms is this, that the *Supreme power*, Rom. 13. *is ſtiled by the Apoſtle, the Miniſter of God, and not of the people.* And is not this manifeſt to any that looks on *Rom.* 13. 4. where he is twice ſtiled διάκονος Θεοῦ, *the Miniſter of God*, and is neither there, nor any where elſe ſtiled the *Miniſter of the People?*

§. 75. But, ſaith Maſter *Goodwin*, *This no way infringes the credit of his concluſion, that Kings are the Servants and Miniſters of the People.* The *Apoſtles were the Miniſters of God, and yet they preach themſelves alſo the ſervants of Men*, 2 Cor. 4. 5. *and Miniſters of the Saints*, Rom. 15. 25, &c. To this I anſwer, that the phraſe διάκονος Θεοῦ, *Miniſter of God*, ſignifies a *Miniſter of Gods Ordination*, and *Inſtitution*, and though it may ſignifie ſomewhat elſe, yet this is the only notion wherein Doctor *Hammond* takes it in his *Addreſs*, according to *Rom.* 13. of which he ſpeaks, where the *powers are ſaid to be ordained by God*, and to be his *Ordinance*. Now he that is thus a *Miniſter of God*, cannot be alſo of the *People*, becauſe theſe two Ordinations being incompatible, he that holds by one, muſt needs diſclaim holding by the other. Another notion there may be of the phraſe, as it ſignifies *performing of ſervice to God*; and ſo indeed the ſame *Apoſtle* that *ſerves God*, may be a *ſervant of Men* alſo; and to that, all Maſter *Goodwins* probations are directed: and though Saint *Pauls* διακονεῖν ἁγίοις, *his carrying of alms, and contributions to the poor Saints*, be no very proper inſtance to this purpoſe; yet thus 'tis acknowledged, that Saint *Paul* may be a *ſervant of Men*, and perform Offices of Humility to them, (though by the way this *Servant* of theirs behaves himſelf ſometimes very like a *Maſter*, and comes with a *Rod* when he ſees it convenient.)

§. 76. But this is nothing to the purpoſe to infer the *King* to be διάκονος ἀνθρώπων, a *Miniſter of the People* in the former notion, *i.e.* a *Miniſter of the peoples Inſtitution*; and therefore all that Maſter *Goodwin* adds of the Reaſons why the *Ruler*, Rom. 13. is not called the *Miniſter of the people*, is very extrinſecal to that purpoſe. The utmoſt that he can enforce from that place is, that the *King attends on the publick good.* But ſure that will avail as little to prove that he is not a *Miniſter of Gods inſtituting*, or one that hath the power from him, as the Shepherds waiting over the Flock, is a proof that he is *ordained*, or *inſtituted* by his Sheep.

§. 77. The next undertaking of Maſter *Goodwin* againſt Doctor *Hammond*, is to prove that the *Civil Magiſtrate* is by Saint *Peter* call'd ἀνθρωπίνη κτίσις; which he renders the *Ordinance* or *creature of Man, becauſe they receive their very being from the people as Kings, and as Magiſtrates.* Doctor *Hammond* hath, I conceive, ſufficiently vindicated that Text of Saint *Peter* from this interpretation, and 'twere eaſie to ſhew, that the phraſe ἀνθρωπίνη κτίσις muſt by all Analogy be rendred *Humane creature*; not *Ordinance*, or *creature of Man*; by *humane creature*, meaning any part of mankind; by *creature of man*, a thing of mans creating. The phraſe to expreſs the latter of theſe would be, κτίσμα ἀνθρώπου, taking *Creature* for *production*, or *work*, and *Man* for the *artificer*, or *workman* of it; what is ſaid in the *Addreſs*, is ſufficient to direct any ſober man to a right underſtanding of that place. And Maſter *Goodwins* exceptions are very far from perſwading the contrary. As 1. [*That the King is there called Supreme, not in reſpect of the community of the people, as*, ſaith he, *the Doctor ſuppoſeth, but as compar'd with ſubordinate Rulers.*] But this is of no force againſt the *Doctor* in that place, where all that he infers from their title of *Supreme*, is, that they are the very perſons that are enſtiled the *Ordinance of God*, Rom. 13. and that is the *ſignal character* which he mentions in that Text, without taking notice of any other aſpect of the word *Supreme*, or drawing any nice concluſion from it.

§. 78. His ſecond exception is againſt the concludence of a *Negative Argument.* Which I acknowledge an exception ſo far as to keep that Argument from being demonſtrative, in caſe all the force of it were fetcht from the *Negative*; But that Argument from the *Negative* (or from the *governours* not being ſaid to be *ſent by the people*) is but *præluſory* and preparative to another more forcible branch of the *Argument*, *viz.* that (on the contrary) *Supremacy* is affixt to the King, and *Subjection for the Lords ſake*, commanded to be paid him, (as *miſſion from him* is affirmed of all other *Magiſtrates*) And both thoſe put together, the *Kings being Supreme*, (*i.e.* inferiour to none but God) and *Subjection* being affirmed to be due to him *for the Lords ſake*, (*i.e.* becauſe of the relation which he ſtands in to God, by whom he is ſaid to be ordained, *Rom.* 13.) may well enough paſs for a *character* of ſome remark upon the King, and keep the pretended rendring of ἀνθρωπίνη κτίσις, from being the neceſſary importance of that Text, or the *Supreme* power from being concluded to be *originally in the People.*

§. 79. As for the [*groaning of the creation* or *creature*] Rom. 8. which Doctor *Hammond* renders [*the hope of the Heathen World*] 'tis not all Maſter *Goodwins* συναμαχία that will render it an improbable interpretation. That the *Heathen World* (though *without hope*, i. e. in a deſperate condition in reſpect of ſalvation, as long as they remained in their idolatries) were yet ſo capable of receiving benefit of *Chriſts* coming into the World, that *Chriſt* is called *Deſiderium omnium Gentium*, the deſire of all Nations, in *Haggai*, and προσδοκία ἐθνων, *the expectation of the Gentiles*, in the Septuagints rendring of *Jacobs* Prophecie; that they ſeeing their own impure condition, deſired the means of *reſtoring* their loſt treaſure, and conſequently are ſaid to *deſire Chriſt*, without explicit foreknowing any thing of him, (becauſe that which they deſired was no otherwiſe compaſſable, but by him) is no nicety of the Doctors invention, but largely inſiſted on by Saint *Auguſtine* in his Books *De Civ. Dei*; and this one Conſideration is Reply ſufficient to all the inconveniencies which Mr. *Goodwin* hath ſprung in this interpretation.

§. 80. As for the other difficulties which to him ſeem to preſs and reſiſt the interpreting of the following words to this ſence, they are not ſo ſolemnly mentioned by Maſter *Goodwin* as to own my impertinence, if I ſhould enlarge on them; though I can aſſure him that Doctor *Hammond* hath long ſince conſidered the whole Context, and is ready to give an account of the agreeableneſs of it to this preſent notion, whenſoever it ſhall be ſeaſonable. Only in favour to the Reader, he doth not unneceſſarily obtrude it on him at this time, meaning to expect a fairer opportunity for that, and other the like diſſertations.

§. 81. But

§. 81. But Maſter *Goodwin* upon the granting of this notion of πᾶσα κτίσις, for the *heathen* World, hath faln upon a ſpecial κρησφύγετον, that however, *It ſignifies the world under the conſideration of being the Creature or creation of God.* And then he wonders why ἀνθρωπίνη κτίσις ſhould not ſignifie the *Magiſtrate to be the creation of Man, and how by this interpretation that concluſion of the Kings being the creature of the people, is avoided.* To this I anſwer punctually, that Maſter *Goodwin* being the affirmer of this Doctrine, [*That the King is the creature of the people*] and his proof of it being thoſe words of Saint *Peter*, where *obedience* is commanded to be paid πάσῃ ἀνθρωπίνῃ κτίσει, as 'tis by him rendred, *to every creation*, or *ordinance*, or *creature* of man, It is certainly ſufficient for Doctor *Hammond* (to diſprove this concluſion ſo inferred from that place of St. *Peter*) if he ſhall be able to mention another probable interpretation of thoſe words, from whence that *Concluſion* will not be inferred; eſpecially if by other places of Scripture he make it manifeſt, that that interpretation is moſt agreeable to the analogie of that and other *Scriptures*. Now this hath Doctor *Hammond* done, by ſhewing that πᾶσα ἀνθρωπίνη κτίσις is a phraſe which needs not ſignifie any more than *every man*, or *humane creature*, not only *Chriſtian*, but *Gentile*, or Heathen alſo. Which if it be the entire notation of the phraſe (as at this time Maſter *Goodwin* is content to grant) then ſure is there no ground for him from thence to conclude, that the *King* is ἀνθρωπίνη κτίσις in that other ſo diſtant ſence, *an ordinance or creature of the people.* As long as Maſter *Goodwins* concluſion depends upon that *one* only notion of the phraſe, ſo long, unleſs that be acknowledged the genuine ſence of it, (as certainly 'tis not, when another ſo diſtant from that, is ſuppoſed poſſible to be it) there is no ſtability to be expected to that concluſion, whoſe premiſſes are thus forfeited by his own *conceſſion*.

§. 82. As for the *Doctors* Anſwer to the ſuppoſed Objection, (where by the parallel *command of honouring all*, verſe 17. he infers the limitation of the Subject, *All to whom honour belongeth* there, (*i. e.* ſuperiours, not inferiours) and ſo here, *every humane creature*, (*i. e.* every ſuch, that is in place of *Magiſtracy*) certainly M. *G.* hath failed much in his attempt to invalidate it, by affirming that that *Apoſtle*, in his *command to honour all, ſuppoſeth a debt of honour due from every man to every man, according to that of* Rom. 12. 10. *In honour preferring one another.* For to this I anſwer, that the meaning of 1 *Pet.* 2. 17. cannot ſure ſo properly be fetcht from *Rom.* 12. 10. as it may from the circumſtances of the Text and Verſes on each ſide of it in the place of Saint *Peter*. In the former verſes, 13, and 14. the words clearly refer to the doctrine of *obedience to Superiours*, and ſo *verſe* 15. the mention of *Gods Will* [that *by well-doing we ſhould put to ſilence the ignorance of fooliſh men*] (i. e. that by obeying of our *Superiours* we ſhould take off the Scandal that lay on *Chriſtianity*, as if it made men *ill Subjects*, verſe 16.) doth plenarily belong alſo to the ſame matter. So again, *honouring the King* in the end of the 17. *ver.* and *ſervants obeying their Maſters*, verſe 18. are very forward to concur with this notation; And the precept of *loving the brotherhood*, i. e. their *fellow-Chriſtians*, and of *fearing God*, (from which *fear* the *honour* divolves upon his Vice-gerent) will no way prejudice this notion of the *honour* there ſpoken of, that it belongs only to the debt of *inferiours* to *ſuperiours*; and ſo that the [*All*] are only thoſe *all* that are thus capable of it.

§. 83. As for the *honouring* of *Widows* (by M. *G.* mention'd from Saint *Paul* to *Timothy*) that ſure is not appliable to this matter, ſince the *honour* there, is the *relieving*, or feeding of them, giving them that *honour of ſupply*, which is acknowledged to be another notion of the word, not that which in the fifth *Commandment*, and thoſe other places, is the principal importance of it.

§. 84. As little reaſon hath Maſter *Goodwin* to conclude that the precept of *being Subject one to another*, 1 *Pet.* 5. 5. ſhould not be a precept of *obedience* to *Superiours*, when the words immediately precedent are, *Likewiſe ye younger ſubmit your ſelves to the Elders*, and thoſe *Elders*, verſe 2. the ποιμαίνοντες & ἐπισκοποῦντες, the *Paſtors and Biſhops of the Church*. 'Tis poſſible indeed that the [*one another*] may be, *Others* beſide *Superiours*, but ſure 'tis not ſo probably ſo, when that which immediately precedes, is *Submiſſion* to *Elders*, to which the ſubjection here added, is not a phraſe of *diminution*, but of *addition* rather, and when Gods *reſiſting the proud*, that immediately follows, is, ſ ith Saint *Auguſtine*, (as in the Poet, *debellare ſuperbos*) the direct contrary to *Subjectis parcere*, the giving *pardon*, or *grace* to the *obedient Subjects*. And thus I conceive the parallel words of Saint *Paul*, *Epheſ.* 2. 21. *Submitting your ſelves one to another*] are moſt probably to be interpreted, to thoſe among you who are in any relation of *ſuperiority*, for ſo it follows immediately, *verſe* 22. *Wives ſubmit your ſelves to your own Husbands*, &c. Whereas, when he returns to the *Husbands duty* toward the *Wife*, it is not *ſubmiſſion* but *love* only, *v.* 25. Other places I might eaſily mention, where the word (ἀλλήλους) may very well ſignifie no more than *others*. So the ἐξομολογεῖσθε ἀλλήλοις τὰ παραπτώματα, *confeſs your faults one to another*, *Jam.* 5. 16. cannot farther be extended than to a direction to the ſick to make *confeſſion of his ſins*, whether to *others ſimply*, or to thoſe *others* whom he hath *injur'd*, but obligeth not them that are in *health* to *confeſs their ſins reciprocally* or back again to the ſick; and ſo in the next words [*and pray ὑπὲρ ἀλλήλων, for one another*] that is, that the brethren in health ſhould *pray for them that are ſick*, and not *reciprocally* that the *ſick* ſhould *pray* for them in *health*, the end of the prayer there mentioned being ἵνα ἰαθῆτε, *that ye may be healed*; which end, and cloſe doth, I conceive, confine the diſcourſe to the *ſick* firſt to *confeſs*, and to the *healthy* after to pray for the *ſick*, and no more. And ſo φιλόξενοι εἰς ἀλλήλους, 1 *Pet.* 4. 9. notes *hoſpitality* to the *ſtrangers* that wanted, and not *mutual*, *reciprocal entertainments*, one of the other: For though it is poſſible that it might note the Inhabitants civility to the *traveller* firſt, and then that *travellers* repayment of the like, when he comes to be a fixt *Inhabitant*, yet the word ξένοι, *ſtrangers*, being ordinarily taken as a *ſpecies* of men in want (as beſides ſome places of Scripture, I remember in *Juſt. Mart. ſecond Apolog.* ſpeaking of the *offertory*, he ſaith that by that means *the Præfect became the guardian of ſtrangers*, &c. *and of all that were in want*) I conceive φιλόξενοι is no more than *kind* to that ſort of *poor ſtrangers*, and that without any expectation of being *entertain'd* by *them again*, for that the *Alms-giver* ſhould expect that return from the *poor* or *ſtranger*, is both *unreaſonable* and *unchriſtian* alſo. So *Luke* 12. 1. καταπατεῖν ἀλλήλους cannot be taken reciprocally, that they which *trod* on others were alſo *trod* upon by them, but that *one trod upon another*, agreeable to our preſent ſence: So *Acts* 7. 26. ἵνα τί ἀδικεῖτε ἀλλήλους; not that the perſon *injur'd* was *injurious* alſo, but only that *one injur'd the other*.

And

And yet more plainly, *Rom.* 2. 15. *their thoughts excuſing or accuſing*, μεταξυ ἀλλήλων, where it cannot be imagined that the thoughts *mutually* or reciprocally *accuſe* or *excuſe*, the *accuſation* belonging *to the conſcience*, which *accuſeth* the erroneous will, but not in like manner to the will, that that ſhould *accuſe* the *Conſcience*. Theſe places are added *ex abundanti*; That of *Epheſ.* 5. will be able alone to ſerve the turn, if theſe others ſhould not be thought to be *demonſtrative*. I have thus briefly reply'd to theſe other exceptions of Maſter *Goodwin* as far as concerns that place in Saint *Peter*, and I ſuppoſe have vindicated it from being the foundation of Maſter *Goodwins* beloved *dogma* (which I ſhall deſire him to ſhew to be the affirmation of any one ancient Father or Commentator on that place, or of any one place of Scripture beſides, which might help to countenance it) that *Kings are the creatures of the people*.

§. 85. There are yet ſome old reckonings which Maſter *Goodwin* is willing to make even with the *Doctor*, and I muſt beg a very little patience from the *Reader* to obſerve what *account* he hath given of them.

§. 86. He begins with fair words of Doctor *Hammond*, and acknowledgments, that *having frequently heard of him, he never heard any thing but well and worthy of a man, his judgment in the grand State-queſtion of the times only excepted*. That the diſcharge of his *Conſcience* in obedience to the fifth *Commandment* ſhould be thus made an exception againſt the *Doctor*, he hath ſure learnt μὴ ξενίζεσθαι neither to think *ſtrange*, nor take it ill at Maſter *Goodwins* hands, remembring that ſome of the *Chriſtians* which were anciently in the World, in the abſence of other viſible crimes, were thought worthy of all reproaches for their *common* profeſſion, or being *Chriſtians*. One thing only I ſhall ſuppoſe, I have the *Doctors* leave to aſſure Maſter *Goodwin*, that it was no ſpecial *deſire to engage* Mr. *G.* which cauſed the particular mentions, and refutations of ſome paſſages in his books, but only the opinion which he had, that they might probably prove matter of *ſeduction* to the Reader (and that ſeduction of a dangerous conſequence) if ſuch neceſſary antidotes were not provided to *avert*, or *prevent* the *danger*. Doctor *Hammond*, I ſuppoſe, is not over-fond of ſuch Diſputes, or debates as theſe, and is never more in conſtraint, than when he lies under ſuch engagements.

§. 87. Some paſſages in M. *G. Butchers bleſſing* were a firſt great temptation to him, which though reſiſted by the love of quiet, prepared him to receive more violent impreſſions from ſome remarkable Sections in the *Anticavalieriſm*. And at laſt the fire kindled, and his Pen gave teſtimony of it.

§. 88. The particulars he then took notice of in M. *G.* were 1. His dexterities in evacuating the force of *Tertullians* teſtimonies concerning the *patience*, and non-reſiſtance of the *Primitive Chriſtians*, and theſe are at large refuted in the tract of *Reſiſting*, &c. page 58. to page 63. Secondly, his ſtrange affirmation of *Gods hiding from the firſt Chriſtians this liberty of reſiſting Superiours, as part of his counſel to bring Antichriſt into the world, and his manifeſting it to us now, as a means of caſting Antichriſt out*. The latter of theſe two D. *H.* conceived as ſtrange, and as dangerous a Doctrine, as he ever met with, and therefore examined it to the *bottom*, *Reſiſt.* page 63. to 66. Theſe two main matters of difference Dr. *Hammond* acknowledges to have managed againſt Mr. *Goodwin*, but I conceive without any thing of *aſperity*, or *exceſs* in any kind, which ſhould look like a *particular deſire of engaging* M. *G.* And M. *G.* hath thought fit for many years to let theſe reckonings ſleep without ever giving the leaſt reply to either of them. And now that [*of Gods hiding of truths from the Ancient Chriſtians*, and the *helping Antichriſt to his throne*] hath not the fortune to be taken notice of at all. And for the other of *Tertullian*, though that be now mentioned, yet is it a little ſtrange that no other return would be made to all the *Doctors anſwers*, ſave only the tranſcribing of two or three pages from M. *Rutterford*, and M. *Pryn*, as from a pair of *Royaliſts*, in their two tracts of *Lex Rex*, and *Soveraign power of Parliaments*, which ſure he could not believe will be of any Authority with the *Doctor*, though he is ſo pleaſant as to mention the *friendlineſs of their judgments and the Doctors in caſe of the late King*: beſides this *tranſcription*, there is but one paſſage in thoſe diſſertations of the *Doctors*, to which he thinks fit to make reply; and that is a *Grammatical* σφάλμα, taken notice of παρέργως by the *Doctor*, *viz.* Maſter *Goodwins* attributing to *Montaniſt*, that he call'd himſelf the *Holy Ghoſt*. This Doctor *Hammond* did conceive to be haſtily written by Maſter *Goodwin*, and not agreeably to the rules of the *Grammar*, unleſs as in *Smectymnuus*, *Areopagi* are ſet for the *Areopagites*, ſo *è contra*, *Montaniſt* were ſet by Maſter *Goodwin* for *Montanus*. In this caſual incidental charge Mr. *Goodwin* thinks himſelf very nearly concern'd, more it ſeems, than in giving account either of his *Cenſure of Tertullians teſtimony* of the *Chriſtians patience*, or of *Gods hiding of Truths* and *aſſiſting Antichriſt*. For to juſtifie the *Grammaticalneſs* of theſe words, [*Montaniſt who called himſelf the Holy Ghoſt*] a great deal of pains is taken, and three whole pages ſpent on that affair. 'Tis not poſſible I ſhould think fit to exerciſe my Reader by continuing ſuch a *Debate* as this any longer, but ſhall think it abundantly ſufficient to aſſure Maſter *Goodwin* that the Engliſh remains ſtill unjuſtified, upon this ground, that the word *Montaniſt* is no *poſſeſſive*, and if he ſtill have inclinations to diſpute it, I ſhall propoſe him this parallel: Maſter *Goodwin* is *a Chriſtian, who died for the ſins of the World*; and ask him, Whether it be *Grammatical* ſence to have ſaid this. As for the deep recrimination againſt Doctor *Hammond* for uſing the word [*Reſolve*] for *concluding*, or *being ſatisfied within himſelf*, *&c.* If this be any matter of *eaſe* or *refreſhment* to Maſter *Goodwin*, 'twere pity he ſhould be denied the *liberty* to make uſe of it.

§. 89. There now remains but one particular, the Doctors *accuſing* Maſter *Goodwin of flattery* in the Elogies beſtowed upon that action of the Army, (collected in the *Addreſs*, page 95.) Whether they were thus guilty, I ſhall no farther diſpute, but leave it to the *Reader* to determine; having no other deſign in this whole *Reply*, than that Maſter *Goodwin* may reſume the conſideration of his actions, and of his arguments, and remember that the matters of theſe Debates are of ſuch an importance toward the publick peace, that men of our *profeſſion* owe an account to *God* for them. And for other paſſages of this *Authour*, wherein the *London-Miniſters* are concern'd, I leave them to anſwer for themſelves, and ſo conclude this Paper.

THE END.

A VIEW
OF THE
New Directory;
AND
A VINDICATION of the Antient LITURGY of the CHURCH of ENGLAND.

CONSIDERATIONS concerning the CHANGE
OF
Church-Government.

OF THE
POWER of the KEYS,
OR OF
Binding and Loosing.

I. A VIEW *of the* NEW DIRECTORY, *and a Vindication of the ancient* LITURGY *of the Church of* England:

In Anſwer to the Reaſons pretended in the Ordinance *and* Preface, *for the aboliſhing the one, and eſtabliſhing the other.*

II. CONSIDERATIONS *of preſent Uſe, concerning the danger reſulting from the Change of our* CHURCH-GOVERNMENT.

III. *Of the* POWER of the KEYES: Or, *of Binding and Looſing.*

1 Cor. 11. 31.

Εἰ ἑαυτοὺς διεκρίνομεν, οὐκ ἂν ἐκρινόμεθα.

By the King.

A PROCLAMATION

Commanding the Uſe of the *BOOK* of *COMMON-PRAYER* according to Law, notwithſtanding the pretended Ordinances for the New Directory.

WHEREAS by a Printed Paper, dated the third of January laſt paſt, intituled, An Ordinance of Parliament for taking away the Book of Common-Prayer, and for eſtabliſhing and putting in execution of the Directory for the publique worſhip of God, It is ſaid to be ordained amongſt other things, That the Book of Common-Prayer ſhould not remain, or be from thenceforth uſed in any Church, Chappel, or place of Publique Worſhip within the Kingdom of England, or Dominion of Wales; And that the Directory for Publique Worſhip in that Printed Paper ſet forth, ſhould be from thenceforth uſed, purſued, and obſerved in all Exerciſes of Publique Worſhip of God in every Congregation, Church, Chappel, and place of Publique Worſhip. And by another Printed Paper, dated the 23 day of Auguſt laſt paſt, intituled, An Ordinance of the Lords and Commons aſſembled in Parliament, for the more effectual putting in execution the Directory for Publique Worſhip, &c. particular Directions are ſet down for the diſperſing, publiſhing, and uſe of the ſaid Directory, in all Pariſhes, Chappelries, and Donatives, and for the calling in and ſuppreſſing of all Books of Common-Prayer, under ſeveral forfeitures and penalties to be levyed and impoſed upon Conviction before Juſtices of Aſſiſe, or of Oyer and Terminer, and of the Peace, as by the ſaid two Printed Papers may appear. And taking into Our Conſideration, that the Book of Common-Prayer, which is endeavoured thus to be aboliſhed, was Compiled in the times of Reformation by the moſt Learned and Pious Men of that Age, and defended and confirmed with the Martyrdom of many; and was firſt eſtabliſhed by Act of Parliament in the time of King Edward the ſixth, and never repealed or laid aſide, ſave only in that ſhort time of Queen Maries Reign, upon the Return of Popery and Superſtition; and in the firſt year of Queen Elizabeth, it was again revived and eſtabliſhed by Act of Parliament, and the repeal of it then declared by the whole Parliament, to have been to the great decay of the due honour of God, and diſcomfort to the profeſſors of the Truth of Chriſts Religion: and ever ſince it hath been uſed and obſerved for above fourſcore years together, in the beſt times of Peace and Plenty that ever this Kingdom enjoyed; and that it contains in it an excellent Form of Worſhip and Service of God, grounded upon the Holy Scriptures, and is a ſingular means and help to Devotion in all Congregations, and that, or ſome other of the like Form, ſimply neceſſary in thoſe many Congregations which cannot be otherwiſe ſupplied by learned and able Men; and keeps up an uniformity in the Church of England; And that the Directory, which is ſought to be introduced, is a means to open the way, and give the liberty to all ignorant, Factious, or evil Men, to broach their own fancies and conceits, be they never ſo wicked or erroneous; and to miſlead People into ſin and Rebellion, and to utter thoſe things, even in that which they make for their Prayer in their Congregations as in Gods preſence, which no Conſcientious man can aſſent or ſay Amen to. And be the Miniſter never ſo Pious and Religious, yet it will break that uniformity which hitherto hath been held in Gods Service, and be a means to raiſe Factions and Diviſions in the Church. And thoſe many Congregations in this Kingdom, where able and Religious Miniſters cannot be maintained, muſt be left deſtitute of all help or means for their Publique Worſhip and Service of God. And obſerving likewiſe, that no reaſon is given for this alteration, but only inconvenience alledged in the General (and whether Pride and Avarice be not the ground, whether Rebellion and deſtruction of Monarchy be not the Intention of ſome, and Sacrilege and the Churches poſſeſſions the aims and hopes of others, and theſe new Directories, the means to prepare and draw the People in for all, We leave to him who ſearches and knows the hearts of Men.) And taking into Our further Conſideration, that this alteration is introduced by colour of Ordinances of Parliament made without and againſt Our Conſent, and againſt an Expreſs Act of Parliament ſtill in force, and the ſame Ordinances made as perpetual binding Laws, inflicting penalties and puniſhments, which was never, before theſe times, ſo much as pretended to have been the uſe or power of Ordinances of Parliament, without an Expreſs Act of Parliament, to which We are to be Parties. Now leſt Our ſilence ſhould be interpreted by ſome,

as a Connivance or indifference in Us, in a matter so highly concerning the Worship and Service of God, the Peace and Unity of the Church and State, and the establish'd Laws of the Kingdom, We have therefore thought fit to Publish this Our Proclamation; And We do hereby Require and Command all and singular Ministers in all Cathedral and Parish-Churches, and other Places of Publique Worship within Our Kingdom of England or Dominion of Wales; and all other to whom it shall appertain, That the said Book of Common-Prayer be kept and used in all Churches, Chappels, and places of Publique Worship, according to the said Statute made in that behalf in the said first Year of the said late Queen Elizabeth; And that the said Directory be in no sort admitted, received, or used, the said pretended Ordinances, or any thing in them contained to the contrary, notwithstanding. And We do hereby let them know, that whensoever it shall please God to restore Us to Peace, and the Laws to their due Course, (wherein We doubt not of his assistance in his good time) We shall require a strict Account and prosecution against the breakers of the said Law, according to the force thereof; and in the mean time, in such places where We shall come, and find the Book of Common-Prayer suppress and laid aside, and the Directory introduced, We shall account all those that shall be Ayders, Actors, or Conceivers therein, to be Persons disaffected to the Religion and Laws establish'd; and this they must expect, besides that greater loss which they shall sustain by suffering themselves thus to be deprived of the use and comfort of the said Book. Given at our Court at *Oxford*, this Thirteenth day of *November*, in the One and Twentieth Year of our Reign, 1645.

God save the King.

A PREFACE TO THE ENSUING DISCOURSE.

THAT the Liturgy of the Church of *England*, which was at firſt as it were writ- *Sect.* 1.
ten in blood, at the leaſt ſealed, and delivered down to us by the Martyrdom of moſt of the compilers of it, ſhould ever ſince be daily ſolicited, and call'd to the ſame ſtage and Theatre, to fill up what was behind of the ſufferings of thoſe Fathers, is no ſtrange or new piece of œconomy in the Church of God. *This Propoſition I ſhall take liberty briefly to prove by way of Introduction to the enſuing Diſcourſe, and ſhall hope that you will acknowledge it with me, if you but conſider theſe ſeverals.*

1. *That there is not a ſurer evidence and* κριτήριον, *by which to diſcern the great excellency* *Sect.* 2.
of moderation in that book, and ſo the apportionateneſs of it to the end to which it was deſigned, than the experience of theſe ſo contrary fates, which it hath conſtantly undergone, betwixt the perſecutors on both extream parts, the aſſertors of the Papacy on the one ſide, and the Conſiſtory on the other; the one accuſing it of Schiſm, the other of Complyance; the one of departure from the Church of Rome, *the other of remaining with it, like the* poor Greek Church *our fellow-martyr, devoured by the Turk for* too much *Chriſtian profeſſion, and damn'd by the Pope for* too little, *it being the dictate of natural Reaſon in* Ariſtotle, *(whoſe rules have ſeldom failed in that kind, ſince he obſerved them) that the* middle vertue is moſt infallibly known by this, that it is accuſed by either extream as guilty of the other extream: *that the true liberality of mind is by this beſt exemplified, that it is defamed by the prodigal for parſimony, and by the niggard for prodigality, by which (by the way) that great block of offence, which hath ſcandalized ſo many, will be in part removed, and the* reproaches *ſo continually heaped upon this book, will to every diſcerning Judge of things, paſs for as weak an unconcluding argument of* guilt *in it, as the ſcars of the Military man doth of his cowardice, or the* πᾶν πονηρὸν ῥῆμα, the every Topick of rayling Rhetorick, *Mal.* 5. *of the unchriſtianneſs of the perſon on whom they are poured out.*

2. *That ever ſince the reproaches of men have taken confidence to vent themſelves againſt* *Sect.* 3.
this book, there hath nothing but air and vapour been vomited out againſt it, objections of little force to conclude any thing but only the reſolute contumacious, either ignorance, or malice of the objectors, which might at large be proved, both by the view of all the charges that former Pamphlets have produced, all gathered together and vindicated by Maſter Hooker, *and that no one charge of any crime, either againſt the whole or any part of it, which this Directory hath offered; which as it might in reaſon, make ſuch an act of malice more ſtrange, ſo will it to him that compares this matter with other practices of theſe times, (whoſe great engine hath been the* calumniari fortiter, *the* gaining credit by the violence of the cry, *when it could not be had by the validity of the proofs, moſt men being more willing to believe a calumny, than to examine it) make it but unreaſonable to wonder at it; It being an experiment of daily obſervation, that thoſe which have no crime of which they are accuſable, are therefore not the leſs, but the more vehemently accuſed, proſecuted, and dragg'd to execution, that the puniſhment may prove them guilty, which nothing elſe could, it being more probable in the judgment of the multitude, (who eſpecially are conſidered now a-days, as the inſtruments to act our great deſigns) that a nocent perſon ſhould plead not guilty, than an innocent be condemned; which prejudice, as it might be pardon'd from the charity wherein 'tis grounded, that they who are appointed to puniſh vileneſſes, will not be ſo likely to commit them, ſo being applied to uſurping judges, (whoſe very judging is one crime, and that no way avowable, but by making uſe of more injuſtices) will prove but a piece of Turciſme, which concludes all things* honeſt, *that prove* ſucceſsful, *or of the modern Divinity in the point of Scandal, which makes it a ſufficient exception againſt any indifferent uſage, that it is by ſome excepted againſt, a competent cauſe of* anger, *that men are* angry *at it though never ſo* without a cauſe.

Sect. 4. 3. *That it hath been constantly the portion, and prerogative of the best things (as of the best men) to be under the* cross, *to have* their good things *of this world* μετὰ διωγμῶν, with persecutions, Mar. 10. 30. *and so no strange thing that that which is always a dealing with the cross, should be sometimes a panting, and gasping under it; There was never any surer evidence of the cleanness of a creature amongst the Jews, than that it was permitted to be sacrificed; the Lamb, and the Turtle emblemes of innocence, and charity, and the other christian vertues, were daily slaughter'd and devour'd, while the Swine; the* θηριάλωτα, *and all the uncleaner creatures, were denied that favour, placed under a kind of* Anathema, *or Excommunication sentence,* of such it *was* not lawful, no not to eat; *and so it must be expected in the anti-type, that all the heat of the Satanical impression, all the fire of zeal, the sentence to be sacrificed, and devoted, should fall as now it doth, on this* Lamb-like, Dove-like *creature, of a making not apt to provoke any man to rage, or quarrel, or any thing, but love of communion, and thanksgiving to God for such an inestimable donative.*

Sect. 5. 4. *That a Liturgy being found by the experience of all antient times, as a necessary hedge, and mound to preserve any profession of Religion, and worship of God in a* National Church, *it was to be expected that the* enemy *and his instruments, which can call destruction mercy, embroyling of our old Church the* founding *of a new (we know who hath told one of the Houses of this Parliament so, that* they have laid a foundation of a Church among us, *which if it signifie any thing, imports that there was no Church in this Kingdom before that Session) should also think the destroying of all Liturgy, the only way of security to Gods worship, the no-form being as fitly accommodated to a no-Church, as the no-hedge, no-wall to the Common, or desart, the no-inclosure to the no-plantation.*

Sect. 6. 5. *That the eradication of Episcopacy, first Voted, then Acted, by the Ordination of Presbyters, by Presbyters without any Bishop, which began to be practised in this Kingdom, about the end of the last year, was in any reason to be accounted proœmial and preparatory to some farther degree of* ἀταξία, *or disorder, and to be attended by the abolition of the Liturgy in the beginning of this new Year, (Episcopacy and Liturgy being like the* συναποθνήσκοντες, *among the Ægyptians, this Daughter to attend that Mother, as among the Barbarians when their Prince died, some of the noblest were constantly to bear him company out of the World, not to mourn for, but to dye with him.) A thing that the People of this Kingdom could never have been imagined low and servile enough to bear or endure, (I am sure within few Years they that sate at the stern of action conceived so, and therefore were fain by Declaration, to disavow all such intention of violence) till by such other assays and practices and experiments, they were found to be* satis ad servitutem parati, *sufficiently prepared for any thing that was servile, almost uncapable of the benefit or relief of a Jubilee, like the* slave *in* Exodus, *that* would not go out free, *but required to be* bored thorow the Ear *by his Master, to be a slave for ever.*

Sect. 7. 6. *That it is one profest act of Gods secret Wisdom, to make such tryals as this, of mens fidelity, and sense, and acknowledgment of his so long indulged favours, to see who will sincerely mourn for the* departing of the glory from Israel, *whether there be not some that (with the Captive* Trojan *Women in* Homer, *who wept so passionately at the fall of* Patroclus, *but* made that publick loss the season to pour out their private griefs) *are sensible of those* sufferings *of the Church only, wherein their* interests *are involved, and more nearly concerned; whether not some that count the* invasion *of the* Revenues *of the Church a Sacriledge, a Calamity, a sin unparallel'd, but think the* abolition of the Liturgy *unconsiderable, a venial sin and misery; whether that, wherein Gods glory is not joyned with any secular interest of our own, that which makes the separation betwixt Christ and Mammon, may be allowed any expression of our passion or zeal,* i. e. *in effect, whether we pour out one drop for Christ in all this deluge of tears, or whether like uncompounded self-lovers, whose only centre and principle of motion is our selves, we have passion to no spectacle but what the Looking-glass presents to us; with a* Πάτροκλον πρόφασιν, *making God the* pretence, *and* apology, *for that kindness which is paid and poured out unto another shrine. For of this there is no doubt, that of all the changes of late designed and offered to authority, there is none for which flesh and blood, passions and interests of men can allow so free a suffrage, so regretless a consent, as this of the abolition of Liturgy, (The* sluggishness of ungisted men; *the only thing that is affirmed to be concerned in, or to gain by it, is perfectly mistaken, as shall anon appear) and were there not a God in Heaven, the care of whose honour obliged us to endeavour the preservation of it, were not a future growth of Atheism and Prophaneness the feared consequent of such abolition, and notorious experience ready to avow the justness of this fear, I have reason to be confident that no Advocate would offer Libel, no Disputer put in exception, against this present Directory; I am privy to my own sence, that I should not, I have rather reason to impute it to my self, that the want of any such carnal motive to stir me up to this defence, might be the cause that I so long deferr'd to undertake it, and perhaps should have done so longer, if any man*

else

elſe had appear'd in that argument. And therefore unleſs it be ſtrange for men, when there be ſo many tempters abroad, to be permitted to temptations, ſure Gods yielding to this act of the importunity of Satan (who hath deſired in this new way to explore many) will not be ſtrange neither.

Laſtly, that our ſo long abuſe, of this ſo continued a mercy, our want of diligence, in aſ- Sect. 8.
ſembling our ſelves together (*the too* ordinary *fault of too* many *of the beſt of us*) *our general, ſcandalous, unexcuſable diſobedience to the commands of our Church, which requires that ſervice to be uſed conſtantly in publick every day, the vanity of prurient tongues and itching ears, which are ſtill thirſting after news and variety, but above all, the want of ardor and fervency in the performance of this preſcribed ſervice, (which hath given it the fate of that gem, of which the Naturaliſt affirms, that if it be put in the mouth of a* dead *man, it loſes all its vertue) the coldneſs and deadneſs of our hearts, the admitting of all ſecular company (I mean worldly thoughts) into its preſence, preferring all ſecular buſineſs before it, the general irreverence and indifference in the celebrations, may well be thought to have encouraged Satan to his* expetivit, *to the* preferring his petition to God, *and his importunity at length to have provoked God to deliver up our Liturgy to him, and his miniſters, to oppoſe and malign, to calumniate and defame, and at laſt to gain the countenance of an Ordinance, to condemn and execute it as at this day. The Lord be merciful to them that have yielded to be inſtrumental to that great* deſtroyer *in this buſineſs.*

I have thus far laboured to preſs home that part of Saint Peters *exhortation* μὴ ξενίζεσθαι, Sect. 9.
not to think *the calamity* ſtrange *which hath befallen this Church in this matter, on no other purpoſe, but to diſcharge that duty which we owe to Gods ſecret providence, of obſerving the viſible works of it, that diſcerning our ſelves to be under his afflicting hand, we may,* 1. *Joyn in the uſe of all probable means to remove ſo ſad a preſſure, by humbling our ſelves, and reforming thoſe ſins which have fitted us for this captivity, then* 2. *That we may compaſſionate and pardon, and bleſs, and pray for thoſe, whoſe hands have been uſed in the execution of this vengeance and reproach upon the land, and Laſtly, That we may endeavour, if it be poſſible, to diſabuſe and rectifie theſe, who are capable, by more light, of ſafer reſolutions; To which purpoſe thoſe following animadverſions being deſigned in the bowels of compaſſion to my infatuated Country-men, and out of a ſincere ſingle deſire, that our ſins may have ſome end or allay, though our miſeries have not (and therefore framed in ſuch a manner, as I conceived, might prove moſt uſeful, by being moſt proportionable to them, who ſtood moſt in need of them, without any oblation provided for any other ſhrine, any civility for the more curious Reader) are here offered to Thee, to be dealt with as thou deſireſt to be treated at that laſt dreadful tribunal, which ſure then will be with acceptation and pardon, and with that* Charity, *(the but juſt return to that which mixt this antidote for thee)* which will cover a multitude of ſins.

A VIEW OF THE New Directory; AND A VINDICATION of the Antient LITURGY of the CHURCH of ENGLAND.

CHAP. I.

Sect. 1. IN the Ordinance prefixt to the Directory (being almoſt wholly made up of forms of Repeal) there are only two things worthy of any ſtay or conſideration.

1. The motives upon which the Houſes of Parliament have been inclined to think it *neceſſary* to *aboliſh the Book of Common-Prayer, and eſtabliſh the Directory*, and thoſe are ſpecified to be three. Firſt the *conſideration of the manifold inconveniences, that have riſen by the Book in this Kingdom.* 2dly, *The reſolution according to their Covenant, to reform Religion according to the Word of God, and the beſt reformed Churches.* 3ly, *Their having conſulted with the Learned, and Pious, and Reverend Divines to that purpoſe; From whence they conclude it neceſſary to aboliſh the Book.*

Sect. 2. To this concluſion infer'd upon theſe premiſes, I ſhall confidently make this return, 1. That the concluſion is as illogical, as any that an Aſſembly of wiſe men have ever acknowledged themſelves to be guilty of, no one of the three Motives being ſeverally of ſtrength to bear ſuch a ſuperſtructure, and therefore all together being as unſufficient; for if the concluſion were only of the *prudence*, or *expedience*, of taking it away, ſomewhat might be pretended for that inference from the premiſes, ſuppoſing them true; But when 'tis of *neceſſity* (and that twice repeated, and ſo not caſually fallen from them) there muſt then be ſomewhat of *precept divine* in the premiſes to induce that *neceſſity*, or elſe it will never be induced: for I ſhall ſuppoſe it granted by them with whom I now diſpute, that nothing is *neceſſary* in the worſhip of God, but what God hath preſcribed, the *neceſſity of precept* being the only one that can have place in this matter, and the *neceſſitas medii*, being moſt improper to be here pleaded. But that there is no ſuch *direct precept*, ſo much as pretended to by thoſe three motives, it is clear, and as clear that all together do not amount to an *interpretative precept*. For that a lawful thing though preſt with manifold inconveniences ſhould be removed, is no where *commanded the lawful Magiſtrate*, but left to his prudence to judge whether there be not conveniences on the other ſide, which may counterballance thoſe inconveniences, much leſs is it commanded the inferiour Courts in deſpight of King and ſtanding Law; for what-ever of expedience, and ſo of prudence might be ſuppoſed to interpoſe, that may be ſufficient to incline a *Wiſe Magiſtrate* to make a Law, but not any elſe, either to uſurp the power of a Law-maker, or to do any thing contrary to *eſtabliſh'd* Laws; there being nothing that can juſtifie the leaſt *diſobedience* of Subjects to their *Prince*, or the *Laws* of the Kingdom, but that obligation to that one ſuperiour Law of that higher Prince, *our Father which is in heaven*, which being ſuppoſed, 'tis not all the *reſolutions* and *Covenants* in the World that can make it *lawful* for any ſo to diſobey, much leſs *neceſſary*, any more, than the *ſaying Corban* in the Goſpel, *i. e.* pretending a Vow will free the Child from the obligation of *honouring or relieving his Father*, or than *Herods* vow made it lawful to cut off the Head of *John* the Baptiſt: and then how far the *conſultation with thoſe Divines* may induce that *neceſſity*, will upon the ſame ground alſo be manifeſt, to any, eſpecially that ſhall remember, with what caution that Aſſembly was by the Houſes admitted to conſult, and with what reſtraints on them, and profeſſions, that they were call'd only to be *adviſers*, when they were *required*, but not to *conclude* any thing, either by a *general* concurrence, or by that of a Major part, and farther than the *reaſons* which they ſhould offer them, might *prevail* with them; to which purpoſe it was ſo ordered, that if any one man diſſented from the reſt of their Divines, his opinion and reaſons were as much to be repreſented to the Houſes, as that other of the reſt of the Aſſembly.

Sect. 3. By this I conceive it appears, that I have not quarrell'd cauſleſly with the Logick of this concluſion, the premiſes pretending at moſt but motives of *expedience*, and ſo as unable to infer a *neceſſity*,

as

as a *Topical* argument is to *demonſtrate*, or a *particular* to induce an *univerſal*. That which I would in charity gueſs of this matter, as the cauſe of this miſtake, is my not groundleſs ſuſpicion, that when the Presbyterians had prepared the premiſes, the Independents framed the concluſion, the former of theſe joyning at laſt with the other in a reſolution of taking away the Book, but only on Prudential conſiderations, not out of Conſcience of the unlawfulneſs, and proportionably ſetting down thoſe reaſons but prudential reaſons, and the latter though reſtrained from putting conſcience into the premiſes, yet ſtealing it ſecretly into the concluſion, and ſo each deceiving and being deceived by each other. I am not ſure that my conjecture is right in this particular, yet have I reaſon to inſert it. 1. Becauſe I find in many places of the *Directory* certain foot-ſteps of this kind of compoſition and compliance, and mixture of thoſe ſo diſtant ſorts of Reformers. 2. Becauſe the Presbyterians which have formerly appeared both in other and in this Kingdom (whoſe copy theſe preſent reformers of that party have tranſcribed) have conſtantly avowed the lawfulneſs of Liturgy, and ſo cannot affirm any neceſſity of aboliſhing; witneſs *Calvin* himſelf (whom we ſhall anon have occaſion to produce) and the practice of his Church of *Geneva*, and nearer to our ſelves, witneſs thoſe four claſſes, which in Queen *Elizabeths* days, had ſet themſelves up in this Kingdom. Theſe had made complaint to the Lord *Burleigh* againſt our Liturgy, and entertained hopes of obtaining his favour in that buſineſs about the year 1585. he demanded of them, whether they deſired the taking away of all Liturgy, they anſwered, no; he then required them to make a better, ſuch as they ſhould deſire to have ſetled in the ſtead of this. The firſt Claſſis did accordingly frame a new one, ſomewhat according to the *Geneva* form. But this the ſecond Claſſis diſliked, and altered in 600. particulars; that again had the fate to be quarrel'd by the third Claſſis, and what the third reſolved on, by the fourth; and the diſſenting of thoſe Brethren, as the Diviſion of tongues at *Babel*, was a fair means to keep that Tower then from advancing any higher. Nay, even for our neighbours of *Scotland* themſelves, what ever ſome of them of late have thought fit to do, ſince they became Covenanters, (in animoſity perhaps and oppoſition to that terrible *mormo*, the Liturgy ſent to them from hence) we know that they were Presbyterians formerly, without ſeeing any neceſſity of aboliſhing Liturgy.

Sect. 4. 'Tis no news to tell you that Mr. *Knox* wrote a Liturgy, wherein there is frequent mention of the days of Common-Prayer, and among many other particulars, theſe enſuing, worthy your remark. 1. Plain undiſguiſed confeſſions of ſuch faults, which this age, though as notoriouſly guilty of as they, will not put into publick forms, or leave upon record againſt themſelves, as, That *for the pleaſure and defence* of the French *they had violated their Faith, oft breaking the leagues of unity and concord, which their Kings and Governours had contracted with their Neighbours*, and again, that *for the maintenance of their friendſhip, they have not feared to break their ſolemned oaths made unto others.* To which I might add, from another Confeſſion, that *Whoredom and adultery, are but paſtimes of the fleſh, crafty dealing, deceit and oppreſſion is counted good conqueſt*, &c. but that it would look too like a Satyre againſt ſome part of that Nation at this time thus to ſpecifie. Secondly, Their great ſenſe and acknowledgment of obligations from this Kingdom of *England*, and not only prayers for continuance of peace between *England* and *Scotland*, but even execrations *on all* (and ſo ſure on thoſe their ſucceſſors of this age) which ſhould continue or contribute ought toward the breaking of it, the words are theſe. *Seeing when we by our power were altogether unable*, &c. *thou didſt move the hearts of our neighbours (of whom we had deſerved no ſuch favour) to take upon them the common burthen with us, and for our deliverance, not only to ſpend the lives of many, but alſo to hazard the eſtate and tranquillity of their Realm, Grant unto us that with ſuch reverence we may remember thy benefits received, that after this in our default, we never enter into hoſtility againſt the Nation of England, ſuffer us never to fall into that ingratitude and deteſtable unthankfulneß, that we ſhould ſeek the deſtruction and death of thoſe whom thou haſt made inſtruments to deliver us from the tyranny of mercileß ſtrangers*, [the French.] *Diſſipate thou the counſels of ſuch as deceitfully travail to ſtir the hearts of either Realm againſt the other, let their malicious practices be their own confuſion, and grant thou of thy mercy, that love, and concord, and tranquillity may continue, and encreaſe among the Inhabitants of this Iſland, even to the coming of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt.* 3. That ſome of their forms of words are directly all one with ours, others with ſome ſmall additions retaining our forms, as in the Prayer for the King, and the Exhortation before the Sacrament, and the adjuration of the parties to be married will appear. 4. That on their day of Faſt (though that be with great care provided and ordered to be the Sunday twice together, quite contrary to the Canons and Cuſtom of the Primitive Church, yet) 'tis then appointed that *the Miniſter with the People ſhall proſtrate themſelves, &c.* a poſture of moſt humble bodily adoration, made to reproach thoſe who will not ſo much as recommend or direct any one kind of corporal worſhip or geſture of humiliation in all their *Directory*. The inlarging to this mention of particulars I acknowledge to be a digreſſion. But the preſenting to your knowledge or remembrance this *Scottiſh* Liturgy is not; By which ſuperadded to the former, and by much more which might from other Churches be added to that, it briefly appears what is or hath been the uniform judgment of the Presbyterians in this matter, directly contrary to the concluded *neceſſity of aboliſhing*.

Pag. 102. *Ib.* *Pag.* 163. *Pag.* 106.

Sect. 5. Which neceſſity on the other ſide the Independents have ſtill aſſerted, and for that and other ſuch differences have avowed their reſolutions to be the like ſcourges to them as they have been to us, profeſſing (and *ad homines*, unanſwerably proving the reaſonableneſs of it) to reform the *Geneva* reformation (as a firſt rude and ſo imperfect draught juſt creeping out of Popery there, and therefore not ſuppoſeable to be compleat at the firſt eſſay) as the *Presbyterians* upon the ſame pretences have deſign'd and practiſed on our *Engliſh* Reformation.

Sect. 6. All this I have ſaid againſt the concluded neceſſity in caſe, or on ſuppoſition that the premiſſes were true, but now I muſt add the falſeneſs of thoſe alſo, and then if the *neceſſity* will ſtill remain, I muſt pronounce it a piece of Stoical fatality, an inſuperable unruly *neceſſity* indeed, that will acknowledge no Laws, or bounds, or limits to confine it.

And

Sect. 7. And first for the *manifold inconveniencies*, if that phrase denote those severals which in the Preface to the *Directory* are suggested, I shall in due place make it appear,

1. That there are not such inconveniencies:

2. That greater than those may easily, and hereafter shall be produced against their *Directory*; and consequently, that, although true inconveniencies were supposed sufficient to infer a *necessity* of abolition, yet such only pretended names of inconveniency, such *Chimæra's* and *Mormo's* (especially over-ballanced with real ones in the other scale) would be abundantly insufficient to do it. But if the *manifold inconveniencies* have a larger prospect to refer to, we shall conclude it very uncharitable not to mention those, which might possibly have had the same effect with us as with them, convinced us also to be their Proselytes, and in the mean time very unjust to put so uncertain an equivocal phrase into a Law, which we have no Criterion, or nomenclature to interpret; but beyond all, very imprudent to mention and lay weight on such slight and such no inconveniencies afterward specified, when others might have been produced better able to bear the envy of the accusation.

Sect. 8. As for your *resolution*, if it went no higher than the *Covenant*, and that but to *reform Religion, according to the Word of God, and example of the best reformed Churches*, I am sure it cannot oblige, or so much as incline you to take away that Book, there being nothing in it, 1. Contrary to *design of reformation*, 2. Contrary to *the Word of God*, or, 3. Contrary to the *example of the best reformed Churches*.

Not 1. To Reformation, for Reformation is as contrary to *abolition* of what should be *reformed*, as cure to killing; and if it be replyed, that the *abolition of Liturgy*, as unlawful, may be necessary to the *reforming of Religion*, I shall yield to that reply on that supposition, but then withal add, that Liturgy must first be proved *unlawful*, and that testified from *divine infallible principles*; which because it is not thorow this whole Book so much as pretended, both that and the second suggestion from the word of God must necessarily be disclaimed, and then the example of the best Reformed Churches will soon follow, not only because all other Reformed Churches ordinarily known by that Title, have some kind of Liturgy, and that is as contrary to abolition, as the continuing of ours without any change, but because no *reformation* is to be preferr'd before that which cuts off no more than is *necessary* to be cut off, and *which* produces the *Scripture Rule*, the *sword of the Spirit*, for all such amputations; and therefore the *Church of England*, as it stands *established* by Law is avowable against all the Calumniators in the World, to be the *best* and *most exemplary reformed*; so far, that if I did not guess at the sence of the Covenant more by the temper than words of the Covenanters, I should think all men, that have *Covenanted to reform after the example of the best reformed Churches*, indispensably obliged to conform to the King-*Edward*, or Queen-*Elizabeth*-English Reformation, the most regular perfect pattern that *Europe* yieldeth.

Sect. 9. As for the truth of the last affirmation that they have *consulted with the Divines* called together to that purpose; although I have no reason to doubt of it, yet this I know, that very many of the learned'st there present, were, immediately before their imbarking in that imployment, otherwise minded, and that therefore so suddain an universal change of minds savours either of some strong *charm*, or *strange inconstancy*, and I shall make bold to ask this Question of that whole number of Divines, whether I should do them wrong in affirming, that there yet are not ten Divines in that number that think all Liturgy unlawful, and consequently that it was *necessary* (not to reform, but) to *abolish* our Book, which is the stile of the *Ordinance*. If this challenge of mine may not be answer'd with a plain punctual subscription of so many to the condemnation of all Liturgy as unlawful, I am sure this is an Argument *ad homines*, unanswerable. And the ground of my challenge, and of my specifying that number, is the relation we have oft had of the but *seven* dissenting Brethren, *i. e.* the but so many of the Independent Party among them, which upon my former ground I now suppose the only mortal enemies to all Liturgy. But if I am mistaken, and this be the common sence of those Assemblers, then have I reason to add to my former complaints this other of their so over cautious expressions, which through this whole Book hath not once intimated either the whole or any part to be *unlawful*, but only quarrel'd the *inconveniencies*, which suppose it otherwise to be *lawful*.

Sect. 10. And thus much might suffice of the first observable in the Ordinance, the concluding this abolition to be necessary. But because I would foresee and prevent all possible rejoynder, and because I would here interpose some considerations which would otherwise take up a larger place, I shall suppose the Presbyterians may have another notion of the word *Necessary*, of a lower importance than this under which we have hitherto proceeded against them (though still the Independents, whose judgment is not wont to be despised in the framing of *Ordinances*, cannot be imagined to take it in any other) and that is, that it shall signifie only a *Political necessity*, or that which is necessary if not to the *being*, yet to the *well-being*, *i. e.* to the *Peace and prosperity* of this Kingdom. Now because there be two parts of every Christian Kingdom, a *State* and a *Church*, and so two branches of Policy, *Civil* and *Ecclesiastical*, I shall not undertake to be so far Master of their sence, as to pitch upon either as that wherein they affirm this *abolition necessary*, but say somewhat to both, and to shew that it is not *necessary* in either sence of *Political necessity*.

Sect. 11. And first that the abolition of Liturgy cannot have so much as a benign influence on the *State*, much less be *necessary* to the prosperity of it, I shall infer only by this vulgar aphorism, that any notable or * grand mutation, if from some higher principle it appear not *necessary* to be made, will be necessary not to be made, at least not to be made *συμφυῶς ἅπαν*, altogether, but only by degrees and prudent dispensings. I shall not any farther enlarge on so plain a theme, than to mention one proportion or resemblance of this truth in the natural body observed by the Physicians in the cure of an hydropical patient, who, when the body lies covered with such a deluge of water, that it proves necessary to make some fluce to let out the burthenous superfluity, do not yet proceed by any loose way of letting out all at once, because the violent *effluvium*, or pouring out of Spirits constantly consequent to that, would certainly destroy the Patient, and endanger him on dry ground, as much or more, than in the midst of those waters; but the method is a *παρακέντησις*, the making so small a hole

* σμικρῶν ἔνεκα παρεγχειρήσεων ὁλοκλήρως καταδάλλεσθαι τὰ εἰωθότα γράμματα, ὅμοιον τῷ τὰ ὑπὸ τῶν Ἀθηναίων βυλομένῳ μετακινεῖν ἤδη τὸ θεμέλιον, ὅπου τὰ δεσμὰ τῆς κιβωτοῦ ἔκειτο σμικρὰν ποιήσειν. Themist. Παραφ. τῶν ὑς. Ἀναλυτ. l. 1.

hole in the skin, that ſhall drain the body by inſenſible degrees by drawing out a little at once, and never above a pint at a time, though many gallons are deſigned to paſs by this way of evacuation. I ſhall add no more to this reſemblance, but what * *Apollonius Tyaneus* is obſerved to have ſaid, χαλεπὸν μεταβαλεῖν δημὸν εἰς τὸ ἀθρόως σῶφρον, 'tis dangerous to work upon the people too ſuddain and violent reformations, let them be wrought by degrees, and they may proſper; and, to our point in hand, that the total violent illegal abolition of Liturgy in a ſetled Church, is certainly of this nature, and being ſuperadded to the change of the Government into a Form quite contrary to that which for 1600. years hath prevailed in the univerſal Church of Chriſt, there ſetled by the Apoſtles, may be allow'd the ſtile of *inſignis mutatio*, a mutation of ſome conſiderable importance to a Chriſtian ſtate, which being admitted altogether without any preparative alleviating ſteps, will (by the rapid ſuddain motion at leaſt, if there were nothing elſe) have a dangerous influence upon the whole body, of which the cunningeſt diviner cannot at this diſtance foreſee the effects, or prevent the emergent miſchiefs which ſucceeding time may diſcover. If it be ſaid, that this abolition is now *neceſſary to conclude the preſent War*, and that be affirmed to be the *Politick neceſſity* here meant, I anſwer, that if it were able to do that, I ſhould acknowledge it the ſtrongeſt argument that could be thought on to prove it *Politically neceſſary*, this War being ſo unneceſſarily deſtructive, and any thing that could rid us of that, ſo ſtrongly convenient, that if Conſcience would permit the uſe of it, I ſhould allow it the title of neceſſary. But to make ſhort of this, no man can believe that theſe Armies were raiſed or continued to ſubdue the Common-Prayer-Book, for, beſides that there was a time when 'twas found neceſſary for the Houſes to declare, that they had no deſign to take away that Book, for fear the People ſhould be diſobliged by it, and another when the Earl of *Eſſex* his Army expreſt ſome kindneſs to it; 'Tis now confeſt by the pretenders of both perſwaſions, Presbyterians and Independents, one that they do not, the other that they muſt not take up Arms for Religion, and ſo that kind of political neceſſity of aboliſhing the Book is, and by themſelves muſt be diſclaimed alſo.

* Philoſtr. l. 5. c. 13. p. 149.

Now for the ſecond branch of this *neceſſity*, that which is in order to *Eccleſiaſtical* or Church-policy, we ſhall take liberty in this place to conſider this matter at large, becauſe it may perhaps ſave us from pains hereafter, and becauſe their pretending of this *neceſſity* of doing what they do, is a tentation, if not a challenge to us to do ſo, and then we ſhall leave it to the Reader to judge what grounds may hence be fetcht for this pretended *neceſſity*. And this muſt be done by laying together the ſeveral things that are in our *Liturgy*, and are purpoſely left out in the *Directory*, and ſo are as it were the Characteriſtical note by which the *Directory* is by the Aſſemblers deſigned to differ from our *Liturgy*, as ſo much food from poiſon, Chriſtian from Antichriſtian (if *Neceſſity* be properly taken) or (if improperly for that which is *neceſſary* only to the well-being) as a more perfect and more profitable, from that which, if it be ſo at all, is not either (in their opinion) in ſo high a degree. *Sect.* 12.

Now the ſeverals of our *Liturgie* which are purpoſely avoided in this *Directory*, I have obſerv'd to be principally theſe: Of thoſe that are more *extrinſecal*, ſix. *Sect.* 13.

1. *The preſcribing of Forms, or Liturgy it ſelf.*
2. *Outward or bodily worſhip.*
3. *Uniformity in performing God's ſervice.*
4. *The Peoples bearing ſome part in the ſervice.*
5. *The dividing the Prayers into ſeveral Collects, and not putting them all into one continued Prayer.*
6. *The ceremonies of kneeling in the Communion, of Croſs in Baptiſm, of Ring in Marriage, &c.*

Then of thoſe that are *intrinſecal*, and parts of the Service.

1. *The Abſolution, in the beginning of the Service next after the Confeſſion, and before the Communion, and in the Viſitation of the ſick.*
2. *The Hymns, the Introite, the Te Deum, &c.*
3. *The uſe of the Doxology, or giving glory to God.*
4. *The Confeſſion of Faith in the Creeds.*
5. *The frequent repeating of the Lords Prayer, and the Prayers for the King.*
6. *The obſervation of divers Feaſts commemorative, not only of Chriſt, but of Saints departed, and aſſigning Services, Leſſons, Epiſtles, and Goſpels, and Collects to them.*
7. *The reading the Commandments, and the Prayers belonging to that Service.*
8. *The Order of the Offertory.*
9. *Private Baptiſm.*
10. *A preſcript form of Catechiſm.*
11. *Confirmation.*
12. *The ſolemnities of burying the Dead.*
13. *Thanksgiving after Child-birth.*
14. *Communion of the ſick.*
15. *The Service containing the Commination.*
16. *The obſervation of Lent and the Rogation*, and I would add alſo of *the Ember-weeks.*

This may ſeem too looſe a task, to enlarge on each of theſe, and yet we are in juſtice to this Book, and for an anſwer to the pretended Neceſſity of aboliſhing it, obliged to do ſo, as briefly as it may, only ſo far as may ſerve to give the Reader a view of the lawfulneſs at leaſt, and withal of the uſefulneſs of each of theſe, and conſequently of the no-appearance of reaſon why it ſhould be thought neceſſary to aboliſh any one of them, much leſs of all the reſt for that ones ſake.

And firſt for the preſcribing of Forms of Prayer, or Liturgy it ſelf, we ſhall refer it to judgment whether it be *neceſſary in Eccleſiaſtical Policy*, i. e. ſtrongly conducing to the benefit and edification of a Church to interdict or baniſh it out of the Kingdom, when we have propoſed theſe few things concerning it. 1. The example of God himſelf and holy men in the Old Teſtament, preſcribing ſet Forms of bleſſing the People, to be uſed daily by *Aaron* and his Sons, *Numb.* 6. 23. *The Lord bleſs thee and keep thee, &c.* ſet Forms for the People to uſe themſelves, *Deut.* 26. 3, 5. *Thou ſhalt ſay be-* *Sect.* 14.

fore the Lord, A Syrian, &c. as alſo at the going out of their Armies, *Deut.* 20. 3. and of Thankſgiving, *Exod.* 15. 1. made by *Moſes*, and it ſeems learnt by heart by all the people; and in the ſame words uſed again by *Miriam*, *verſe* 21. and ſo it appears, *Iſa.* 38. 20. that *Hezekiah* did not only form a ſet Thankſgiving, but uſed it all the days of his life, and the ſame *Hezekiah*, 2 *Chron.* 29. 30. in his thankſgiving commanded the *Levites* alſo to ſing praiſes to God with the words of *David* and *Aſaph*, *i. e.* Forms already prepared to his hand by thoſe ſacred Pen-men. So *Jer.* 33. 11. the Form of praiſing God is mentioned out of the *Pſalm*, [*For the Lord is gracious, and his mercy endureth for ever:*] and that thoſe very words taken out of *Pſalm* 136. were ſung by the *Jews* at their returning from captivity, appears *Ezr.* 3. 11.

Sect. 15. 2. The practice of the *Jews* ſince *Ezra*'s time conſtantly uſing ſet Forms of Prayer by way of *Liturgy*; For this I ſhall produce no other proof than the teſtimony of a learned Member of their Aſſembly, Mr. *Selden* in his notes on *Eutychius*, vouching all his affirmations out of the antient Records of the cuſtoms of the Jewiſh Nation, from whom, that they may be of authority with you, I ſhall tranſcribe theſe ſeverals, *That certain forms of praying which were to be uſed by every one daily by Law or received cuſtome, were inſtituted by Ezra and his houſe*, i.e. *his conſiſtory*. That *the Jews about the end of the Babyloniſh Captivity had* their *antient manners as well as language ſo depraved, that without a Maſter they either were not able to pray as they ought, or had not confidence to do ſo.* And therefore *that* for the future, *they might not recede either in the matter of their Prayers* (through corruption) *or expreſſion* (through ignorance) *from that form of Piety commanded them by God, this remedy was applyed by the men of the great Synagogue, Ezra and his* 120 *Collegues*, (where by the way is obſervable one ſpecial uſe and benefit of ſet Forms, not only to provide for the ignorant, but to be an hedge to the true Religion, to keep out all mixtures or corruptions out of a Church; To which purpoſe alſo the Councils in the Chriſtian Church have deſigned ſeveral parts which we ſtill retain in our *Liturgy*, a real and a valuable benefit, if it were conſidered.) *That of this kind there were* 18 *Prayers or Benedictions, call'd in the Gemara compoſed or appointed Prayers.* That *the three firſt of theſe, and the three laſt reſpected the glory of God, the twelve other intermediate, were ſpent on thoſe prime things that were neceſſary either to the whole People, or every particular man*; (Proportionable to which perhaps it is, that our Saviour who accommodated moſt inſtitutions of his, Baptiſm and his laſt Supper, &c. to the cuſtoms of the Church, did alſo deſign his Prayer, as it is ſet down in *Matthew*, though not according to the number of the Jewiſh prayers, yet to the general matter and form of them, the three firſt branches of it, and the concluſion, which may paſs for three branches more, referring to the glory of God, and the other intermediate to our private and publick wants.) That *theſe Prayers were to be learnt by every man, that the Prayers of the unskilful might be as perfect as of the moſt eloquent.* That *every act of Praying was begun with* Pſal. 51. 15. *O Lord open thou our lips, and our mouth ſhall ſhew forth thy praiſe* (the very form of words ſtill retain'd in Saint *James* his Liturgy, and in ours before the Introite) and *concluded with* Pſalm 31. 6. *Into thy hands*, &c. That *of theſe* 18 *Prayers no one was to be omitted, that if any other were added, they were counted of like free-will-offerings, as the other were anſwerable to the preſcribed, and were called by that name.* That *the additions might be made only in thoſe Prayers which concern their own wants, becauſe thoſe were capable of variation, but not to thoſe that concern'd God.* That *on Sabbath and Feaſt-days no man might uſe a voluntary Prayer*; *That about the time of the Jews deſtruction, Gamaliel and his Sanhedrin added a nineteenth Prayer, and after him others, ſo that at length the daily ſervice grew to an hundred Prayers.* That *it is likely that the Pagans came to uſe their ſet Forms in their Sacrifices alſo*, (and perhaps the *Mahumedans* too) *by the example of the Jewiſh Church*, for which he there refers the Reader to many Books of the Learned. I conceive the authority of this Gentleman hath not been deſpiſed by the Houſe of Commons, and the Aſſemblers (when it hath chanced to agree with their deſigns or intereſts) and therefore I have thus far, as an Argument *ad homines*, inſiſted on it. And becauſe the opinion of Proteſtants of other Churches is acknowledged to be of ſome authority with theſe Aſſemblers, I ſhall to this head of the *Jewiſh Liturgies* make uſe of one teſtimony more, hoping that it may by that means be received into deeper conſideration, than if I ſpake only from my own obſervations. 'Tis the obſervation of a Noble and learned *French* Proteſtant, that the Apoſtles were ſent, not to deſtroy, but eſtabliſh that pure worſhip or ſervice of God, which was in the Synagogues of the *Jews*, which they therefore retained (after Chriſts example) as far as did not contradict the œconomy or diſpenſation of things under Chriſt: and therefore though they changed the Sacrifices, and the Sabbath (Chriſt being the ſubſtance adumbrated by one, and the Lords day being appointed to take the place of the other) yet the ſervice it ſelf in other particulars they did continue. The grounds of this obſervation you have in the Scripture: Chriſt himſelf goes into their Synagogues, and the Apoſtles ordinarily at the Hours of Prayer, and certainly joyned with them in their ſervice, as far as agreed with the preſent ſtate. And by this means ſome ſympathy hath been obſervable between the Jewiſh and Chriſtian ſervices. This is clear by the Jewiſh forms: for ſome of which, and for the rites of uſing them, we are beholden to a moſt excellent man (a Proteſtant alſo) *P. Fagius*, and to ſome others ſince, who have made uſe of his collections. The firſt part of their ſervice was a Confeſſion of the ſins of their people (which was always ſolemnly uſed in their ſacrifices) a rule for which we have in the Sacred Writers, and in the Jewiſh Books the very *verba concepta*, the ſet conſtant forms mentioned by that Worthy on the Targum, *Lev.* 16. This they called *confeſſio* הרברים, or *verbalis*. After that followed ſome Pſalms of *David*, &c. which were ſung the whole Pſalms together, as alſo ſome תורות Hymns or givings of thanks, which, ſay the *Jews*, were inſtituted by *Eſdras*, who after the *Babyloniſh* Captivity reſtored the ſervice of God. After that they had their Leſſons out of the Law, which were divided into 54. *Sedarim*, or *Paraſchoth*, i. e. Sections, as alſo the Leſſons of the Prophets, diſtributed into as many *haphtaroth*, or *Aperturæ*, or, as ſome render it, *Dimiſſiones*, ſo divided that there may be one for every Sabbath in an *Intercalary* year. Then again was the whole action concluded with Prayer, *viz.* a general Prayer for the neceſſities of the Church and State, publick and private, and in that many particulars. After theſe Prayers the *Archiſynagogus* bleſſed the People, and diſmiſſed them. Save only that on any great feſtival ſolemnity, the Paſſe-

P. 49.

P. 50.

P. 55.

Du Pleſſ. de Miſſ. l. 1. c. 3.

over,

over, &c. there followed Benedictions particular to the occaſion, which on the Paſſeover were pronounced by the mouth of the Maſter of the Family; a form of which *Miſerere Domine*, &c. we have in *P. Fagius* on the Targum, *Deut.* 8.

Some *veſtigia* of this practice of theirs, in each part, we have in the New Teſtament: Firſt, of their confeſſion (ſaith that Noble learned man) *Matth.* 3. 6. *Mark* 1. 5. *Acts* 13. 38. Secondly, of their leſſons, *Acts* 5. 21. *Acts* 13. 14. *Luke* 4. 18. Thirdly, of their Pſalmodies and Hymns, *Eph.* 5. *Col.* 3. where 'tis obſervable that the three words of Greek uſed by the Apoſtle are the very ſame which are uſed by the *Septuagint* to render the three Hebrew words uſed in the Old Teſtament, and ſo refer particularly to the practice of the *Jews*. Fourthly, of their prayer for neceſſaries (ſaith he) in the Lords Prayer, *Matth.* 6. which, with him, ſome other very learned men conceive to have had ſpecial reference to the *formula ſolennes* then among the *Jews*: And that it may not be thought ſtrange, I ſhall give you ſome account of it out of their ancient *Hebrew Euchologues*. *In Seder Tephilloth Luſitan.* we have theſe words, *Pater noſter qui es in cœlis fac nobis gratiam, Our Father which art in Heaven*------In *Muſar.* 49. 1. theſe, *Deus noſter qui in cœlo unicus es, ſtabiliatur nomen tuum ſemper, regnum tuum regnet ſuper nos, in ſæculum & æternum, ſanctificetur autem nomen tuum ſuper opera noſtra. Our God who art the only one in heaven, thy name be always eſtabliſhed, thy kingdom reign over us for ever and ever, thy name be ſanctified over our works.* Again in *Seder Tephill. Luſitan.* p. 115. *Nomen tuum Domine Deus noſter ſanctificetur, & memoria tua glorificetur in cœlo deſuper, & ſuper terram inferné. Thy name O Lord our God be hallowed, and thy memorial glorified in heaven above, and upon the earth beneath.* In the *Comment* on *Pirke Aboth* f. 24. theſe, *Pii priores dicebant, Remitte & condona omnibus iis qui vexant me, The pious men of old ſaid, Remit and pardon all them who vex me.* Again in *Seder Tephill. Ne inducas me in tentationem,*------*& remove à me* * *figmentum malum, Lead me not into temptation,*------*and remove from me* every *evil machination.* Again in *Muſar.* 9. 12. *Ne inducas nos in manus peccati, neque in manus tentationis, ſed libera nos ab occurſu malo, Lead us not into the hands of ſin, nor into the hands of temptation, but deliver us from all evil that may meet us.* And laſtly in *Seder Tephill*, p. 222. *Quia tuum eſt regnum, & in ſæcula ſæculorum regnabis gloriosè, For thine is the Kingdom, and thou ſhalt reign glorioufly for ever and ever.* Almoſt every Petition, together with the exordium and concluſion of that Prayer. Fifthly, of their Prayer for the Common-wealth, and all that were in place of power over them, you have an acknowledgment, 1 *Tim.* 2. 1. which words there in Saint *Paul* ('twas Saint *Auguſtines* affirmation) were *nominatim intelligenda de ſolennibus Eccleſiaſtici officii precibus*, &c.

* *Qu.*

For the practice of the firſt * Chriſtians, how agreeable it was to this practice of the *Jews*, will be eaſily diſcerned. Saint *Baſil* in the deſcription of a Clergyman officiating, *ad Cler. Cæſar. Ep.* 63. They go, ſaith he, to the houſe of Prayer, and after the confeſſion, they prepare for the ψαλμῳδία, ſinging of Pſalms, (ſpeaking of the firſt Apoſtolical times; for now, ſaith he, we ſing the Pſalms in parts, or by turns: It ſeems they had not done ſo before, but all together) and by the intermixing of prayers, and interchanges or variety of Pſalms and Hymns, they overcome or ſpend a great part of the Night (ſpeaking of the *antelucani conventus*) and as ſoon as the Day breaks, they offer to God the Pſalm of Confeſſion, and ſo diſmiſs the Aſſembly. Beſides the Leſſons out of the Old Teſtament, the Chriſtians (you will believe) added alſo others out of the New; and (ſaith *Morney*) *ejus particulam aliquam Antiſtes interpretari ſolitus.* After Sermon they proceeded to the celebration of the Euchariſt (parallel to their cuſtoms on the great feſtivities of the Paſſeover, &c.) In it 1. the words of the Inſtitution were recited, with a thankſgiving or bleſſing, (as in *Juſtin Martyr* 'tis deſcribed;) then the Bread and Wine (before received by the offertory of the people) was diſtributed to the people; after which a Pſalm was ſung, &c. Before the Sacrament (ſaith Saint *Ambroſe*) was the Prayer for Kings, *Et hæc Regula Eccleſiaſtica tradita à Magiſtro Gentilium*, ſaith he, *De Sacra. l.* 4. *c.* 4. and of the uſe of that alſo *Tertul.* is expreſs, *Apol. c.* 39. After the Lords Supper the τρισάγιον or Doxology was taken up in imitation of Chriſt, who after Supper ſung an Hymn with his Diſciples, not diſdaining to make uſe of the antient Jewiſh Cuſtom. One teſtimony more I ſhall only add out of Saint *Cyprian*, *de Orat. Dom. Ser.* 8. *Publica nobis eſt & communis Oratio*----[*Publick Common-Prayer*] *pro toto populo oramus*, for all the people, (as among the *Jews* for all *Iſrael*; and we for the whole Church, eſpecially for Kings.) And that men may mind nothing but that their preſent employment; *Ideo ſacerdos præfatione parat fratrum mentes, dicendo, Surſum corda, ut dum reſpondet plebs, Habemus ad Dominum, moneatur nil ſe niſi Dominum cogitare debere.* I ſhall trouble the Reader no longer than to deſire that the Liturgy lately uſed in this Church may be compared with the ſeverals here mentioned, from the *Jews* firſt; and after, the Apoſtolical Chriſtians: and as you will find the general form exactly continued in Confeſſion, Pſalms, Leſſons, Hymns, Prayers for all the Church, eſpecially for Kings, &c. (and no reaſon to doubt but that ſometimes the very words were continued alſo; aſſuredly ſet Forms then, as now, as appears by the *Surſum Corda*, and *Habemus ad Dominum*; *Lift up your hearts, We lift them up unto the Lord.*) So it will be acknowledged not without reaſon, that I have thought fit to draw one argument of many from the practice of the *Jews*; to which the other two of the Mahometans and Heathens come in *ex naturali ſequela*, but as rivulets and derivations from the Fountain.

* *Primi Chriſtiani huic officio ſe accomodarunt.* Morn de Miſſ. l. 1. c. 4.

3. The not only practice, but precept of Chriſt in the New Teſtament, who did not only uſe himſelf a ſet form of words in Prayer, three times together uſing the ſame words, *Matth.* 26. 44. and after Supper ſung a ſet cuſtomary Hymn (for otherwiſe how could the Diſciples have joined with him ὑμνήσαντες) and that, ſay the Learned, the ſame that the *Jews* ſolemnly uſed to ſing after eating the Lamb, from the hundred and thirteenth to the hundred and eighteenth Pſalm, which was called הלל *the hymn*, and ברכת שיר *a metrical ſong of benediction*; and upon the Croſs in the ſame manner, praying in the Pſalmiſts words, only changed to the Syriack dialect, which was then the vulgar: but alſo commanded the uſe of thoſe very words of his perfect form, which it ſeems he meant not only as a pattern, but a form it ſelf (as the Standard weight is not only the meaſure of all weights, but may it ſelf be uſed) *Luc.* 11. 2. *When you pray, ſay, Our Father, &c.* And for the ſame form ſet down *Matt.* 6. with a Preface of ὕτως οὖν προσεύχεσθε, *After this manner therefore pray ye:* that the word ὕτως *Sect.* 16.

there (which we render *after this manner*) doth not excuſe us from the uſe of that very prayer, will appear by the parallel phraſe in another Author, (which though Apocryphal, will be ſufficient to prove the ſignification of a word) the Prayer of the three Children annext in the *Greek* to *Dan.* 3. and beginning thus, καὶ ηὐξατο Ἀζαρίας προσεύξατο οὕτως, *and* Azarias *prayed thus*, which certainly ſignifies the mind of the Author to be, that that form which he there ſets down was uſed by *Azarias*: and then by analogie, if οὕτως προσεύξατο, *he prayed thus*, or, *after this manner*] ſignifie, he uſed this form of words, as truly as afterwards, *ver.* 27. ἐδόξαζον λέγοντες, *they praiſed ſaying*] doth ſignifie, that they uſed that very form of praiſe; then οὕτως προσεύχεσθε in the Imperative, *pray thus*, in St. *Matt.* will be a command to uſe this form immediately adjoyned, as much as in St. *Luke*, ὅταν προσεύχησθε, λέγετε, *When you pray, ſay*, which precept no man can with a good conſcience ever obey, that holds all ſet forms *neceſſary* to be caſt out of the Church.

Sect. 17. 4. The practice, not only of St. *John the Baptiſt*, who *taught his Diſciples to pray*, Luke 11.1. (which occaſioned Chriſts Diſciples to demand, and him to give them a form of prayer) but eſpecially of the Apoſtles, of which we find intimations, 1 *Cor.* 14.26. *When you come together, every one of you hath a Pſalm*, which ſure refers to ſome of the Pſalms of *David* or *Aſaph*, uſed then ordinarily in their Devotions, (and that, as even now I ſaid, authorized by the example of Chriſt himſelf upon the Croſs, who it is thought, repeated the whole 22. *Pſalm*, it is certain, the firſt Verſe of it, *My God, my God, why haſt thou forſaken me?*) and ſo certainly a ſet form, and that of Prayer too (of which Thankſgivings and Praiſes are a part.) But becauſe *every* one had his *ſeveral Pſalm*, it is therefore reprehended by the Apoſtle as tending to *confuſion*; and by that conſequence, St. *Pauls* judgment is thence deducible for the joyning of all in the ſame form, as being the only courſe tending to *Edification*, in the end of that verſe: and then ſure 'twould be hard, that that which the Apoſtle conceived the only courſe for *Edifying*, ſhould now be *neceſſary* to be turned out of the Church, as *contrary to edification*. Farther yet, 'tis clear by Text, that the Apoſtles when they met together to holy duties (ſuch are Faſting, Prayer, receiving the Sacrament) continued very long time, ſometimes a whole day together. Now it being ſufficiently known that thoſe Apoſtles, and all that were by the Holy Ghoſt ſet apart for the planting of the Church, had the gift of Miracles, not every one all, but one one, another another; It is St. *Chryſoſtoms* obſervation that among theſe gifts there was in thoſe firſt times χάρισμα εὐχῆς, the *gift of Prayer*, (that gift a Miracle, as the gift of *Healing*, *Propheſying*, &c.) that this was beſtowed εἰς ἕνα τινα, upon ſome one, who did pray for the reſt, and ask thoſe things which were uſeful for them, and teach others how to pray. Some of theſe ſpecial prayers thus conceived and moſt frequently uſed by them, which were fit for the common perpetual uſes of all Chriſtians, were, no queſtion, received, and kept by thoſe whom they thus taught, and are they which the Antients mean by the *Liturgie* of St. *James*, which is ſtill uſed (or ſome other in the * diſguiſe of them) by the Greek Church on ſolemn days. Theſe alſo being of the longeſt for every days uſe, St. *Baſil* is ſaid to have ſhortned, and his again St. *Chryſoſtome:* how certain theſe reports are, I ſhall not take upon me to affirm; but only add, 1. that the Greek Church, who are moſt likely to know the truth of it by their records, do retain all theſe three *Liturgies*, and would loudly laugh at any man that ſhould make doubt whether St. *James*, St. *Baſil* and St. *Chryſoſtome* were not the Authors of them. 2. That the judgment of that Church (if they are deceived alſo, and may not be thought worthy to be heeded by our Aſſemblers) is yet an argument of great authority to any prudent man, if not that theſe *Liturgies* were purely the ſame with thoſe which were written by that Apoſtle, and thoſe holy men, yet that there were ſuch things as *Liturgies* of their Penning. The like might be added of that ſhort form of St. *Peters*, which alone they ſay was uſed in the *Roman* Church for a great while, till after by ſome Popes it was augmented; and the ſame of St. *Marks* Liturgie. For when thoſe extraordinary χαρίσματα ceaſed, it is clear, there was need of ſomewhat elſe to ſupply that place, and that would not be in any reaſon to let every man pray as he would (for that was the thing for the preventing of which, and the unhappineſſes conſequent to it, the χάρισμα εὐχῆς ſpecial *gift of Prayer* had before been given, which, but in that reſpect, had not before been uſeful) but ſet prepared forms for the daily conſtant wants, and thoſe provided by the Governours of the Church, Apoſtolical men, which had ſo benefited under the prayers of thoſe that had the χάρισμα, or perhaps remembred ſome forms of theirs, at leaſt the method and manner uſed by them, that their forms might well deſerve to be heeded by, and ſo continue in the Church; at leaſt, were ſure to be fitter for the turn than the unpremeditated effuſions of thoſe, which now had not the extraordinary χάρισμα, and of all whom it cannot be preſumed that they have the ordinary wiſdom to pray always as they ought. To deſcend more particularly in the retail, It is moſt clear that the *Dominus vobiſcum*, *The Lord be with you*] is a moſt ancient form, uſed both in the Greek and Latine Liturgies, taken out of 2 *Theſ.* 3. 16. and uſed by Chriſtians inſtead of the bleſſing of the Prieſt, *Num.* 6. 22. And I am ſure St. *Auguſtine* ſpeaking of ſome forms retained in the Church, and ſtill to be found in our *Liturgie*, particularly that of *Surſum corda*, *Lift up your hearts*,---ſaith, that they are *verba ab ipſis Apoſtolorum temporibus petita*, words fetcht from the times of the Apoſtles, which ſuppoſes that they did uſe ſuch forms; and for the whole form of Conſecration, ſuch as it was in St. *Baſils* days, it was, ſaith he, *Apoſtolica traditionis*, delivered down from the Apoſtles, *l. de Sp. Sancto*. And for that former particular mentioned by St. *Auguſtine*, it is agreeable to the *conſtitutions of the Apoſtles*, l. 8. c. 16. (which collection if it be not ſo ancient as it pretends, doth yet imitate Apoſtolical antiquity) and ſo in St. *James*, and St. *Baſils*, and *Chryſoſtomes* Liturgie in the ſame words with our Book as far as to the word [*bounden*] And for that which follows, *Therefore with Angels*----there is little queſtion but it is the very form which is called by the Greeks χερουβικὸς, by the Latines, *Præparatio*, by *Amalarius*, *Hymnus refertus gratiarum actione & laudibus Angelorum*, by *Walafridus Strabo*, *Præfatio actionis*, viz. of the Sacrament, as 'tis ſtill in our Church, by *Iſidore*, *hymnatio præcedens confirmationem Sacramenti*, by *Cyril* of *Jeruſalem*, ὑμνῳδία, ἀινολογία, δοξολογία ἐκ τῶν Σεραφὶμ (which as it was there placed after the εὐχαριστία, *i. e.* the giving of thanks (not the Sacrament) as it is with us after the [*Let us give thanks*---] ſo is it before the Prayer of Conſecration, as with us alſo) by the Author under the title of *Dionyſ. Ar.* ὑμνολογία and καθολικὴ ὑμνῳδία, and by *Juſtin Mart.* that αἴνος and δόξα, which, ſaith he, precede the Euchariſt

or

* Jacobi, Clementis, Baſilii, Chryſoſtomi, Cyrilli, Gregorii apud Egyptios Liturgiæ partim veræ ſunt, partim falſæ. *Salmaſ. contr. Grot.* opus Poſth. p. 254.

or Conſecration. And 'tis obſervable that *Cyril* mentioning it, ſaith, it was παραδοθεῖσαν ὑμῖν, *deliver'd to us*, which words being taken in the ſence of the antients, note it to be *delivered* from the Apoſtles or Apoſtolical men, (not as ſome perhaps may miſtake the words in the Greek, παραδοθῆσαν ἡμῖν ἐκ τῶν Σεραφὶμ ἀπολογίαν ταύτην λέγομεν, as if 'twere *delivered us by the Seraphim*, for that were more than an Apoſtolical, an Angelical tradition, but an hymn taking in the Angels to joyn in lauds with us, as I told you out of *Amalarius*, *hymnus refertus laudibus Angelorum*, and this hymn delivered down to us by our Anceſtors at leaſt, of which number *Cyril* being ſo antient himſelf could mean little leſs than the Apoſtles, or Apoſtolical men. And that this is the very form now uſed by us, is probable by the words that follow in *Cyril*, ὅταν κοινωνοὶ τῆς ὑμνῳδίας ταύτης ὑπερκοσμίους γινώμεθα στρατιάς *that we may joyn with the heavenly Hoſt in our ſinging of hymns*, (as we [*with all the company of heaven, we praiſe---*] ἵνα ἁγιάσαντες ἑαυτοὺς διὰ τῶν πνευματικῶν τύπων ὕμνων παρακαλῶμεν τὸν φιλάνθρωπον θεὸν τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα ἐξαποστεῖλαι ἐπὶ τὰ προκείμενα, ἵνα ποιήσῃ τὸν μὲν ἄρτον σῶμα χριστοῦ, τὸν δὲ οἶνον αἷμα Χριστοῦ, *that having ſanctified our ſelves by theſe ſpiritual hymns, we may beſeech our merciful God to ſend out his holy Spirit upon what is ſet before us, that he may conſecrate the bread to be the body of Chriſt*, (*i. e.* ſanctifie it to that ſacramental uſe, as ποιεῖν, and *conficere corpus Domini* ſignifies) *and the wine to be his bloud.* To which purpoſe 'tis obſervable, that when the Heathen ſcoffer *Lucian* lets fall in his φιλοπατρ. (in the perſon of *Triephon* who repreſents the Chriſtian) τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀπὸ πατρὸς ἀρξάμενος, καὶ πολυώνυμον ὠδὴν εἰς τέλος ἐπιθείς, *beginning* his form of *prayer from the Father*, *and adding at the end the famous Ode* or *Song*; by theſe two *Rigaltius* a learned Critick on *Tertullian* conceives the Lords prayer and the χερουβικὰς or this [*Therefore with Angels---*] to be underſtood. But I muſt confeſs my opinion rather to be, that as the former noted by [*beginning from the Father*] is queſtionleſs the *Pater Noſter*, with which both now and anciently the Communion Service was begun; ſo by the ſecond is meant that hymn of ours, *Glory be to God on high---we praiſe thee, we bleſs thee---*] with which that ſervice ends (having none but the benediction after it) which being ſo powerful an importunate repetition of *O Lord God, heavenly King---* and *O Lord God, Lamb of God---*] is moſt properly called πολυώνυμος ὠδὴ in the notion that it was uſed in among the Heathen writers. But this by the way. So alſo for the Prayer after the Hymn, called ἐπίκλησις, wherein they prayed for the ἐπιφοίτησιν or ἐπίλευσις πνεύματος ἐπὶ τὰ προκείμενα, the *coming of the Spirit* upon the Bread and Wine, *&c.* which were *ſet before them*, and therefore by *Cyril* is called ἐπίκλησις τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, the calling down the Holy Ghoſt, after which οὐκ ἔτι ἄρτος λιτὸς, ἀλλὰ χριστοῦ---it is *no longer ſimple* (or common) *Bread, but the Body of Chriſt*, (in the Sacramental ſence.) An antient form of this we have in St. *Baſils* Liturgie, Σὲ δεόμεθα---*We pray thee*--ἐλθεῖν τὸ πνεῦμά σου ἅγιον ἐφ' ἡμᾶς καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ προκείμενα δῶρα ταῦτα καὶ εὐλογῆσαι ἁγιάσαι--- *that thy holy Spirit may come upon us and upon theſe gifts* (or offerings) *ſet before* us, *and may bleſs them and ſanctifie them*---And the ſame S. *Baſil* the Great, among traditions conſtantly received in the perpetual practice of the Church, reckons the form of Prayer with which the Sacrament was conſecrated, and was from thence call'd the Euchariſt. 'Tis true indeed 'twas antiently the cuſtome at that time to pray alſo for ſuch perſons and things, as the preſent neceſſities of the Church, and occaſion of celebrating the Euchariſt did require, and this (it ſeems by the Epiſtle of *Epiphanius* to *John* of *Jeruſalem*, tranſlated by St. *Jerom*) was anciently left to the diſcretion of him that miniſtred, and the fruit of it was, that private men uſing ſuch prayers for the dead, and mentioning ſuch occaſions of celebrating the Euchariſt, as their ſeveral conceits, not guided or limited by the Church, indited or ſuggeſted to them, the opinion of *Purgatory*, and the doctrine of private Maſſes, hath by that means gotten ſo great a footing in the Church, as it hath at this day. Beſide theſe thus mentioned, many other ſuch particular Forms uſed by us, we find in *Cyril* of *Jeruſalems Catechiſm*, one of the antienteſt Authors we have; And then that it ſhould be *neceſſary* for the Church to turn out what the Apoſtles had thus brought into it, will not eaſily be made good by our Aſſemblers.

5. The practice of the univerſal Church from that time to this, which is ſo notorious to any that is converſant in the Writings of the ancient Fathers, and of which ſo many teſtimonies are gathered together for any mans ſatisfaction by *Caſſander*, and other writers of the *Liturgica*, that 'twere a reproach to the Reader to detain or importune him with teſtimonies of that nature. To omit the teſtimony of *Plinie* concerning them as early as *Trajans* time, near upon the death of St. *John*, mentioning that *carmen quod ſoliti ſunt Chriſtiani ſtato die ante diluculum Chriſto quaſi Deo dicere ſecum invicem*, that *Hymn* (or other form to be ſaid or ſung, which he calls a *verſe*) which the *Chriſtians upon a ſet day before light were wont one among another to ſay to Chriſt as to God* (which may probably refer to the πολυώνυμος ὠδὴ even now mentioned, where Chriſt the *Lamb of God, Son of the Father* is invoked as *Lord God*,---). And not to inſiſt more largely on the practice of * *Conſtantine*, who preſcribed a form for his Souldiers (a Copy of which we have in *Euſeb. de vit. Conſt. l.4. c.20.*) I ſhall only mention two grand teſtimonies for ſet Forms, one in the 23. Canon of the third Council of *Carthage*, *Quaſcunque ſibi preces aliquis deſcribet non iis utatur niſi priùs eas cum inſtructioribus fratribus contulerit. No man may uſe any Prayers which he hath made, unleſs he firſt conſult with other learneder Chriſtians about them*, and the other more punctual, *Concil. Milev. c.12. Placuit ut preces quæ probatæ fuerint in concilio ab omnibus celebrentur. Nec aliæ omninò dicantur in Eccleſiâ niſi quæ à prudentioribus tractantur vel comprobatæ in Synodo fuerint, ne fortè aliquid contra fidem aut per ignorantiam, aut per minus ſtudium ſit compoſitum. It was reſolved on, that the Prayers that were approv'd in the Council ſhould be uſed by all, and that no other ſhould be ſaid in the Church but thoſe that had been weighed by the more prudent, or approv'd in a Synod, leſt any thing, either through ignorance or negligence ſhould be done againſt the Faith.* Inſtead of ſuch Citations (and becauſe whatſoever argument is brought from that Topick of Eccleſiaſtical tradition, is now preſently defamed with title of Popiſh and Antichriſtian, becauſe forſooth *Antichriſt* was a *working* early in the Apoſtles time, and every thing that we have not a mind to in antiquity, muſt needs be one of thoſe *works*) I ſhall rather chooſe to mention another, as a more convincing argument *ad homines*, and that is,

Sect. 18.

* The ſame *Conſtantine* in his Palace imitating the Orders of the *Church* among other things, ἐυχὰς ἐκθέσεως ἀπέδωκε, *gave them ſet Prayers, Euſeb. de vit. Conſt. l.4. c.17.* And ſo it is ſaid of the Nobles about him, that they uſed ἐυχαὶ βασιλικαὶ. *Prayers that the Emperor liked*, and were all brought by him, ταυτὸν πράττειν, &c. to pray the *ſame* prayers all of them, even in private, *c.18.*

6. The

Sect. 19. 6. The judgment and practice of the Reformed in other Kingdoms, even *Calvin* himself in several ample testimonies, one in his Notes upon *Psal.* 20. 1. another in his Epistle to the *Protector*. I shall not give my self license to transcribe these, or multiply more such testimonies, only for the honor not only of *Liturgy* in general, but particularly of our *Liturgy*, 'twill be worth remembring that *Gilbertus* a *German*, many years since, in a book of his, propounds our Book of Prayer for a sample of the Forms of the ancient Church; And for the purity of it, and thorough Reformation, that *Cranmer* procured the King *Edwards* Common-Prayer-Book to be translated into Latine, and sent it to *Bucer*, and required his judgment of it, who answer'd, that there was nothing in it, but what was taken out of the Word of God, or which was not against it, *commodè acceptum*, *being taken in a good sence*, somethings indeed, saith he, *quæ nisi quis*, &c. *unless they be interpreted with Candor*, *may seem not so agreeable to the Word of God*, *and which unquiet men may wrest unto matter of contention*. As may be seen at large in *Bucers Scripta Anglicana*. Upon this occasion that Book of King *Edwards* was again survey'd, and in those particulars, that were subject to such Cavils, corrected. After which time the quarrels about that Book were generally with the Papists (not so much with the opposite extream) and therefore *John Ould* in Queen *Maries* days wrote against them in defence of it, and of the King *Edwards* Reformation. And *Cranmer* made a challenge, that if he might be permitted by the Queen to take to him *P. Martyr*, and four or five more, they would enter the lists with any Papists living, and defend the Common-Prayer-Book to be perfectly agreeable to the Word of God, and the same in effect which had been for 1500. years in the Church of Christ. This for the reputation of the Book. Then for the fruit and benefit that by the use of it redounded to Christians, take an essay by Mr. *John Hullier*, Fellow of Kings Colledge in *Cambridge*, who was Martyr'd in Queen *Maries* days, *An.* 1557. and being at the stake among many other Books that were thrown into the fire to him, it happened that a Common-Prayer-Book fell between his hands, which he joyfully receiving opened, and read till the flame and smoke suffered him not to see any more, and then he fell to prayer, holding his hands up to Heaven, and the Book betwixt his arms next his heart, thanking God for that mercy in sending him it, the relation is Mr. *Foxes*, and from thence the plea authentick, that *the tree that bare wholsom fruit*, *should not be cut down by the Law*, *Deut.* 10. 20. even when War was to be made on a City, and as *Maimon.* adds *l. de Idol.* though it were worshipt for an Idol; and if that which was then of so dear esteem be now so necessary to be cast out, it is an ill indication of the times into which we are faln.

Precum fol. 302. 312.

Acts & Monu. pag. 1818.

Sect. 20. 7. The reasons on which the very Heathens themselves took up the same practice, which was universal (it seems) through all the World, more Catholick than the Church it self. To this purpose beside those Authors which Mr. *Selden* refers to, I shall only add these three testimonies, one of *Plato l.* 7. *de leg.* where he commands, that *whatever Prayers or Hymns the Poets composed to the Gods*, *they should first shew them to the Priests* (as if they were in a manner leprous till then) *before they publisht them*, *lest they should ask evil things instead of good.* (an infirmity that these days are very subject unto.) The second in *Thucyd. l.* 6. *p.* 434. ἐυχὰς νομιζομένας πρὸ τ ἀναγωγῆς ἐ κατὰ ναῦν ἑκάστυ, σύμπασίς δὲ ἀπὸ κήρυκ& ἐποιοῦντο. *Set* forms for several occasions, and a *common joynt* sending them up to Heaven. The third in *Alexander ab Alex. l.* 4. *c.* 17. that *the Gentiles read their Prayers out of a Book before their Sacrifices*, *Ne quid præposterè dicatur*, *aliquis ex scripto præire & ad verbum referre solitus est*, That *the work might not be done preposterously.* (To which purpose also the Reader may see what *Plutarch* περὶ παιδ. ἀγ. hath said of the rudeness and indecencies of extemporary Orations; which sure if they were liable to that censure, when they were spoken but to men, will not be more excusable for our having chosen to use that confidence to God.) Which two reasons of theirs, the one lest they should stray in the matter of their Prayers, the other lest offend in the manner, may pass for Christian reasons, as seasonable with us, as they were among them. And no *necessity* that those *reasons* should be despised by us neither.

Sect. 21. 8. The irrational concludings, or shortness of discourse of those which are against set Forms, especially in two things, the first observed by Dr. *Preston* (whose memory is, I hope, not lost among these Assemblers) and made use of in a Printed work of his to the confuting of them: That while they in opposition to set Forms require the Minister to conceive a Prayer for the Congregation, they observe not, that the whole Congregation is by that means as much stinted, and bound to a set Form, to wit, of those words which the Minister conceives, as if he read them out of a Book. 2. That the persons with whom we have now to deal, though they will not prescribe any *Form* of Prayer, yet venture to prescribe the *matter* of it in these words, pag. 14. *the Minister is to call upon the Lord to this effect.* Now why the *prescription* of the *matter* is not the stinting of the Spirit as well as the *form of words* (unless the Spirit, like the Heathen * *Mercury* be the God of Eloquence, and be thought to deal in the *words* only,) or why the promise of *dabitur in illâ horâ*, *it shall be given you in that hour*, should not be as full a promise for *matter*, as for *expressions*: especially when that Text forbids care or provision πῶς, ἢ τί, not only *how*, but *what* they should *speak*, and the promise is peculiarly for the τί, *it shall be given you what you shall speak*, and this is it, that is attributed to the Spirit, *v.* 20. (from whence if I should conclude, that the Holy Ghost taught the Disciples only the matter of their answer; and they themselves were left to put it in Form of words, there is nothing in that Text against that assertion; and that it was so in their penning of the New Testament, many probable Arguments might be produced if it were now seasonable) and consequently, why the prescribing of one should not be unreasonable in them, that condemn all prescribing of the other, I confess is one of those things, which my charity hath made me willing to impute to an infirmity in them which in others would be stiled shortness of discourse, because I am unwilling to lay any heavier charge upon it.

* ἡγεμὼν& τῆ λόγῳ, *Act.* 14. 12. Matt. 10. 19.

Sect. 22. 9. The strangeness (I shall add, prodigiousness) of that argument which by an especial opposer of all *set forms* is made the prime (and in the last resolution, the only engine to destroy them, or turn them out of the Church; I mean that of him which will needs suppose the use of them to be a breach of the *second Commandment*, a worshipping of God in or by an *Image* or *Idol*, and by this one hold hath so fortified himself, that whatever contrary argument, or advantage be produced to prove the lawfulness,

lawfulneſs, or uſefulneſs of ſet Forms, he is content to acknowledge the concludency thereof ſo far, as that it ſhould be of force, were it not for this, that it is a piece of *Idolatry* to make uſe of them. How ſlightly that foundation (which is appointed to bear ſo great a weight) is laid, or indeed how impoſſible it is by any ſort of *Topicks* to make it credible, that all kind of *Liturgie* is an *Idol*, or that all ſet Forms are ſuch, when the very ſame, if they were poured out *extempore*, were acknowledged not to be ſuch, as if the care of forming, or the precept of uſing it, (and not the worſhipping it ſelf) were the only things that make an *Idol* to be an *Idol*, I had rather leave the Reader to conſider, than dilate any longer on ſo wild a theme.

From all which conſidered, and a great deal more which might be added, from the uſefulneſs of known Forms to thoſe, whoſe underſtandings are not quick enough to go along with unknown, and if they have no other, are fain oft-times to return without performing any part of that ſo neceſſary duty of prayer in the Church, from the experience of the effects of the contrary doctrine, the many ſcandalous paſſages that have fallen from Miniſters in their extemporary prayers (of which meer pity and humanity, civility and mercy to Enemies, reſtrains us from inſerting a large Catalogue) and the no manner of advantage above that which ſet Forms may alſo afford, but only of ſatisfaction to the itching ear, exerciſe and pleaſure to the licentious tongue, and the vanity of the reputation of being able to perform that office ſo fluently (which yet is no more than the *Rabbins* allow *Achitophel*, that he had every day three new forms of prayer) or of having a plentiful meaſure of the Spirit, which is believed to infuſe ſuch Eloquence, I ſhall now conclude it impoſſible that any humane eye ſhould diſcern a *Neceſſity*, in reſpect of Eccleſiaſtical policy, or edifying the Church, why all *Liturgy* ſhould be deſtroyed, not waſht, or purg'd with Sope, ſuch any *Reformation* would be, but torn and conſumed with nitre, for ſuch is *abolition*, why it ſhould ſuffer this Oſtraciſm, (unleſs as *Ariſtides* did for being too vertuous) be thus vehemently firſt declaimed, and then baniſht out of the Church. *Sect.* 23.

Secondly, for *outward bodily worſhip* 'tis particularly prohibited by the *Directory* at one time, *at the taking of our ſeats or places when we enter the Aſſembly* (directly contrary to that of *Iſidor*, *ſi quis veniat cum lectio celebratur, adoret tantum Deum, if any come in when Leſſon is a reading, let him only perform adoration to God, and hearken to what is read*) and never ſo much as recommended at any time, nor one would think, permitted in any part of their publick ſervice, like the *Perſians* in *Strabo*, *l.* 15. that never offer'd any part of the fleſh to the Gods in their ſacrifices, kept all that to themſelves, τοῖς θεοῖς ἥδιστον ἀποτίμαντες μέρος, ſuppoſing the Gods would be content with the ſouls, which in the blood were poured out and ſacrificed to their honour, τῆς γὰρ ψυχῆς φασι τῷ ἱερείῳ δῦναι τὸ θεῖον, ἀλλὰ δ' ἥδιστος, they ſay that the Gods wanted and deſired the ſouls for a *ſacrifice*, *but not any thing elſe*; of which people *Herodotus*, *l.* 1. hath obſerved that they had neither Temples nor Altar, and laugh'd at them which built either, but went to the top of ſome Hill or other, and there ſacrificed, preferring ſuch natural Altars before any other. The former of theſe is the avowed Divinity of theſe men (and might perhaps have been attended with the latter too, were it not that there be ſo many Churches already built conveniently to their hands.) Inſtead of which our *Liturgy* hath thought fit not only to recommend but preſcribe bodily worſhip, firſt by directing in the *Rubrick* what part of ſervice ſhall be performed kneeling, then by reading the *Venite*, where all incourage and call up one the others *to worſhip, and fall down, and kneel*, &c. to worſhip, *i.e.* adore, which peculiarly notes bodily worſhip, and ſo ſurely the *falling down, and kneeling before the Lord.* And of this I ſhall ſay that it is, 1. an act of obedience to that precept of *glorifying God in our bodies as well as ſouls*; 2. a tranſcribing of Chriſts copy, who *kneeled*, and even proſtrated himſelf *in prayer*, of many holy men in Scripture, who are affirmed to have done ſo (and that affirmation *written for our example*) and even of the *Publican*, who though ſtanding, yet by *ſtanding afar off, by not looking up, by ſtriking his breaſt*, did clearly joyn bodily worſhip to his prayer, of [*Lord be merciful to me a ſinner*] uſed at his coming into the Temple, and in that poſture thrived better than the *Phariſee* in his loftier garb, *went away more juſtified*, ſaith our Saviour, as a veſſel at the foot of a hill, will (ſay the Artiſts) receive and contain more water, than the ſame or a like veſſel on the top of it would be able to do; And he that ſhall do the like, that ſhall joyn adoration of God, and nothing but God, to the uſe of that or the like fervent ejaculation at his entrance into Gods houſe, will ſure have Chriſts approbation of the *Publicans* behaviour, to juſtifie him from any charge of Superſtition in ſo doing. Nay there is little doubt, but upon this example, this cuſtom of bowing at the coming into the Church was antiently to be met with among all the religious perſons, the μονάζοντες and ἀσκηταί, which profeſt the ſtate of penitents, and among them was called μετάνοια, and becauſe it was uſed to be performed three times, μετάνοιαι τρεῖς, and ſo to bow in that lowly manner μετάνοιαν ποιεῖν or μετάνοιαν βάλλειν. Of this, ſay the antient writers of the ceremonies of the *Greek* Church, there were two ſorts, the greater called μετάνοιαι μεγάλαι and σφοδραί, differing little from proſtration, and the leſſer called μικραί. In each of theſe outward bodily adorations it was the manner to uſe προγραφῆσαν εὐχήν, a ſhort *form of prayer*, which we may ſee in the *Greek Liturgies*, in the Προλόγιον. At the firſt time the words were Κύριε καὶ δέσποτα τῆς ζωῆς μου, πνεῦμα ἀργίας, περιεργίας, φιλαρχίας καὶ ἀργολογίας μὴ μοι δῷς. *O Lord and owner of my life, give me not the Spirit of ſloth, of idle medling* with other folks matters, *of ambition*, of falſe, or *idle ſpeaking*. At the ſecond time, Πνεῦμα δὲ ταπεινοφροσύνης καὶ σωφροσύνης καὶ ὑπομονῆς καὶ ἀγάπης χάρισαί μοι τῷ σῷ δούλῳ. *But give to me thy ſervant the ſpirit of humility and ſobriety and patience and charity.* At the third time, Ναὶ Κύριε βασιλεῦ, δώρησαί μοι ἵνα τὰ ἐμὰ πλαίσματα, καὶ μὴ κατακρίνειν τὸν ἀδελφόν μου, ὅτι εὐλογητὸς εἶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. *Yea Lord and King, give me* grace *to ſee my ſins, and not to condemn my brother; for thou art to be praiſed for ever and ever.* Theſe forms thus ſeverally and diſtinctly were to be uſed by all of any learning in thoſe religious houſes: But for the ἰδιῶται the more ſimple and illiterate, this only form was preſcribed. ἱλάσθητί μοι κύριε ὁ ἁμαρτωλῷ, *Lord be merciful to me a ſinner.* Theſe are in St. *Chryſoſtoms* Liturgy called προσκυνήματα τρία καθ' ἑκάστην, *three adorations towards the Eaſt*, and the form there ſolemnly uſed in each, *Lord be merciful*--- as being deſigned for all (not only the perſons of extraordinary knowledge and piety, but alſo) for the ἰδιῶται, to whom you ſee that form was allowed in the

Sect. 24. P. 10. *De div. Off. c.* 10.

Vid. Clav. in Sacr. Boſt. c. 1.

Ὡράιον.

Ὠφέλιμον. The third *thing* that I ſhould affirm of this ceremony of outward worſhip is, that it is the moſt agreeable humble geſture, and ſo beſt becoming, and * evidencing, and helping the inward performance of that moſt lowly duty of Prayer, and conſequently that it may be charg'd with blaſphemy, as well and as properly, as with ſuperſtition, and probably would be ſo, if the latter were not the more odious of the two: and indeed why kneeling or bowing ſhould be more liable to that cenſure, than either mental or oral prayer, there is no reaſon imaginable, it being as poſſible that one may be directed to a falſe object (and ſo become Idolatrous, or ſuperſtitious in the true notion of thoſe words (as they denote the *worſhip of Idols or dead men*, δαίμονες, or *ſuperſtites*) as the other; and (for the improper notion of *Superſtition*) the one again as much capable of being an exceſs in Religion (the mind or tongue being as likely to enlarge and exceed as the body) or of uſing a piece of falſe Religion, as the other, the bodily worſhip duly performed to God, being the payment of a debt to God (and no doubt acceptable, when 'tis paid with a true heart) and no way an argument of want, but a probable evidence of the preſence *and cooperation* of inward devotion, as I remember *Nazianzen* ſaith of his Father, *Or.* 8. πολὺ τὸ φαινόμενον, πλουσιώτερον δὲ τὸ κρυπτόμενον, *he ſhewed a great deal in the outſide, but kept the greater treaſure within in the inviſible part.* And on the other ſide, the ſtiffneſs of the knee, an argument of ſome eminent defect, if not of true piety, yet of ſomewhat elſe, and Chriſts prediction, *Joh.* 4. *that the time ſhould come that the worſhippers ſhould worſhip God in ſpirit and truth*, (being not ſet in oppoſition to bodily worſhip, but to the appropriating it to ſome ſingular places, *Jeruſalem*, or *that Mountain*) not producible as any apology or excuſe for ſuch omiſſion. To theſe brief intimations I ſhall need add no more, when the concluſion that I am to infer is ſo moderate, being only this, that it is not *neceſſary* to turn all bowing, or kneeling, or bodily worſhip out of the Church, (were there any ſuperſtition in any one or more geſtures, this were too great a ſeverity, to mulct the Church of all, above the proportion of the moſt unlimited arbitrary court, whoſe amerciaments muſt always be within the compaſs of *ſalvo contenemento*, which this will not be, if there be no competency of bodily *worſhip* left behind) and that the *Liturgy* doth better to preſcribe it at fit times, than the *Directory* to omit all mention of it at all times, unleſs by way of diſlike and prohibition. Which concluſion will be the more eaſily evinced againſt them, by asking them whether in their Family-Parlour-Prayers, or in their private Cloſet-Prayers, they do not approve and practiſe that geſture; which as I believe in charity they do, ſo I muſt from thence infer, that by them *the houſe of God* is the only place thought fit to be *deſpiſed*. And if it be replyed, that the *Directory* forbids not kneeling, but only commends it not, leaving it free to uſe or not to uſe, I anſwer 1. That the effect of this liberty is very remarkable among them, and equal to that of a prohibition, no man almoſt of their perſwaſion, ever kneeling in their Churches. 2. That the never ſo much as *recommending* it, is very near a *forbidding* of it. 3. That *bowing* or *adoration* is directly forbidden once (which by the way is as much the defining of a Ceremony, *viz.* that of ſtanding or going upright, and ſo as contrary to the Independents perſwaſions, and to the great clamorous complaint for *Liberty* in Ceremonies, as any preſcription *of kneeling or bowing can* be.) 4. That kneeling alſo is at the receiving of the Sacrament forbidden, by neceſſity of conſequence, ſitting being preſcribed, and therefore that that reply or excuſe is falſe alſo. And ſo now what *ſpecial advantage* this is like to bring in to this Church of ours, to have the bodies of negligent, or profane, or factious men left (without any ſo much as an admonition) to their own inclinations, and ſo what depth of Eccleſiaſtical policy there was which made this change ſo *neceſſary*, I deſire may now be judged.

* *Cum bi motus corporis fieri niſi motu animi præcedente non poſſint, eiſdem rurſus exterius viſibiliter factis ille interior inviſibilis augetur.* Aug. l. de curâ pro mort. 3.

Sect. 25. Thirdly, *for uniformity in that Service*; (which our *Liturgy* labours to ſet up, by preſcribing the manner of it, but the *Directory* hath taken away by leaving all to the chance of mens wills, which can no more be thought likely to concur in one form, than *Democritus*'s *Atomes* to have met together into a world of beautiful Creatures, without any hand of providence to diſpoſe them) it hath certainly the approbation of all wiſe men, and command of St. *Paul*, 1 *Cor.* 14. 40. in that grand place, *Let all things be done decently and in order.* Of which I conceive the clear importance to be, that all be *done* in the Church *according to cuſtom and appointment.* The former implyed in εὐσχημόνως, (cuſtom being the only rule of decency, and therefore the indecency of wearing long hair, is proved by being againſt *nature*, *i. e.* ſaith *Suidas*, in the Scripture phraſe, χρονίαν συνήθειαν, a cuſtom of ſome continuance in that place, and thereupon St. *Paul* thinks it enough againſt an Eccleſiaſtical uſage, and that which might ſuperſede all ſtrife about it, 1 *Cor.* 11. 16. [*we have no ſuch cuſtoms, &c.*]) and the latter in plain words κατὰ τάξιν, *according to order or appointment* (for ſo the words literally import) and then upon theſe two grounds is uniformity built, and neceſſarily reſults, where all that is done in the Church, is ruled by one of theſe, by cuſtom, or by Law, which being here commanded by St. *Paul*, is a proof of the more than lawfulneſs of τάξις, *preſcription* of Ceremonies in a Church, *and of uniformity therein.* And then what neceſſity there is or can be that St. *Pauls* command ſhall be ſo neglected, all care of uniformity ſo diſclaimed, all τάξις, *conſtitution or ordinance*, for any Eccleſiaſtical matter (unleſs their ordinance againſt all ſuch conſtitutions) ſo ſolemnly diſavowed, it will be hard to imagine, or gheſs, unleſs it be on purpoſe to obſerve Mr. *Prinns* rule of *Conforming the Church to the State*, to fill one as full of diſorder and ἀταξία, and confuſion, as the other. I remember a ſaying of *Socrates* which *Plato* and *Cicero* record from him, *Mutatâ Muſicâ mutantur & mores*, that the change of the kind of Muſick, had a great influence on mens minds, and had a general change of manners conſequent to it. I conceive uniformity in Gods ſervice to be parallel to Muſick, being it ſelf an outward concord or harmony of the moſt different affections; and that that ſhould be not only changed, but loſt, I cannot underſtand any *neceſſity*, unleſs it be that ſome ſuch like effects may be wrought in Religion alſo.

Sect. 26. For the Fourth, the Peoples bearing ſome part in the ſervice, that is, 1. by way of reſponſe in the Prayers, and Hymns, or 2. by reading every other verſe in the Pſalm. And this is mentioned in *Theodorets* ſtory *l.* 2. *c.* 24. where ſpeaking of *Flavianus* and *Diodorus* he ſaith of them, οὗτοι πρῶτοι διχῆ διελόντες τὸν τῶν ψαλλόντων χορὸν ἐκ διαδοχῆς Δαυϊτικὴν ἐδίδαξαν μελῳδίαν, &c. *they divided the Quire of Singers into two parts, and appointed them to ſing the Pſalms ſucceſſively*, which cuſtom being begun

begun by them (who, saith he, were *admirable men, and labour'd extreamly to stir up all men to Piety*, and to that end invented this) * διέδραμε πάντας καὶ κατέλαβε τῆς ἐκκλησίας τέρματα, *prevail'd over the whole world*: But yet higher than this original, this custom of singing or reciting the praises of God (in Hymns or Psalms) by way of ἀντίφωνα or *alternatim*, one answering another, is by *Socrates l.* 6. *c.* 8. of his *Eccles.* story attributed to *Ignatius* that Apostolical Bishop of *Antioch* shortly after St. *Peter*: and that, saith he, from a vision of Angels διὰ τῆς ἀντιφώνων ὕμνων τὴν ἁγίαν τριάδα ὑμνοῦντων, *singing* Psalms *to the holy Trinity* in this manner. And so *Photius* also, Ἀρχὴν δέ φασι τῆς ἀντιφώνων ᾠδῆς Ἰγνάτιον γενέσθαι ἐπὶ θεοφόρον. An example of this *Philo* mentions also among the *Esseni* of the *Jews*, *l. de Vit. contempl.* γίνονται χόροι ἐξ ἀμφοῖν, μίμημα τῆς πάλαι σύστασις κατὰ τὴν ἐρυθρὰν θάλασσαν, this way of *alternate singing* was used amongst them in *imitation of that which was instituted* on the shore of the *Red sea*. And these *Esseni* being the first converted to Christianity in *Alexandria* might from thence continue it there. But however the antiquity of it in the Church is sufficiently testified by *Basil ad Neocæsar. Cler.* Διχῆ διαιρεθέντες ἀντιψάλλουσιν ἀλλήλοις, ἔπειτα πάλιν ἐπιτρέψαντες ἐπὶ κατάρχειν τῷ μέλους οἱ λοιποὶ ὑπηχοῦσιν. *They divide themselves into two parts and sing alternately, and sometimes one begins the song and the rest answer him.* And from these St. *Ambrose* brought it into the *Latin* Church, and inserted it into their service. So saith *Sigebert* in *Ann.* 387. *Ambrosius Episcopus ritum Antiphonas in Ecclesia canendi primus ad Latinos transtulit à Græcis, apud quos hic ritus jamdudum inoleverat ex instituto Ignatii Antiocheni Episcopi & Apostolorum discipuli, qui vir visionem, &c.* Bishop *Ambrose* was the *first* that *brought this custom of singing Antiphonas to the Latins from the Greeks*, among whom that custom had of old been used from the institution of *Ignatius* Bishop of *Antioch* and Disciple of the Apostles, who received a vision to that purpose. Beside these 'tis used by us, 3. by way of mutual charity, the people returning a Prayer for the Priest, who began one peculiarly for them; which *Innocentius* refers to, in his letter to *Aurelius* and *Augustine*, calling them *communes & alternas preces*, to which he there attributes more force, *quàm privatis*, than *to private*; and 4. by way of following the *Presbyter* in Confession of sins, both at the beginning of the *Service*, and before the *Communion*; 5. in Profession of Faith in the *Creeds*, wherein every the meanest Christian is to have his part: And in every of these it is certainly designed by the Church, from the example of pure antiquity, to very gainful uses, to quicken devotion, which the length of continued hearing may have leave to dull and slacken, and to recal those thoughts which may upon the like temptation have diverted to other objects; in a word, to engage every one to be made no idle or unprofitable Spectator of the Service: and as long as there is still need of that help to these so *necessary* ends, and not the least shew or pretence of objection against it, how *necessary* it can be to reject it wholly, and lay all the task upon the Priest, and not require so much as an *Amen* (which it seems was in fashion in St. *Pauls* time) of the ἰδιώτης, or *Lay person*, I leave to the most prejudicate Reader to give sentence for me.

As for the *Litany*, wherein the *People* are more exercised than in any other part of the *Service*, 'tis certainly designed to make it more proportionable to the title bestowed on it by the Antients of ἐκτενὴς ἰκεσία, *earnest or intense Prayer*, and in *Methodius*, ἐκτενεῖς δεήσεις, *earnest Petitions*, (and in the Greek *Liturgy* simply ἐκτενὲς, *intense or earnest*) from *Act.* 12. 5. *Luc.* 22. 44. This continual joyning of the people in every passage of it, tending very much to both the improving and evidencing that fervor and intension, which can never be more necessary than throughout that *Service*, of which I shall in passing say these three things, and justifie them against any gain-sayer, that there is not extant any where, 1. a more particular excellent enumeration of all the Christians either private or common wants, as far as is likely to come to the cognisance of a Congregation; nor 2. a more innocent blameless Form, against which there lies no just objection, and most of the unjust ones that have been made, are reproachful to Scripture it self, from whence the passages excepted against are fetcht, as that particularly of *Praying for Gods mercy upon all men*, from 1 *Tim.* 2. 1. and 3. a more artificial composure for the raising that zeal, and keeping it up throughout, than this so defamed part of our *Liturgy*, for which and other excellencies undoubtedly it is, (and not for any Conjuring or Swearing in it) that the Devil hath taken care that it should drink deepest of that bitter cup of Calumny and Reviling, which it can no way have provoked, but only as Christ did the reproach of the diseased man, *What have I to do with thee?* &c. when he came to exorcise and cast out the Devil that possest him. And for this to be thrown out of the Church, sure there is no other *necessity*, than there was that there should be *Scandals and Heresies* in it, only because the Devil and his Factors would have it so. *Sect.* 27.

5. For the *dividing of Prayers into divers Collects or Portions*, and not putting all our Petitions into one continued Prayer, these advantages it hath to give it authority, 1. the practice of the *Jews*, whose *Liturgy* was dispensed into *Lessons*, *&c.* and 18 *Collects*, or short *Prayers*: 2. the example of Christ prescribing a short Form, and in that, saith St. *Chrysostome*, διδάξας ὑμᾶς μέτρον εὐχῆς, *teaching us the measure or length due to each Prayer of ours*, *Hom. de Annâ. f.* 965. and setting a mark of *Heathenism*, *Mat.* 6. and of *Pharisaism*, *Mat.* 23. 14. on their *long Prayers*: 3. the advice of the Antients, who tell us St. *Peters* Form, used for a great while in the *Roman Church*, was a short one, and that *Christ* and St. *Paul* commanded us to make our Prayers, βραχείας καὶ πυκνὰς, καὶ ἐξ ὀλίγων διαλειμμάτων, *short and frequent*, and *with little distances between*. And so *Epiphanius* ἐν τῷ τομ. *orat. c.* 24. directs to offer our Petitions, μετὰ πάσης πυκνότητος, with all frequency; and *Cassian*, *de instit. mon. l.* 2. *c.* 10. from the universal consent of them, *Utilius censent breves orationes sed creberrimas fieri*, *The way that is resolved to be most profitable, is to have short Prayers, but very thick or frequent.* And he adds a consideration which prompted them to this resolution, *Ut Diaboli insidiantis jacula succinctâ brevitate vitemus*, *That by that means, the Devils darts which he is wont to find and steal his times to shoot into our breasts, may by the brevity of our Prayers be prevented.* To these many more might be added, but that the no-advantage on the other side above this (save only the reputation of the labour and patience of speaking or hearing so much in a continued course, in one breath as it were) will save us the pains of using more motives to perswade any, that sure it is not *necessary* to exchange this pleasant easie course of our *Liturgy*, for the tedious toilsom less profitable course in the *Directory*. *Sect.* 28.

* And so in *Suidas*, in the word χέρ. Χὲρ δὲ τὸ σύστημα τῶν ἐν ἐκκλησίαις ἀδόντων. Σημαίνειν δὲ τοὺς χόρους εἰς δύο μέρη διῃρῆσθαι. Κωνσταντῖνος τοῦ μὲν μεγάλου Κωνσταντίου καὶ Φλαβίαν αὐτὸν ἐπισκώπτει Ἀντιοχείας ἀρχῆς τῶν Δαβιδικῶν ἀδόντας ὅπερ ἐν Ἀνδιοχείᾳ πρῶτον ἀρξάμενον εἰς πάντα πεπλῆσθαι τῆς οἰκουμένης τὰ πέρατα.

Chrysost. Ib.

Sect. 29. 6. For the *Ceremonies used in the several Services*, much might be said, as particularly for that of *standing* up and giving glory to God at the reading of the *Gospel*, according to the expres's words of *Chrysostome*, or whosoever that Author was οἷς τὸ ἀποδυόμενον. t. 6. p. 975. τῶ διακόνῳ ἀνοίγειν μέλλοντι τὸ τῶ εὐαγγελίῳ τετράδυπον (so it should be, not τετράδυρον, as appears p. 974. l. 20. where τὸ τῶν εὐαγγελίων τετράδυπον ἄρμα) πάντες αὐτῷ ἀτενίζομεν ἡσυχίαν παρίχοντες, καὶ ὑπνίνα τῶ δρόμῳ τῆς ἀναγνώσεως ἄρξεται, οὐθέις διανίσταται ὑμῶν, ἀπιφωνῆσαι, Ἀλλὰ δόξα σοὶ κύριε, of *kneeling* (in opposition to *sitting* at the *Lords Supper* designed in the *Directory*) 1. that it is agreeable to the practice of all Antiquity, who though they *kneeled* not, because the Canon of the Council of *Nice* obliged all to *stand in the Church*, between *Easter* and *Whitsuntide*, or on the *Lords day* all the year long, (which by the way, absolutely excludes *sitting*, as also doth that saying of *Optatus*, *l.* 4. That *the People may not sit in the Church*, and of *Tertullian*, *l. de Orat. c.* 12. That *'twas an Heathen custom to sit in the Church, and therefore ought to be reprehended*;) yet used the Prayer-gesture at receiving, *i.e. bowing their bodies and heads*, which the *Fathers* call adoration; *kissing of the hand*, is the propriety of the *Latin* word, but the ordinary denotation of it, *bowing the body*, the προσκύνησις, which is more than the former, the *cultus major*, among the Learned; For as *Herodotus* observes of the Eastern Nations, that the manner of *Equals* was to *kiss one another at meeting*, of *inferiours* to *kiss the hand of the Superiour*, but of the *Suppliants or Petitioners*, that would express the greatest humility to *bow themselves* before him, so was this last of the three continued among the Primitive Christians in their Services of the greatest Piety and humility, *Climacus*, *p.* 298. Τὸ δῶρον δεξάμενος προσκυνῶ, *when I receive I worship, or adore*, agreeable to which the great men in the *French* Churches, who receive it passing or going (a meer *Ægyptian-Passeover* custom) do first make a lowly *cringe* or *curtesie* before they take it in their hands. 2. That Christs Table-gesture at the delivering it, is no Argument for *sitting*, both because it is not manifest by the Text that he used that, save only at the *Passeover*, from which this *Supper of the Lord* was distinct, and was celebrated by *blessing*, *and breaking*, *and giving the bread*, *&c.* to which some other gesture might be more proper, and more commodious, and because Christs gesture in that is no more obligingly exemplary to us, than his doing it *after Supper* was to the Apostles, who yet did it *Fasting*, *Acts* 13. 2. and generally took it before the *agapæ*, and as by *Plinies* Epistle it appears, so early in the morning, that the Congregation departed and met again, *ad capiendum cibum promiscuum, to take their meals together*. As also 3. that the contrary gesture of *sitting*, as it was, not many years since, by a full Synod of Protestants in *Poland* forbidden, if not condemned, because they found it used by the *Arrians*, as complying with their opinion, who hold our Saviour to be a meer Creature, so is it now profest by some of our late *Reformers* Writings to be a badge and cognizance of their believing in the infallibility of Christs promise of coming to reign on this Earth again, and take them into a familiar and (a kind of) equal conversation with him, the Doctrine of the *Millenaries*, once in some credit, but after condemn'd by the Church, and though favour'd by some Learned men, both anciently and of late, is not yet sure clear enough to come into our *Creed* or *Liturgy*; or to be profest and proclaim'd by that gesture, when ever we receive the *Sacrament*: The evidence or proof of it being primarily that in the *Revelation*, which in all probability signifies no such matter. But I shall not enlarge on this, nor the other Ceremonies mention'd, but refer the Reader to the Learned Satisfactory unanswer'd labour of Mr. *Hooker*, on these Subjects; and then ask him when he hath read him, 1. whether he repent him of that pains, 2. whether in his Conscience he can think it *necessary*, or tending to *edification*, to cast all these causelessly out of this Church, or the whole *Liturgy* for their sakes.

Populus in Ecclesia sedendi potestatem non habet. Ideo reprehendi meretur, quia apud Idola celebratur.

Sect. 30. Now for those things that are more intrinsecal to the *Liturgy*, and parts of the *Service*; as

1. For the *pronouncing of Absolution*, which Christ so solemnly instated on the *Priest* in his Disciples (by three several acts, 1. unto *Peter* as the mouth of the Apostles, *Matth.* 16. 19. then by way of promise to them all together, *Cap.* 18. 18. then by way of actual instating it on them, *breathing* that power and the *Holy Ghost* on them together, *John* 20. 23.) and which is so distinctly named by Saint *James*, *c.* 5. 15. in the case of sickness, ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ, (not as we render *they shall be forgiven him*, as if it were ἀφεθήσονται, and belonged only to Gods act of pardoning, but) impersonally *Absolution shall be given him*; and so constantly preserved and exercised in the universal Church in publick and private, and approv'd (as far as our *Liturgy* uses it) ever by those who affirm that *power* in the Minister to be *only declarative*, that any man conversant either in the *Gospel*, or writings of the *Fathers*, or modern *Authors*, or that hath but seen *Knoxes Scotch Liturgy*, and observ'd that part of it, about the *receiving of Penitents*, would be amazed to see a *Directory for the Publick worship of God* (which is a large phrase and contains the whole Office of the Priest) and in it a Title *for the Visitation of the Sick*, and yet find never a word about *Absolution*, no not in *case of scruple, doubt or temptation*, *pag.* 67. or the death-bed it self. This exercise of those *Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven*, *i.e.* of the Church, this pronouncing of Gods pardon, and actually giving the Pardon and Peace of the Church to all her Penitent Children, especially that more particular act before the Communion, and on the Bed of sickness, is, besides the obedience to Christ, so necessary an expression of Christian charity in every Church to its poor members, and the denying of it, where it is due, so barbarous an inhumanity (which yet I hope no man shall be the worse for, but those that do deny it) that as the turning of *Publick Censures* out of this Church, is a rare example of despight unto Christs Command, (there being no *National Church* from Christs time to this to be found without it, till this of ours for these last three years) so the sending of *Absolution* after it, and the affirming it to be necessary to be done, and appointing all foot-steps of it, to be turn'd out of the *Service*, is a piece of *disorder*, as contrary to *Charity* as to *Piety*, to *Reason* as *Religion*, this being so far from the blame of an exuberancy in our *Service*, that there is more reason to wish that there were more of this nature, than that that, which we have already, were omitted.

Sect. 31. 2. For the *Hymns of the Church*, it will not be amiss perhaps to give you first the true notion of the word; there being among the *Hebrews* three sorts of Songs, 1. *Mizmor*, a *concise or short verse*,

verſe, 2. *Tehillah*, *Praiſe*, celebrating or depredicating of God, and 3. *Schir.* a *Canticle*, as the word is uſed in the title of that *Song of Songs*. And anſwerable to theſe three, we have *Col.* 3. 17. ψαλμὸι, ὕμνοι, and ᾠδαὶ, *Pſalms* and *Hymns*, and *Songs*, where the word *Hymn* is anſwerable to the ſecond of theſe, a praiſing and magnifying of God in and for ſome of his moſt remarkable acts of mercy and power. Thus was it the dictate, even of Nature it ſelf among the Heathens, to imploy a great part of their Poetry, *i.e.* their Piety (for ſo *Orpheus* the firſt and moſt famous Writer of *Hymns*, was called *Theologus Poeta*, a Poet that was a Divine alſo) in framing of *Hymns* to their Gods, though thoſe of *Muſæus* and *Linus*, the other two *Theologi Poetæ*, are not now to be met with. The like we have ſtill of *Homer* alſo, and I remember *Galen* the famous Phyſician, in one of his Books *De uſu partium*, deſcribing the compoſure of the Foot, breaks out of a ſuddain into an excellent acknowledgment which he calls, ὕμνον ἀληθινὸν τῷ δημιουργήσαντι ἡμᾶς, *a true Hymn in laud of that* God *which made theſe* curious *bodies* of men. This duty of natural Piety, Chriſtianity certainly hath not obſtructed, but elevated it to a far higher pitch by ſuperadding that greateſt obligation taken from the *Redemption of mankind*, to that old one of the *Creation*. And thus in all Ages of the Church ſome *Hymns* have been conſtantly retained to be ſaid or ſung in the *Churches*, I mean not only the daily Lections of the *Pſalms of David* (which yet this *Directory* doth not mention, but only commands a more frequent reading of that Book, than of ſome other parts of *Scripture*) not the ſinging of ſome of thoſe *Pſalms in Meter*, (which yet this *Directory* doth not preſcribe neither, ſave only on days of *Thankſgiving*, or after the Sermon, *if with conveniency it may be done*, making it very indifferent, it ſeems, whether it be kept at all in the Church or no, unleſs on thoſe ſpecial occaſions) But the *alternate* reading of the *Pſalms* both by Prieſt and people, (*Pſalmi ab omnibus celebrentur*, *Let the Pſalms be ſaid by all*, in the *Milevit. Counc. Can.* 12.) the conſtant uſe of ſome ſpecial *Pſalms*, as the *Introite*, and of other more purely Chriſtian *Hymns*, either framed by Holy men in the *Scripture* in reference to *Chriſts Incarnation*, or by the *Church* ſince on purpoſe to bleſs and praiſe God for his mercies in *Chriſt*, which ſure deſerve a daily celebration from every Chriſtian, as well and as richly as any *Victory* over Enemies, though it be one of theirs over the King himſelf, can deſerve of them upon any ſuch day of *Thankſgiving*. Of this kind is the *Te Deum*, a moſt divine and admirable Form, called by Saint *Baſil*, ἐπινίκιος, a triumphant Song, generally thought to be compoſed by Saint *Auguſtine*, and Saint *Ambroſe*, on the day that Saint *Ambroſe* baptized Saint *Auguſtine*, and fitted to that purpoſe with an acknowledgment of the *Trinity*, in reference to Saint *Auguſtines* converſion from *Manicheiſm*; If this be true, then ſure it is one of thoſe, the repeating of which moved Saint *Auguſtine* to ſo much paſſion, that he ſaith in his *Confeſſions*, *l.* 9. *Quantum flevi in hymnis & Canticis Eccleſiæ tuæ*, that and the like *Hymns of the Church fetcht many tears from him.* Of which I ſhall only ſay, that to any man that hath but an humble, faithful, thankful, fervent heart to go along with it, it is as Chriſtian a piece of praiſe and prayer, as any humane pen could contribute toward the publick worſhip of God, which he that hath had the uſe of in the Church, and now thinks fit to baniſh out of it, ſhews his own former coldneſs and non-proficiency under that means of Grace, and that he never joyned in it with any zeal or earneſt, or elſe his wretchleſs ingratitude to the Church which hath allow'd him the benefit of it.

Tiſman in Baſil. T. 1. p. 795.

Sect. 32. The like might be added of thoſe two other in the adminiſtration of the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, the former before the Sacrament beginning with *lift up your hearts*, and ending with the *Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of Hoſts, &c.* a form to be found with little variation, both in St. *James*'s, Saint *Baſil*'s, and Saint *Chryſoſtom*'s Liturgy, the other, after the Sacrament, *Glory be to God on high, &c.* called antiently *hymnus Angelicus*, *the angelical hymn*, from the firſt part of it which was ſung by *Angels*, and both theſe ſuch antient, pure, excellent compoſures in themſelves, and ſo fitly accommodated to the preſent buſineſs, and all that I have named ſo far from any appearance of evil, ſo free from any the leaſt objection of any the moſt petulant malicious calumniator (as far as I yet ever heard) ſo well-becoming a congregation of Saints, who by praiſing God in the Church, ſhould practiſe before-hand, and fit themſelves for the ſinging of *Hallelujahs* perpetually in Heaven, and in the mean time bear the Angels company here (who * Saint *Chryſoſtom* tells us, ſing all the Hymns with us) that 'tis little better than fury, (ſavouring much of the temper of that *evil ſpirit* on *Saul*, that was exorciſed with *David*'s *Muſick*, and therefore may be allowed to have malice to that and the like ever ſince) to think it *neceſſary* to throw this piece of *heaven* out of the *Church*.

* μετ' ἀγγέλων ᾄδομεν, μετ' ἀγγέλων ὑμνοῦμεν. t. 4. p. 753. l. 40. edit. Savil.

purpoſe there is a Prayer in Saint *Baſils* Liturgy (Δέσποτα κύριε ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν ὁ καταξιώσας ἐν ὑπερβάτῳ πλούτῳ καὶ ἀνεκδιηγήτῳ φιλανθρωπίᾳ ἀρχαγγέλους καὶ ἀγγέλους εἰς λειτουργίαν τῆς σῆς δόξης, πέμψον σὺν τῇ εἰσόδῳ ἡμῶν εἴσοδον ἁγίων ἀγγέλων γενέσθαι συλλειτουργούντων ἡμῖν καὶ συνδοξολογούντων τῷ σῷ ἀγαθότητι) that God would *ſend his holy Angels* to bear them *company in their ſervices and praiſes of God and his goodneſs.*

Sect. 33. 3. For the Doxology ſo conſtantly annexed to many parts of our ſervice, in theſe words, (wherein the people either are to begin or anſwer) *Glory be to the Father, &c.* It is an antient piece of very great conſideration, the former verſicle of it being, as 'tis affirmed by good authorities, compoſed by the firſt Council of *Nice*, and appointed by them to be uſed in the Church, as a *leſſer Creed, or confeſſion of the Trinity*, and ὁμοουσία, *conſubſtantiality* of the Son and Holy Ghoſt, with the Father (at which it hath therefore antiently been the cuſtom to ſtand up, *confeſſion* of God, being a praiſing of him (as the word in other Languages imports) to which therefore that poſture is moſt due) which may well paſs for no fable, becauſe 'tis clear, that ſoon after that time, *Flavianus ſang it aloud in the Church of Antioch*, as appears by * *Sozomen*, and ‖ *Theodoret*, (and if we may believe * *Nicephorus*, St. *Chryſoſtom joyn'd with him in it*;) Of this *Philoſtorgius* the *Arrian Hiſtoriographer* tells us, *An.* 348. *Flavianus having gotten a Congregation of Monks together*, πρῶτος ἀνέβοησε, *was the firſt that began that form of Doxology*, others uſing that other form of δόξα πατρὶ διὰ υἱοῦ ἐν ἁγίῳ πνεύματι, *Glory to the Father, by the Son in the Holy Ghoſt*, making the Son inferiour to the Father, and the Holy Ghoſt to the Son, as *Eunomius* and *Eudoxius* did, when it ſeems *Philoſtorgius himſelf moſt approv'd of*, (ταύτην μᾶλλον τὴν ἀκφώνησιν ἐπιπολάζειν, ſaith his *Epitomator* of him) others (not as *Gotofred* mends

* *l.* 3. *c.* 19.
‖ *l.* 2. *c.* 24.
* *l.* 18. *c.* 51.

mends his Copy, and reads it, δόξα πατρὶ καὶ υἱῷ ᾧ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι, but as the *Oxford Manuscript*) δόξα πατρὶ ᾧ υἱῷ ἐν ἁγίῳ πνεύματι, *Glory to the Father, and the Son in the Holy Ghost.* These two several Forms, and some say a third [*in the Son and the Holy Ghost*] were it seems proposed against *Athanasius* in the Council of *Antioch*, *An. Dom.* 341. and by men of several perswasions used in the Church of *Antioch*, as a Character, by which τὴν ἰδιαίαν προαίρεσιν ἐπιδείκνυον, *they expresst their several opinions*, saith *Sozomen. l.* 3. *c.* 19. & *l.* 4. 27. and by so doing, πρὸς τὴν ἰδιαίαν δόξαν μεθάρμοζον τὸ ψαλλόμενον, *every one applyed the Psalm or Hymn* (to the end of which, as now with us, it was, it seems, then annext) *to his opinion.* In which narration of *Philostorgius*, we have no reason to suspect any thing, but the πρῶτος ἀπεδόυσε, that *Flavianus* was the *first that sang it*, wherein his favour to the *Arrians* might make him partial, or the truth might be, he was the first that sang it at *Antioch*, for there *Athanasius* was in a Council condemn'd, and so still the Form might in other places be used more antiently. This first verse being on this occasion brought into the Church as a testimony, and Pillar of the Catholick verity against the *Arrians*, and annext by ancient custom to the end of the *Psalms* in the *Liturgy*, St. *Jerom*, or some body before him, being moved by the noise of the *Macedonians* (who excepted against that part of it concerning the *Holy Ghost*, affirming that that Doctrine of the Divinity of the *Holy Ghost* was novel) is said to have been the Author of adding the other verse or line to the former, in opposition to them, *As it was in the beginning, &c* to signifie this to be the antient Catholick, no new private doctrine or opinion; and yet that it was very near, if not as antient as the former may be gheſt by what *Theodoret*, *l.*2. *c.* 24. saith of *Leontius Bishop of Antioch*, that he *was wont to say to himself* the Arrian *Doxology so softly, that no word could be heard by him that stood next, but* εἰς τὰς ἀιῶνας τῶν αἰώνων, *for ever and ever*, (the close of the second line) and this saith he, while *Flavianus*, who opposed him, was a Lay-man. And if this be a time wherein such Forms as these, (which besides *giving glory to God*, do secure and defend the Catholick Doctrine of the *Trinity*, against all antient and modern *Arrians* and *Macedonians*) are necessarily to be cast out, as hindrances to growth and edification, sure the design is only to plant Heresies in the Church (to which alone that may prove impediment) but nothing else.

Nay a mention we have of them in *Concil. Vasens* under Pope *Julius* in the reign of *Constantius*, though it were not delivered to the *Latin* Church till after the Council of *Nice*.

Sect. 34. Having said this, 'twill not be needful to add concerning the fourth head, more than only the acknowledgment of my wonder and astonishment, why the same calamity and tempest that carried away this *lesser Creed*, should also be able to raise so fierce a Torrent, as to drive and hurry with it the *three larger Creeds also*, especially that not only of the *Nicene Fathers*, but of the *Apostles* themselves; Against the matter of which I have not heard, that the *Presbyterians* have any objection, and sure the *Beadsmans* Divinity, that turns the *Creed* into a *Prayer*, hath not concluded the use of it to be a stinting of the *Spirit*. What the effect of this part of Reformation is likely to be, will not be hard to divine, even *Barbarism* and *Atheism* within a while, the turning *God* and *Christ*, and all the *Articles of the Creed* out of mens *brains* also, and not (as yet it is) only out of their *hearts*; what is the necessity of doing it, will not so easily be resolved even by him that hath imbibed the Assemblers principles, unless it be to gratifie the *Separatists*, who are profest denyers of one Article, that of the *Holy Catholick Church*, resolving the end and the effect of the *Holy Ghosts* descent to have been only to *constitute particular Congregations*, and none else. As for the great pattern of the *Presbyterians*, the practice of *Geneva* or *Scotland*, that appears by *Knox*'s *Common Prayer-Book*, to have allowed a set Form of *Confession of Faith*, and designed it for the publick use as the first thing in that *Book of Prayers*, though the truth is, the *Apostles*, or other ancient *Creeds* being set aside, one of the *Geneva* forming is fain to supply the place of them, which yet by the setting the several parts of the *Apostles Creed* in the margent, both there and in the order of *Baptism*, appears rather to be an interpretation of it, and so still the *Separatists* must be the only men in the Church fit to be considered, or else apparently there is no such *Political necessity* of this neither.

Sect. 35. For the fifth thing, the so frequent repetition of the *Lords Prayer*, and *Prayer for the King in our Service*, this account may be briefly given of it. For the former, that in our *Common Prayer-Book*, there be several services for several occasions, of the *Sacraments*, *&c.* for several days, as the *Litany*; for several times in the day, not only *Morning* and *Evening*, but one part to be said *earlier* in the morning, and then toward *noon* a return to another part, (as the antient *Primitives* had three Services in a forenoon, 1. that for the *Catechumeni*, consisting of *Prayers*, *Psalms*, and *Readings*; then a 2. for the *Penitents*, such as our *Litany*; and a 3. for the *Fideles*, the Faithful, our *Communion* Service;) and even that which is assigned to one time so discontinued by *Psalms* and *Hymns* and *Lessons*, that it becomes in a manner two *Services*, clearly two *times of Prayer*. Now our Saviour commanding, *when you pray, say, Our Father*, we have accordingly so assigned it, to be once repeated in every such part of Service; and I remember to have heard one of the gravest and most reverend men of the Assembly, being asked his opinion about the use of the *Lords Prayer*, to have answer'd to this purpose, *God forbid that I should ever be upon my knees in Prayer, and rise up without adding Christs form to my imperfect petitions.* And whereas this *Directory* is so bountiful, as to recommend this Prayer to be used in the Prayers of the Church, and yet so wary as but to recommend it, it is thereby confest that it is lawful to retain a set Form, (for that is surely so and then the often using of a lawful thing will not make it unlawful) but withal that Christs Command in point of his Service shall no more oblige to obedience, than the commands of men, for if it did, this would be more than recommended. And now why that which may, say they, *commendably* (must say we *necessarily* in obedience to Christ) be used in the Prayers of the Church, and being repeated oftner than once, shall be useful to him who was not come at the first saying, or may be said more *attentively* by him who had before been too *negligent*, should be *necessary* to be used but once, when all mens zeal or understanding of so divine a Form, or perhaps *presence* at that part of the Service, shall not *necessarily* go along with it, I leave to more subtle Diviners to instruct us. This I am sure of, that God hath made a peculiar promise to *importunity in Prayer*, to a coming often to him on the same errand, and *Luke* 18. 5. by a phrase in the Parable seems to say, that he that comes oft to God in this manner, will at length *force him to shame*, if he do not grant his Petition; for that is the meaning of ὑπωπιάζειν. And from thence the Fathers use a bold phrase

in

in their *Liturgies*, σὲ ὑποτάσσω τὸν μόνον ἀγαθὸν, *I put thee to ſhame*, i. e. importune thee, *Baſil in Liturg.* and in the *Pſaltery of the Greek Church*, which hath many Prayers mixt with it, οἶδα γὰρ κύριε εἰ μὴ ὑποπτῆ σὲ ἡ τῆς ἰδίας ἀγαθότητος, *unleſs thy own goodneſs put thee to ſhame, &c.* Now that this will not be ſubject to the cenſure of *vain repetitions*, *Mat.* 6. 7. which is the only exception made againſt it, (if the example of *David*, Pſalm 136. be not ſufficient to authorize the *repeating* any Form often, which is as faultleſs as that was) might largely be evidenced, 1. by the nature of the word βαττολογία, there uſed, which both *Heſychius* and *Suidas* apply to another matter, and explain it by πολυλογία, and ἀργολογία, and ἀκυρολογία, *long, idle, unſeaſonable forms, ſuch as Battus uſed in his* μακροὶ καὶ πολύστιχοι ὕμνοι ταυτολογίας ἔχοντες, *his long-winded Hymns ſo full of Tautologies*, which *Munſter* therefore rendreth לא תרבו את דבריכם *do not multiply words*, unprofitably or unſeaſonably: 2. by the cuſtoms of the Heathens which Chriſt there refers to [μὴ βαττολογήσητε ὥσπερ οἱ ἐθνικοὶ *uſe not*, &c. *as the Heathens*] and which are evident in their Writers, eſpecially their *Tragedians*; where 'tis plain, that their manner was to ſound, or chant for many hours together, ſome few empty words to the honour of their Gods, ſuch the Ἔνα βάκχε, in their *Bacchanals*, from the noiſe of which they were call'd *Evantes*; ſuch in *Sophocles*, Ἰὼ Ἰὼ, Παὶν, Παὶν, ὦ Παὶν, Παὶν, &c. and eſpecially in the *Virgins Chorus of Æſchylus's Tragedy*, call'd ἕπτα ἐπὶ Θήβαις. Where there are near a 100. Verſes, made up of meer tautologies, Ἰὼ, Ἰὼ, Ἰὼ, Ἰὼ, θεοὶ θεαίτε, and an enumeration of the ſeveral names of the Gods with unſignificant noiſes added to them, σύ, Ἄρη, ῥεῦ, ῥεῦ, Ἄρτεμι, φίλα ἕ ἕ ἕ, and within two Verſes the ſame again, and much more of the ſame ſtile. Two notable examples of this *Heatheniſh* cuſtom the Scripture affords us, one, 1 *King.* 18.26. where the *Prophets of Baal from morning till noon, cry O Baal, hear us*, and it follows, *they cryed with a loud voice*, and *cut themſelves*, במישפטם *according to their cuſtom or rites* (that *loud crying* the ſame words ſo long together, was as much a *Heatheniſh rite*, as the *cutting of themſelves.*) The other of the *Epheſians*, Acts 19. 34. who are affirm'd to have *cryed with one voyce for two hours ſpace*, Μεγάλη ἡ Ἄρτεμις Ἐφεσίων, *Great is Diana of the Epheſians*, and thirdly, by the deſigned ends that Chriſt obſerves of that *Heathen* cuſtom, 1. *that they may be heard* by that long noiſe, for which *Elias* ſcoffs them, 1 *King.* 18. 27. *Cry aloud*, perhaps your *God is a talking, or a purſuing, &c.* 2. that their *Petitions* may be more intelligible to their Gods, to which Chriſt oppoſes, *your Heavenly Father knoweth what you have need of*, and ſo needs not your *Tautologies* to explain them to him. Much more might be ſaid for the explaining of that miſtaken place, but that it would ſeem unneceſſary to this matter, the exception being ſo cauſleſs, that the Vindication would paſs for an extravagance.

Sect. 36. Of the Prayers for the King, the account will not be much unlike; Saint *Paul* commands *that prayers, and ſupplications, and interceſſions, and thanksgivings be made for Kings, &c.* 1 Tim. 2. 1,2. where though the mention of thoſe ſeveral ſorts of prayers, ſignified by thoſe four words, might be matter of apology, for the making ſeveral addreſſes to God for Kings in one ſervice, ſuppoſing them proportion'd to thoſe ſorts in that Text, yet have we diſtributed the frequent prayers for him into the ſeveral ſervices, one ſolemn prayer for him in the ordinary daily ſervice, (and only a verſicle before as it were proœmial to it) another in the Litany, another after the Commandments (of which though our Book have two forms together, yet both the Rubrick and Cuſtom, gives us authority to interpret, it was not meant that both ſhould be ſaid at once, but either of the two choſen by the Miniſter,) another before the Communion, where the neceſſity of the matter, being deſigned for the *Church militant*, makes it more than ſeaſonable to deſcend to our particular Church, and the King the ſupream of it; juſt as *Herodotus* relates the cuſtom of the Perſians, *l.* 1. *p.* 52. πάσι τοῖς περσῶσι κατευχεσθαι ἐν γίνεσθαι καὶ τῷ βασιλεῖ, *they pray for all the Perſians, particularly for the King.* To this practice of ours ſo grounded in the Apoſtle, we ſhall add, 1. the reward promiſed (by the Apoſtle's intimation) to ſuch Prayers (if not, as I conceive, by thoſe words, *that we may live a peaceable and quiet life, &c.* that *peaceable and quiet life*, of all bleſſings the greateſt, ſeeming to be a benefit or donative promiſed to the faithful diſcharge of that duty, of *praying*, and *ſupplicating*, and *interceding*, and *giving thanks for Kings*, yet certainly ſomewhat elſe) in that high Declaration made concerning it in the next words, *for this is good and acceptable before God our Saviour*, whoſe *acceptation* is reward ſufficient to any action, and yet who never *accepts* but *rewards* alſo. 2. The practice of the antient Chriſtians, ſet down by *Tertull.* *Sacrificamus pro ſalute Imperatoris purâ prece, our prayers are ſent up a pure ſacrifice for the proſperity of the Emperour*, and that *quoties conveniebant*, in another place, *at every meeting or ſervice of the Church, & precantes ſemper pro omnibus Imperatoribus, vitam prolixam, Imperium ſecurum, domum tutam, exercitus fortes, Senatum fidelem, populum probum, Orbem quietum, quæcunque hominis & Cæſaris vota ſunt*, praying always for the Emperours, and begging of God for them, *long life, ſecure reign, the ſafety of his houſe, couragious Armies, a faithful Senate, a good people, a quiet World*, all thoſe ſeverals, (which would make up more prayers than our Book hath aſſigned) *all that either as Man or King they can ſtand in need of*; according to that of the *Greek* Church who having a form of Prayer called στεφῶσαι ὁ θεὸς τοὺς βασιλεῖς, that God would *eſtabliſh Kings*, do ſay of themſelves when they uſe it, στεφῶμεν τοὺς βασιλεῖς, *we do confirm the Kings*, i. e. this prayer of ours tends to the *confirming of Kings* and Kingdoms. See *Jac. à Godr. not. in Euchолog.* p. 33. and ſo *Athenagoras* and others to the ſame purpoſe, eſpecially when they have occaſion to juſtifie the fidelity of Chriſtians to their unchriſtian Emperours, having no ſurer evidence to give of that, than the frequency of their prayers for them, which they which think neceſſary to abridge, or ſuperſede, muſt give us leave by that indication to judge of ſomewhat elſe, by occaſion of, that topick to obſerve their other demonſtrations of diſloyalty to thoſe that are ſet over them by God; And to any that are not guilty of that crime, nor yet of another, of thinking all length of the publick ſervice unſupportable, I ſhall refer it to be judged, whether it be neceſſary, that the King be prayed for in the Church, no oftner than there is a Sermon there.

Ad Scap. c. 2.

Apol. c. 30.

Sect. 37. 6. The Communion of Saints, (which if it were no Article in our Creed, ought yet to be laid up, as one of the Chriſtians tasks or duties) conſiſts in that mutual exchange of charity and all ſeaſonable effects of it, between all parts of the Church, that *triumphant* in Heaven, Chriſt and the Saints there, and this on earth *militant*; which he that diſclaims, by that one act of inſolence, caſts

off

off one of the nobleſt priviledges of which this earth is capable, to be a fellow Citizen with the Saints, and a *fellow member* with Chriſt himſelf. The effects of this charity on their parts is, in Chriſts interceſſion, and in the Saints ſuffrages, and daily prayers to God for us, but on our part thankſgivings and commemorations; which were firſt uſed in the Temple and Synagogue, and are oft mentioned by *Syracides*, under the title of ὑμνολογίαι Κυρίου, *c.*47. 6. and μνημόσυνον ἐν ὑμνολογίαις, *c.*46. 11. 49. 10 (and εἰς ὑμνολογίαν, 1 *Mac.* 3. 7.) a form of which we have in the 44. c. of that Book, which in the Greek was antiently inſcribed Πατέρων ὕμνος, *the Hymn*, or *praiſe of the Fathers*, and begins with Αἰνέσωμεν ἄνδρας ὑμνήσεως καὶ πατέρας—— And the ſame 'tis apparent the Primitive Chriſtians uſed very early, ſolemnizing the day of Chriſts reſurrection, *&c.* and rehearſing the names of the Saints out of their Dypticks, in time of the offertory before the Sacrament; beſides this ſo ſolemn a Chriſtian duty, another act of charity there is, which the Church owes to her living Sons, the educating them in the preſence of good *examples*, and ſetting a remark of *honour* on all which have lived Chriſtianly, eſpecially have *died in teſtimony* of the truth of that profeſſion; and again, a great part of the New Teſtament, being *ſtory* of the lives of Chriſt and his Apoſtles, (and the reſt but *doctrine* agreeable to what thoſe lives expreſſed) it muſt needs be an excellent compendium of that Book, and a moſt uſeful way of infuſing it into the *underſtanding*, and preſerving it in the *memory* of the People, to aſſign proper portions of Scripture in *Leſſons*, *Epiſtles*, and *Goſpels* to every day, every Sunday, every Feſtival in the Year (which are none in our Church, but for the remembrance of *Chriſt* and the *Scripture-Saints*) to infuſe by thoſe degrees all *neceſſary* Chriſtian knowledge, and duties into us, the uſe of which to the ignorant is ſo great, that it may well be fear'd, that when the Feſtivals, and ſolemnities for the birth of Chriſt, and his other famous paſſages of *life* and *death*, and *reſurrection* and *aſcenſion*, and *miſſion* of the *Holy Ghoſt*, and the *Leſſons*, *Goſpels* (and *Collects*) and *Sermons* upon them, be turn'd out of the *Church*, together with the *Creeds* alſo, 'twill not be in the power of weekly *Sermons* on *ſome head of Religion*, to keep up the knowledge of Chriſt in mens hearts, a thing it ſeems obſerv'd by the *Caſuiſts*, who uſe to make the number of thoſe things that are *neceſſariò credenda*, *neceſſary to be believed, no more, than the Feſtivals of Chriſt make known to men*, and ſure by the antient Fathers, whoſe Preaching was generally on the Goſpels for the day; as appears by their *Sermons de tempore*, and their poſtils. To all theſe ends, are all theſe Feſtivals, and theſe Services deſigned by the Church, (and to no other, that is capable of any the leaſt brand of *novel* or *ſuperſtitious*) and till all this *antidote* ſhall be demonſtrated to be turn'd *poyſon*, all theſe *wholeſom* deſigns, to be perfectly *noxious*, till *ill or* no *examples*, uncharitableneſs, ſchiſmatical cutting our ſelves off from being fellow-members with the Saints, and even with Chriſt our Head, till ingratitude, ignorance, and Atheiſm it ſelf, be canonized for *Chriſtian* and *Saint-like*, and the only things tending to edification in a Church, there will hardly appear any ſo much as *politick neceſſity* to turn theſe out of it.

Sect. 38. 7. *For the reading of the Commandments, and prayer before, and the reſponſes after each of them*, though it be not antiently to be found in the Church, as a part of the *Service*, (but only retain'd in the *Catechiſm*) till *King Edwards ſecond Liturgy*, (and therefore ſure no charge of Popery to be affixt on it) yet ſeemeth it to me a very profitable part of devotion, being made uſe of as it ought. The *Prieſt* after a premiſed prayer for *grace* to *love and keep Gods Commandments*, is appointed to ſtand and read every of the Commandments diſtinctly to the People, as a kind of *Moſes*, bringing them from God to them; Theſe are they to receive in the humbleſt affection of heart, and poſture of body, as means to try and examine themſelves, to humble themſelves in a ſenſe of their ſeveral failings, and thereupon implore (every one for himſelf, and for others, even for the whole Kingdom) firſt Gods *mercy* for *pardon* for all that hath been committed againſt the letter of each Commandment, or what-ever Chriſt and the Goſpel hath ſet down under any, or reducible to any of thoſe heads, 2. *Grace* to perform for the time to come, what ever may be acceptable to Chriſt in that particular. This being thus diſtinctly and leiſurely done to each particular precept, the heart enlarging to every particular under that, proves an excellent form of confeſſion of ſins, and of reſolution (and prayer for ſtrength) to forſake them. And let me tell you, were Gods pardon thus fervently and often called for by each humble ſoul in a Kingdom, for every mans *perſonal*, and the whole Kingdoms *National* ſins, the *Atheiſm ſpeculative* and *practical*, the *impiety*, *infidelity*, *want of love* and *fear*, and *worſhip of God*, *&c.* in the firſt Commandment, and ſo throughout all the reſt, and *the grace of God*, to work all the contrary graces in *every heart*, in the *heart* of the whole *Kingdom*, as humbly and heartily invoked, the benefit would certainly be ſo great, and ſo illuſtrious, that none but *Satan*, who is to be dethroned, and part with his Kingdom by that means, would ever deem it *neceſſary* to caſt out this part of Service, and have nothing at all in change for it.

Sect. 39. 8. For the *order of the Offertory*, it muſt firſt be obſerved, that in the Primitive Apoſtolick Church, the *Offertory* was a conſiderable part of the action, in the adminiſtring and receiving the Sacrament; the manner of it was thus. At their meetings for divine Service, every man as he was able brought ſomething along with him, bread or wine, the fruits of the Seaſon, &c. of this, part was uſed for the *Sacrament*, the reſt kept to furniſh a common Table for all the brethren (and therefore in *Ignatius*, δοχὴν ἐπιτελεῖν, *to celebrate the Feaſt*, is to adminiſter that Sacrament being joyn'd there with the mention of Baptiſm) Rich and Poor to eat together, no one taking precedence of other, or challenging a greater part to himſelf, by reaſon of his bringing more; this is diſcernible in Saint *Pauls* words, chiding the *Corinthians* for their defaults in this matter, 2 *Cor.* 11. 21. *every man*, ſaith he, *takes and eats before another his own ſupper*, (*i.e.*) the Rich that brought more, eats that which he brought, ὡς ἴδιον δεῖπνον, as *if he were at home eating his own private meals*, without reſpect to the nature of thoſe ἀγάπαι, which were a common meal for all, and ſo while one is filled to the full, ſome others have little or nothing to eat, which is the meaning of that which follows, *one is hungry and another is drunken*; after the ἀγάπαι ceaſed, and the bringing of the fruits of the ſeaſon, which were as a kind of firſt-fruit offering, was out-dated, whether by Canon of the Church, or by contrary cuſtom, this manner was ſtill continued, that every receiver brought ſomewhat with him to offer, particularly bread, and wine mixt with water. *Juſtin Mart. Apol.* 2. *p.* 97. ſets down the manner

Ep. ad Smyrn.

manner of it clearly in his time, προσφέρεται τῷ προεστῶτι τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἄρτος, &c. *the bread and the wine of the Brethren, i. e.* Communicants *is brought to the Prieſt or Prefect,* (not as the Latine interpreter reads *Prafecto fratrum*) as if ἀδελφῶν, were to be joyn'd with προεστῶτι, which belongs to ἄρτος) *and he receiving it, gives laud and praiſe unto God, in the name of the Son and the Holy Ghoſt, and all the people joyn in the Amen,* then do the Deacons diſtribute that ἄρτον εὐχαριστηθέντα, *the bread, over which he hath thus given thanks,* and then ſaith he, over and above, *the richer ſort, and every one as he ſhall think good, contributes, and that which is ſo raiſed, is left with the Prieſt, who out of that ſtock ſuccours the Orphan and Widow, and becomes a common provider for all that are in want.* This clearly diſtinguiſheth two parts of the Offertory, one deſigned for the uſe of all the *Faithful* in the Sacrament, another reſerved for the uſe of the poor, the former called προσφοραὶ, *Oblations,* in the Council of *Laodicea,* the other παπροφορίαι, in that of *Gangra,* and proportionably, the repoſitory for the firſt called *Sacrarium* in the *fourth Council of Carthage, Can.* 93. (and by *Poſſidonius* in the life of Saint *Auguſtine, Secretarium unde altari neceſſaria inferuntur,* where *thoſe things* are laid, and from *whence fetcht which are neceſſary to the Altar*) the other *Gazophylacium* or *treaſury,* the firſt Saint *Cyprian* calls *Sacrificia ſacrifices,* the ſecond *Eleemoſyna Almes, l. de op. & Eleem.* parallel to thoſe which we find both together mentioned, *Acts* 24. 17. *I came to bring almes to my Nation and offerings.* This ſaith *Juſtin Martyr* is our *Chriſtian Sacrifice,* which will more appear to him that conſiders that the feaſting of the People, their partaking of the *Sacrifice,* having their τόμας and μερίδας, was always annexed to ſacrifices, both among Jews and Heathens, which the Apoſtle calls *partaking of the Altar,* and conſequently that the *Sacrifice,* and the *feaſt* together, the *ſacrifice* in the *offertory,* the *feaſt* in the *eating and drinking* there, do compleat and make up the whole buſineſs of this Sacrament, as far as the people are concerned in it; and all this bleſt by the Prieſt, and God *bleſt* and praiſed by Prieſt and People, and ſo the title of *Euchariſt* belongs to it. Thus, after *Juſtin, Irenaus. The offertory of the Chriſtians is accounted a pure ſacrifice with God, as when Saint Paul,* ſaith he, *mentions the acts of the Philippians liberality, he calls them* θυσίαν δεκτὴν, *an acceptable ſervice* (and ſo *Heb.* 3. 16. *to do good and to Communicate forget not,* ſuch acts of liberality to thoſe that want, *for with ſuch ſacrifices God is well pleaſed,*) and preſently defines what this Sacrifice was, *primitia earum quæ ſunt ejus creaturarum, the firſt-fruits of Gods creatures.* So *Tertullian, modicam unuſquiſque ſtipem menſtruâ die adponit, every one brings ſomewhat every Month,* juſt parallel to our *Offertory* at Monthly *Communions;* Much more might be ſaid of this out of antient *Conſtitutions and Canons,* if 'twere not for my deſire of brevity. Effectually St. *Cyprian, Locuples & dives es, & dominicam celebrare te credis, & corbonam non reſpicis, qui in dominicum ſine ſacrificio venis, qui partem de ſacrificio quod pauper obtulit, ſumis? Art thou rich, and thinkeſt thou receiveſt as thou oughteſt, and reſpecteſt not the Corban, feedeſt on the poor mens Sacrifice, and bringeſt none thy ſelf?* And Saint *Auguſtine* to the ſame purpoſe; And 'tis worth obſerving that many Authorities, which the *Papiſts* produce for the external Sacrifice of the body of Chriſt in the *Maſſe,* are but the detorſion and diſguiſing of thoſe places which belong to the *Offertory* of the *People,* and in the *Canon* of the *Maſſe,* that prayer which is uſed for the offering up of Chriſt, (larded with ſo many croſſes) plainly betrays it ſelf to have been firſt inſtituted in relation to theſe *gifts* and *oblations,* as appears by the mention of *Abels ſacrifice, and Melchiſedecks offering* (that of *Abels* the firſtlings of the flock, *Melchizedecks* a *preſent* only of *Bread* and *Wine* to *Abraham*) and the *per quem hæc omnia ſemper bona creas (by whom thou createſt all theſe good things)* which belongs evidently to the firſtlings of the flock, thoſe living creatures ſacrificed by *Abel,* but is by them now moſt ridiculouſly applyed to the body of Chriſt. I have been thus large in ſhewing the original of the *Offertory,* becauſe it hath in all ages been counted a ſpecial part of divine worſhip, the *third part of the Chriſtian Holocauſt,* ſaith *Aquinas, 2a. 2æ. q.* 85. *art.* 3. *ad* 2. the obſervation of which is yet alive in our *Liturgie* (I would it had a more chearful univerſal reception in our practice) eſpecially if that be true which *Honorius* ſaith, that inſtead of the antient *oblation of Bread and Wine,* the offering of money was by conſent receiv'd into the Church in memory of the pence in *Judas*'s ſale. Now that this offering of Chriſtians to God for pious and charitable uſes, deſigned to them who are his Proxies and Deputy receivers, may be the more liberally and withal more ſolemnly performed, many portions of Scripture are by the *Liturgie* deſigned to be read to ſtir up and quicken this bounty, and thoſe of three ſorts, ſome belonging to *good works* in general, others to *almes-deeds,* others to *oblations,* and when it is received and brought to the *Prieſt,* he humbly prays God to *accept thoſe almes,* and this is it which I call the ſervice of the *Offertory,* ſo valued and eſteemed among all Antients, but wholly omitted in this *Directory* (only a caſual naming of a *Collection for the Poor* by way of a ſage caution, that it *be ſo order'd, that no part of the publick worſhip be thereby hindred*) upon what grounds of policy or pretence of neceſſity, I know not, unleſs out of that great fear, leſt *works of charity* (which the Apoſtle calls an *acceptable ſacrifice,* and *with which God is well pleaſed*) ſhould paſs for any part of the *ſervice* or *worſhip of God,* which after *praying* to him is an act that hath the greateſt remark, and higheſt character ſet upon it, and when it is thus in the *Offertory,* is accounted *pars cultûs, a part of worſhip,* ſay the School-men. And beſide, where it is uſed, as it ought, proves of excellent benefit (when prudent faithful Officers have the diſpenſing of it) toward the ſupplying and preventing the wants of all, μᾶλλον δὲ χρεία ἐστὶ χειμῶνι γίνεται, *the Miniſter is thereby enabled to be the guardian of all that are in want,* ſaith *Juſtine M. Apol.* 2. and ſure *neceſſity* hath little or no *law* or *reaſon* in it, when the rejecting of ſuch cuſtoms as theſe proves the only *neceſſary.*

9. For *private Baptiſm,* that which our *Liturgy* preſcribes is, *that all poſſible care be taken, that all Children that are to be Baptized be brought to Church, and not without great cauſe and neceſſity Baptized at home in their houſes.* And yet when great need ſhall compel them ſo to do, then an order of adminiſtring it is preſcribed, ſuch as in caſe the Child *dye,* it may not be *deprived* of the *Sacrament,* and in caſe it *live,* it may as *publickly* be *preſented,* and with *Prayer* received into the *Church,* and pronounced to be *baptized* already, which is equivalent, as if it had been *baptized in the publick.* The clear confeſt ground of this practice is the deſire of the *Church* not to be wanting to any the meaneſt creature, in allowing it that which Chriſt hath given it *right* to, and to encourage and ſatisfie the charitable deſires of Parents, which in danger of inſtant death require it for them. This ground

ſeems

Dial. cum Tryph. p. 260.

l. 4. c. 34.

Apol. c. 39.

De op. & Eleemoſ. p. 180.

Serm. de temp. 215.

Sect. 39.

ſeems clearly to be acknowledg'd by the Compilers of this *Directory*, pag. 41. *where 'tis affirmed, that the poſterity of the Faithful born within the Church, have by their birth* (not by their living to the next Lords day, or till they can be brought to Church) *intereſt in the Covenant and right to the ſeal of it*, (which ſure is *Baptiſm*) and then what *neceſſity* there is, that they that are acknowledg'd to have *right to that ſeal*, ſhould yet not be permitted to *have* it, (as in caſe *private Baptiſm* be excluded, ſome of them infallibly ſhall not) I profeſs my underſtanding too ſhort to reach. And as ignorant I muſt confeſs to be alſo, why, when they come to the Congregation, it ſhould be utterly unlawful for them to be *Baptized in the place where Fonts have hitherto been placed, i. e.* near the door of the *Church*, as the *Directory* appoints; A new *ſcandalous* piece it ſeems of *Popery* and *Superſtition*, (which is as dangerous as *private Baptiſm*, and therefore with it together forbidden) and yet very antient, and far from any ſuperſtitious intent; *Baptiſm* being at firſt in any convenient Pond or River, as the Goſpel, and after that *Juſt. Martyr* tells us, and is noted by the word βαπτίζω, which is literally, *to dope over head in the water*, and by the word κολυμβήθρα, a *ſwimming or diving place*, by which the Fathers expreſs the *Font*. But when Churches were built, then there was an erection alſo of *Baptiſteria*, at firſt without, but after within the *Churches*, and thoſe placed near the πρόναος, or *Porch of the Church*, on no other deſign undoubtedly, than to ſignifie the *Sacrament* there celebrated to be a rite of *initiation*, or *entrance* into the Church, (as the *Chancel* or upper part of the Chuch was aſſigned unto the other *Sacrament* to ſignifie it to belong to thoſe only that were come to ſome *perfection*) againſt which 'tis not poſſible any thing ſhould be objected of *unfitneß*, but that the Miniſters voice will not in ſome Churches ſo eaſily be heard by the whole *Congregation*, which if it may not be helpt, by raiſing his voice at that time, will not yet infuſe any *Popery or Superſtition into it*, the charge that is here ſo heavily laid on it, (as well as that of *unfitneß*) of which if it be guilty, *Superſtition* is become a ſtrange *ubiquitary*, ready to flye and affix it ſelf to any thing they will have it, and ſhall as juſtly be faſten'd by me on their *negative*, or *prohibition of Baptiſm* in that place [*it is not to be adminiſtred in the places where Fonts, &c.*] as upon our *poſitive appointing* it. For ſure if a *ſignificant rite* or *deſignation* of place, *&c.* without any other guilt, than that it is ſo, be *ſuperſtitious*, an *unſignificant interdiction* of it will be as much, and if the *poſitive ſuperſtition* be to be condemned, the *negative* muſt be ſo alſo.

Apol. 2. in fine.

Sect. 40. 10. For the *preſcript form of Catechiſm*, it is placed by our Church in our *Liturgy*, and as fit to be placed there as any *directions for Preaching* can be in theirs, (which takes up ſo great a part in their *Religion*, and conſequently in their *Directory*) the previous inſtruction of youth being ſo much more *neceſſary* than that, as a *foundation* is than any part of the *ſuperſtructure*, that being *neceſſary* to the end only, but this over and above *neceſſary* to make capable of the other *neceſſary*. Of this particular *Catechiſm* I might ſay ſomewhat, which would be worthy to be obſerved in theſe times, how much Chriſtian *prudence* the *Church* hath ſhewed in it, in ſetting down for all to learn, only thoſe few things which are *neceſſary* to the plaineſt and meaneſt, for the direction of Chriſtian faith and practice; and if we would all keep our ſelves within that moderation, and propoſe no larger *Catalogue* of *credenda* to be believ'd by all than the *Apoſtles Creed*, as 'tis explain'd in our *Catechiſm*, doth propoſe, and lay the greater weight upon conſideration and performance of the *vow of Baptiſm*, and all the commands of God as they are explained (and ſo the obligation to obedience inlarged) by Chriſt, and then only add the explication of the nature and uſe of the *Sacraments*, in thoſe moſt commodious and intelligible expreſſions (and none other) which are there ſet down, I ſhould be confident there would be leſs hating and damning one another (which is moſt ordinarily for opinions) more *piety* and *charity*, and ſo true *Chriſtianity* among Chriſtians and Proteſtants, than hitherto hath been met with. But ſeeing, though this be fit to be ſaid, yet 'tis unneceſſary in this place, this *Catechiſm* being not put in balance with any other way of inſtructing youth in the *Directory*, but only *ſold* or caſt away for *nought* and *no money*, nothing *taken* or offered in exchange for it, I am ſuperſeded from this, and only left to wonder why *Catechizing* of Children in the faith and knowledge of their *vowed duty*, (which I hope is no *ſtinting of their Spirits*) ſhould be one of thoſe burthens which 'tis ſo *neceſſary* ſhould be thrown off, and not ſo much as conſider'd in this *Directory*.

Sect. 41. 11. For *Confirmation*, which (being a thing wherein the *Biſhop* is a party, will, I muſt expect, be matter of ſome envy and *odium* but to name it, and) being ſo long and ſo ſcandalouſly *neglected* in this Kingdom (though the *rule* have alſo been ſevere and careful in *requiring* it) will now not ſo eaſily be digeſted, having thoſe *vulgar prejudices* againſt it, yet muſt I moſt ſolemnly profeſs my opinion of it, That it is a moſt *antient Chriſtian cuſtom, tending very much to edification*. Which I ſhall make good by giving you this view of the manner of it. It is this, that every *Rector* of any Pariſh, or *Curate* of charge, ſhould by a familiar way of *Catechizing* inſtruct the youth of both ſexes within his Cure in the principles of Religion, ſo far, that every one of them before the uſual time of coming to the *Lords Supper*, ſhould be able to underſtand the particulars of the *vow* made in *Baptiſm* for the *credenda* and *facienda*, yea and *fugienda* alſo, what muſt be *believed*, what *done*, and what *forſaken*; and be able to give an intelligent account of every one of theſe, which being done, every ſuch Child ſo prepared, ought to be brought to the *Biſhop* for *Confirmation*. Wherein the intent is, that every ſuch Child attain'd to years of underſtanding ſhall *ſingly* and *ſolemnly* before *God*, the *Biſhop* and the whole *Congregation*, with his own mouth, and his own conſent, take upon himſelf, the obligation to that, which his Godfathers and Godmothers in *Baptiſm* promiſed in his name, and before all thoſe reverend witneſſes, make a firm publick *renew'd promiſe*, that by Gods help he will faithfully endeavour to diſcharge that *obligation* in every point of it, and perſevere in it *all the days of his life*. Which reſolution and promiſe ſo heightned with all thoſe *ſolemnities*, will in any reaſon have a mighty impreſſion on the Child, and an influence on his actions for ever after. And this being thus performed by him, the *Biſhop* ſhall ſeverally *impoſe his hands* upon every ſuch Child (a Ceremony uſed to this purpoſe by Chriſt himſelf,) and *bleß, and pray for him*, that now that the temptations of ſin begin more ſtrongly, in reſpect of his age, to aſſault him, he may *receive grace and ſtrength* againſt all ſuch temptations or aſſaults, by way of *prevention* and eſpecial *aſſiſtance*, without which obtained by prayer from God, he will never be able to do it. This is the ſum of *Confirmation*,

and

and were irrightly observed (and no man admitted to the *Lords Supper*, that had not thus taken the *Baptism-bond* from his *sureties* into his own name, and no man after that suffered to continue in the *Church*, which brake it wilfully, but turn'd out of those sacred Courts, by the *power of the keys* in *excommunication*) it would certainly prove, by *the blessing* of God, there begged, a most effectual means to keep men, at least within some terms of *Christian civility*, from falling into *open enormous* sins; and that the defaming and casting out of this so blameless gainful Order should be *necessary* or *useful* to any policy, save only to defend the *Devil* from so great a blow, and to sustain and uphold his *Kingdom*. I never had yet any temptation or motive to suspect or imagine. Instead of considering any objections of the *adversary*, against this piece, whether of *Apostolical* or *Ecclesiastical discipline* (which I never heard with any colour produced) I shall rather express my most passionate wish unto my *Friends*, those who sincerely wish the good of this *National Church*, that they will endeavour their utmost to revive these means of regaining the purity and exemplary lives of all its members, when God by *restoring our Peace* shall *open a door* for it.

12. For the *Solemnities of Burial*, as they are certainly useless to them who are *dead*, so are they not designed by us but to the benefit of the *living* in *Lessons* and *Prayers* upon those occasions, as also for the freeing us from the imputation of *rudeness* and *uncivility* (which Christianity teaches no body) to those bodies which shall have their parts in the resurrection, and to their *memories*, which the obligation of *Kindred* and *friendship*, at least the common band of *Christianity*, makes precious to us; and that it should be *necessary*, and tend to *edification*, not to pray such seasonable *Prayers*, hear, and impress upon our hearts such seasonable *Lessons*, (at a time when they are exemplified before our eyes, and our hearts being softned with mourning, are become more *malleable*) to perform such laudable Christian *Civilities*, only for fear we should (not pray but) be thought to pray *to* or *for* them, *over* whom, or near whose Hearse, or *by* or *toward* whom we thus pray, (which that we do not, our *Prayers* that then we use, are ready to testifie) is another unreasonable, able to evidence the power of prejudice and faction to any that is not sufficiently convinced of it.

13. For that of *thanksgiving after Child-birth*, as it may be acknowledged to be taken up in proportion to, or imitation of *Purification* among the Jews, so is it not thereby *lyable* to any *charge* of evil; For herein is a marvelous mistake among men, to think that because the continuing of *circumcision* was so forbidden by Saint *Paul*, *Gal.* 5. 2. therefore it should be *unlawful* for any *Christian Church*, to institute any usage which had ever been *commanded the Jews*. For the reasons which made the retaining of *circumcision* so dangerous, will not be of any force against other *customes* of the *Jews*, as 1. That it was prest by the *Judaizing Christians*, as *necessary to justification*, *Gal.* 5. 4. which is in effect the disclaiming of *Christ* or of *any profit*, Ver. 2. or *effect*, Ver. 4. by him, a *falling from Grace*, and renouncing the *Gospel*. 2. That it was contrary to that *liberty* or manumission from the *Judaical* Law which Christ had *purchased*, *ver.* 13. to have *circumcision* imposed *as a Law of God's* still obligatory, when Christ by his death hath cancell'd it. 3. That some carnal professors, which thought by this means to escape the opposition, and *persecution*, which then followed the doctrine of Christ, and profession of Christianity, did much *boast* that they put themselves and their Disciples in a course to avoid the *Cross*, *Chap.* 6. 12. which is the meaning of that, *ver.* 13. that they may *glory in your flesh*, *i. e.* in your being circumcised, as that is by Saint *Paul* opposed to *glorying in the Cross*, ver. 14. *i. e.* the persecution that followed profession of the Gospel, as *chap.* 5. 11. he mentions it as the only reason of his being *persecuted*, that he would not *Preach Circumcision*: agreeable to which is that of *Ignatius* in *Ep. ad Magnes.* Εἰ μέχρι νῦν κατὰ νόμον Ἰουδαϊκὸν, &c. *If we till now live according to the Law of the Jews and circumcision of the flesh, we deny that we have received grace, for the divinest Prophets lived according to Jesus Christ, and* διὰ τοῦτο, *for doing so were persecuted*, which they that desired to avoid, and therefore would be *circumcised*, or *Preach circumcision*, those are the men Saint *Paul* so quarrels with, as those that would not *suffer* for Christs sake, that were not much in love with that *Cross of his*. To which a fourth reason may also be added, that many of the Ceremonies of the Law did presignifie the *future Messias*, and the teaching the *necessity* of such observances as not yet *abolisht*, is the professing *Christ* not to be the *Messias*. All which notwithstanding, it still remains very possible, that a *rite* formerly commanded the *Jews* not as *significative of the future Messias*, but as decent in the worship of God, without *any depending on it for justification*, without *any opinion that the Jewish law obliges us*, and without *any fear of being persecuted* by the *Jews*, or consequent compliance with them, may now be prescribed by the *Christian Church*, meerly as a *humane* institution, judging that *decent* or useful *now* which was so *then*, and in this case if nothing else can be objected against it, save only that *God once* thought fit to prescribe it to his *own People*, there will be little fear of danger in, or fault to be found with any such usage. For it is an ordinary observation which *Paulus Fagius* in his Notes on the *Targum* (a most learned *Protestant*) first suggested to me, that many of the *Jewish Ceremonies* were imitated by *Christ* himself under the *Gospel*. I might shew it you in the *Apostles*, who were answerable to the שלוחים the *missi* or *messengers* among the *Jews*, and were by *Christ* our *High-Priest* sent abroad to all Nations to bring in (that *peculium*, which of all others he counted most his *due*, having paid so dear for it,) sinners to their Saviour, as they were among the *Jews* sent by the *High-Priest* to fetch in the *dues* to the *Temple*. So also the *imposition of hands*, a form of *benediction* among the *Jews*, as antient as *Jacob* himself, *Gen.* 48. 14. *in blessing Josephs Sons*, and is often used by *Christ* to that same purpose. And even the two *Sacraments* are of this nature, *Baptism* related to the βαπτισμοὶ, *washings* used by them at the *initiating* or *admitting* of *Proselytes*, and *Christs taking bread*, and *giving Thanks*, &c. *after Supper* (wherein the other Sacrament was first instituted) was directly the *postcœnium* among the *Jews*, not a peculiar *part* of the *Passeover-Feast*, but a Ceremony *after* all Feasts, very usual among them. So the word ἐκκλησία, from the *Assemblies* civil or sacred among the *Jews*, is made use of to signifie the *Christian Church*, which Christ was to gather together. So the *Lords day* one day

Sect. 43.

in seven, proportionable to their *Sabbath*. So πρεσβύτεροι, *Elders* among the *Jews* are brought by the *Apostles* to signifie an *Order* in the Church, and πρεσβυτέρια Colledges of many of them together, called by *Ignatius*, συνήματα ἱερὰ, *sacred societies*, συμβουλοὶ καὶ συνεδρευταὶ τῆ ἐπισκόπῃ, *counsellers and assistants of the Bishop*, and his συνέδριον, *in Ep. ad Trall.* are parallel to the *Sanhedrim*, or *Council* of *Elders* that were joyned to *Moses* in his government to facilitate the burthen to him. The same may be said of the *Deacons* which were an imitation of the גזבר the *Treasurer* or *Steward* among them, and consequently the place, where the goods which they were to distribute were kept, is (parallel to their חזאנה) γαζοφυλάκιον, the *treasury*, and so the *Bishop* also, saith *Grotius*, is a transcript of the ראש הקהל *the head of the Congregation*. And the *Patriarchs* among *Christians* are taken from the *heads of the Tribes* among them, called ordinarily by the 72. ἀρχοντες πατριῶν, and in the New Testament πατριαρχαί. Add unto these the Christian Censure of *Excommunication* answerable to their ἀποσυναγωγία (whether it were from *sacred* or only from *civil* Assemblies among them, it matters little, for the *civil* among *them* may be accommodated to *Ecclesiastical* among *Christians*, as in some of the foremention'd is acknowledged, and as the word συναγωγὴ, which signifies primarily any kind of *Assembly*, and is so taken, *Mat.* 6. 5. is appropriated to a *place* of divine worship in other places) and in the several degrees of it in the Christian Church, answerable to their *Nidui*, *Cherem*, and *Schammatha*; And so for *Absolution* also. All this I have said, and might add much more to make the demand appear no unreasonable one, that it may be lawful for the *Church* to use a *custome*, which hath some *resemblance* of some *Ceremony* in force antiently among the *Jews*, *viz.* that of the *Purification of Women in our Churching*. Which objection being removed, there will remain no other, and then that it should be simply *unlawful* or *unedifying*, to take notice of the *deliverance* of each Woman, or to pay acknowledgments to God for it, and *necessary* to set up such Schools of *ingratitude* in the Church, is more than *ingenuous nature* will suffer any Christian to believe upon the bare authority of these *Assemblers*.

Sect. 44. 14. The *Communion of the sick*, if it be *Superstition* and Popery also, (as sure is implyed by the no mention of it at the *visitation of the sick* in the *Directory*) 'tis sure of a very long standing in the Church. The Canons of the Councils about the *Lapsi* and Excommunicate, that generally take care that they should have the Peace of the Church *in extremis* (answerable to our *Absolution* at that time) and if with expressions of penitent hearts they desire it, the *Sacrament* also, are evidences so clear of this custome, that I shall not need produce any testimonies; those that are moved with the practice of *Antiquity* being sufficiently furnisht with them; If any man be unsatisfied in this, let him read the *famous story of the dying Serapion* in *Eusebius*, *l.* 6. *c.* 36. And that it should be *necessary* to the edification of the Church, that the *viaticum*, (as the Fathers call'd it) should be denied every *hungring* and *thirsting* Traveller at that time when it might yield him most *comfort*, and our *charity* most inclines us to allow it him, nay that the *Church* should be thought to suffer by that in any eminent manner (if it were ill) which is done *privately*, only to some particular, (and order taken that all *publickly* should be warned to receive the *Communion* frequently in the Church, and so not want it on the bed, or trouble the Minister then for it) and consequently the Church perhaps never hear of it, this is again a new kind of *necessity*, to be fetcht from some under-ground *Fundamental Laws* of I know not whose laying, that the *Christian Church* never heard of till these times.

Sect. 45. 15. As for the *Service of the Commination*, fitted for the *first day in Lent*, which by denuntiations against particular sins under the Law, (appointed to be read to, and attested by the People with an Amen of *acknowledgment*, that every such offender is by the Law *cursed*, not of *prayer* that he *may* be so dealt with in Gods justice) is designed to bring men to humiliation and contrition for sin, the special duty of that day and the *ensuing season*, and closeth with most affectionate *prayers* for such *penitents*; it is matter of some *panick* senceless *fears* to some *ignorant* men (which are very tender and passionate friends to their *beloved* sins, and dare not subscribe to the condemnation of them) but very useful to awake even those and all others out of this *security*, as a *Feaver* to cure the *Lethargick*, to kindle a fire about mens ears, that they may see their danger, and make out to the use of all Christian means of *repentance* and *devotion*, and *laying hold on Christ* to avert it; and if such a bug-bear as that of being thought to *curse our selves* and friends in the saying *Amen* to the threatnings (which will be true to all impenitents whether we say *Amen* or no) be sufficient to *exorcise* such an *exorcist*, to cast out of the Church such a powerful means of bringing sinners to repentance, or if bare prejudice of the Assemblers without either hearing or objecting against it, be enough to make it necessary to be left out of our service, the Devil will never be in danger from his enemies, as long as he may have but the spell of the *Directory* to put them thus to flight for him.

Sect. 46. Lastly, for the *observation* of *Lent*, *&c.* if they be consider'd in general as *Fasts*, there will sure be no *necessity* to renounce them, the *Jews* had their Fasts as well as Feasts (and those *set publick*, not only voluntary *private Fasts*) and not only that *great day of Expiation* appointed by *God* himself, but *occasional* ones appointed by *men*, and yet, when appointed, as constantly observ'd as that other, the *Fast of the fourth month*, *of the fifth*, *of the seventh*, and *of the tenth month*, *Zach.* 8. 19. and under Christianity, though in the time of Christs presence with the Disciples, they *fasted not*, yet the *fasting* of *Johns Disciples*, nay the *twice a week of the Pharisees* themselves, is not (though mention'd, yet) reprehended, but implicitly approv'd by Christ, and of his own, saith he, they should not have that immunity long, *the days shall come when the Bridegroom should be taken away* (and that is ever since Christs ascension) *and then shall they fast in those days*. 'Twere easie to justifie this through the writings, and by the practice of the whole Church of God, till these days of θυμὸς and ἐπιθυμία let loose, till these days of *animosities* and *Epicurisme* have made the usage of *Fasts* by *Papists*, a command to us not to use them, and to conclude the abating any thing of our *gluttony* to be an intrenchment on our *Christian Liberty*, and both those deceits together quarrell'd all Christian times of *fasting* out of our *practice* first, then out of our *Kalendar*. This being said in general of *fasting*, the application of this to these *fasts of the Church*, will be indisputably satisfactory to any, that shall

but

but consider the occasions of each of them, of the *Lenten-fast*, the known *forty days example of abstinence in Christ*, whereupon saith St. *Jerom*, *unam quadragesimam sec. traditionem Apostolorum, &c. jejunamus*, *We fast the Lent according to the tradition of the Apostles*, and *Epiphanius* joyns with him to make the *Lent-fast* an *Apostolical tradition*, and others of the Antients concurring for the *practice* of it; if not so punctual for the *tradition*; St. *Basil* may speak for all *in hom.* 2. of Fasting, that *there was no age nor place, but knew it and observed it*. And then I know no *necessity* of despising *Christs pattern*, and *Apostolical practice*, unless it be the same which obliges to the destroying of *Episcopacy* (which as it is an *imparity* opposite to the *equality of Presbyters*, is clearly deducible from *both* those Authorities, to which it seems *this year* is resolv'd to prove *fatal*;) that so there may be at length as little *imitation of Christ among us*, as *reverence to Apostles*. Then for *Rogation week*, though the original or occasion of that cannot be deduced so high, but is by *Historians* referred to * *Claud. Mamertus Bishop of Vienne in France*, for the averting of some Judgments, which on the observation of many inauspicious accidents and prodigies were sadly feared to be approaching, yet was the observation of it more universal, *pene per* * *orbem totum*, saith, *Alcimus* then, and then sure will it not be *Necessary* to turn the *Fasts*, or the *Litanies*, or the *Services* assigned to it out of the Church, as long as dangers are either *present*, *impendent*, or *possible*, or indeed as long as there be *sins* enough among us to abode us ill, or provoke any wrath of Heaven, any judgments on us; And when all those *occasions* cease, I am content those *Services* may be laid aside also, *i.e.* when we meet all together in Heaven. Next, the *Ember weeks* are of great *Antiquity* in the *Church* called the *quatuor tempora* in the *Latin Fathers*, the *four seasons* of the year, (each called by the old *Saxons* ymbryn *i.e.* περιόδους, from emb *circum*, and ryn *run*, *Cursus*, *viz.* the return of the Sun to the same point, from whence rather than from the Greek ἡμέραι, I conceive is the *English Ember*) and (beside the first institution of them for quarterly seasons of devotion proportion'd to each part of the year, as the first-fruits of every season, that the whole and each division of it might be blest by it; and again, beside their answerableness to those four times of *solemn Fast* mention'd among the *Jews*, that we *Christians* may not be inferiour unto *them* in that duty) an admirable use is assign'd to them in the Church, in imitation of the Apostles, *Act.* 13. 3. by *Fasting and Prayer to prepare for the ordination of Ministers* immediately consequent to every such week, that God would send, and furnish worthy Instruments of his glory to serve him in that glorious Office, and till Ministers are acknowledg'd to be generally so good, that either they cannot or need not be better, till those are also grown *immortal* (as the framers of this *Ordinance*) and so no use of care for *succession*, I shall suppose it not over *necessary* to precipitate these out of the Church of Christ, but rather wish that there were in our *Liturgy* some *Service* appointed of *Lessons* and *Prayers* for this purpose, to be used constantly on the dayes of *Fast* through those *weeks*.

* *Epist.* 54 *ad Marcellin.*

* See the beginning and description of it in *Alcimus Avitus* his *Hom. de Rogation.*

* See Greg Turon. l. 2. Hist. c. 34. Conc. Aurel. 1 Can. 27. *ab omnibus Ecclesiis placuit celebrari*, and Concil Lugd. 2. can. 6.

Thus have I, as briefly as I could, examined all the pretended *exuberances* of our *Liturgy*, which have required it thus to be more than *lanced* even to a *deliquium animæ*, to many *fainting fits* along while, and at last to its *fatal period*, if our Assemblers may be allowed of the *Jury*, and this *Ordinance* have leave to be the *executioner*; And as yet to the utmost of our impartial thoughts can we not discern the least degree of *Necessity*, of any the most moderate signification of the word, to own so *tragical* an *Exit*. The leaves which have been spent in this search, as it may seem *unnecessarily*, might perhaps have been better employed; Yet will it not be unreasonable to expect a favourable reception of them, when 'tis considered, that by this means a farther labour is spared, there needing no farther *answer* to the whole *body* of the *Directory*, or any part of it, when it shall thus appear, that there was no *necessity* for the change, nay (which I conceive hath all along been concluded) that the continuance of the *Liturgy*, unless some better offer or bargain were proposed to us, is still in all *policy*, in all secular or Christian *Prudence* most *necessary*. And therefore when we have considered the second particular in the *Ordinance*, and to that annext a view of some severals in the *Preface*, the Readers task will be at an end, and his *patience* freed from the tentation of our *importunity*.

Sect. 47.

The second thing then in the *Ordinance* is, that all the severals which this *Ordinance* is set to confront, are *Statutes of Edward the sixth*, and of *Queen Elizabeth*, all which are without more ado *repealed* by this *Ordinance*; which I mention not as new acts of boldness, which now we cannot be at leisure to declame or wonder at, but to justifie the calumniated Sons of this Church, who were for a long time offered up malitiously to the Peoples hatred and fury, first as *illegal usurpers*, and adders to Law, then as *Popishly affected*, and the pattern of *Queen Elizabeths* time vouchsafed to the confirming of this their Charge, and the *Erection* of her very *Picture* in some *Churches*, and solemnization of a day for her *annual remembrance*, (by those who will not now allow any *Saint*, or even *Christ* himself the like *favour*) design'd to *upbraid those ways and reprove those thoughts*. It seemeth now 'tis a season for these men to *traverse the scene* to put off disguises, and *profess* openly and confidently, what till now they have been careful to *conceal*, that their *garnishing the Sepulchre* of *Queen Elizabeth* was no argument that they were cordially of her *Religion*, or meant kindness sincerely to the *Queen Elizabeth Reformation*. Some Seeds we know there were of the present practices transmitted hither from our Neighbour *Disciplinarians* in the days of *Queen Elizabeth*, and some high attempts of private zeal in *Hacket*, and *Coppinger*, and *Arthington*, at one time, which when God suffered not to prosper, it was the wisdom of others to call *phrensie* and *madness* in those undertakers. And generally that is the difference of *fate* between wickedness *prospering* and *miscarrying*, the one passeth for *Piety*, the other for *fury*. I shall now not *affirm*, (or judge my Brethren) but meekly ask this *Question* and leave every mans own Conscience to answer (not me, but) himself in it sincerely, and without partiality, Whether if he had lived in the days of *Queen Elizabeth*, and had had his present perswasions about him, and the same encouragements and grounds of hope, the he might prosper and go through with his designs, he would not *then* in the matter of *Religion* have done just the same, which now he hath given his *Vote*, and taken up *Arms* to do? If he say, out of the uprightness of his heart, he would not, I shall then only ask why it is done *now*, what ill planet hath made that *poyson now* which was *then wholesome food*, why *Queen Elizabeth Statutes* should be now *repealed*, which

Sect. 48.

were then ſo *laudable?* If any intervenient provocation, or any thing elſe *extrinſecal* to the matter it ſelf have made this change now *neceſſary*, this will be great injuſtice in the Actors. Or if the *examples of ſeverity* in her days, (the hanging of *Coppin* and *Thacker*, *An.* 1583. at St. *Edmundsbury*, for publiſhing *Browns* book, (ſaith *Camden*) which, (ſaith *Stow*,) *p.* 1174. was written againſt the *Common-Prayer Book*) might then reſtrain thoſe that were contrary-minded, I know no reaſon why the Laws by which that was done, ſhould not ſtill continue to reſtrain; or at leaſt why *Conſcience* ſhould not be as powerful as *Fear*. From all this I ſhall now take Confidence to conclude, that were there not many earlier teſtimonies to confirm it, this one *Ordinance* would convince the moſt ſeducible miſtaker of theſe *two ſad truths*.

Sect. 49. 1. That the preſervation of *Laws*, ſo long and ſo ſpeciouſly inſiſted on, was but an artifice of deſign to gain ſo much either of *authority* to their *Perſons*, or of *power* and *force* into their *hands*, as might enable them to ſubvert and aboliſh the moſt wholſom Laws of the Kingdom, and in the mean time to accuſe others falſly of that, which it was not their *innocence*, but their *diſcretion*, not their want of *will*, but of *opportunity*, that they were not *really*, and *truly*, and *perfectly* guilty of themſelves, that ſo they may moſt compleatly own and obſerve the *principles* by which they move, and tranſcribe that practice, which hath been conſtantly uſed by the *Presbyterians*, (whereſoever they have appear'd) to pretend their *care* and *zeal* to *liberty*, that by that means they may get into *power* (like *Abſalom* a paſſionate *friend to juſtice*, when he had an *itch to be King*; or like *Deioces* in *Herodotus*, μισάρχην ἀρχὴν ἰδὼν καὶ δίκαιον ἄν, *his ambition of Magiſtracy made him content to be juſt*) which as ſoon as they *attain*, they *incloſe*, and tyrannically make uſe of to the *enthralling* and *enſlaving* all other; Even *Laws* themſelves, the only *Bounds* and *Bulwarks* of *Liberty*, which alone can ſecure it from *ſervitude* on one ſide, and *licentiouſneſs* on the other (which very *licentiouſneſs* is the ſureſt way to *ſervitude*, the *licentiouſneſs* of one implying the *oppreſſion* and *captivity* of ſome other, and being it ſelf in a juſt weighing of things the greateſt * *ſlavery*, as much as the mans own unruly *paſſions* are greater *Tyrants* than *Laws*, or lawful *Princes*) are to be levell'd in their *John march*, to be accuſed and found at laſt the only guilty things, and the ſame calamity deſigned to involve the pretended *Enemies* of Laws and the *Laws* themſelves.

* μὴ αἱρέτωσαν ἀπὸ τοῦ κοινοῦ ἐλευθερίας, ἵνα μὴ δοῦλοι εὑρεθῶσιν ἐπιθυμίας. *Epiſt. ad Polycarp. Ignatio adſcripta.*

The ſecond truth that this unhappy *Ordinance* hath taught us, is that which a while ago had been a *Revelation* of a *Myſtery* indeed, which would without any other auxiliary have infallibly quencht this flame (which now like another *Ætna* and *Veſuvius* is gotten into the bowels of this Kingdom, and is there likely to *rage* for ever, if it be not aſſwaged from Heaven, or determined through want of matter, by having devoured all that is combuſtible) but now is a petty vulgar *obſervation*, that hath no influence or impreſſion on any man, and therefore I ſcarce now think it worthy the repeating; and yet to conclude this period fairly, I ſhall; 'tis only this, That the framers of this *Ordinance*, that have ſo long fought *for the defence of the eſtabliſht Proteſtant Religion*, will not now have *Peace*, unleſs they may be allowed liberty to caſt off and repeal every of thoſe *Statutes*, *that of the ſecond and third of* Edward *the ſixth*, *that of the fifth and ſixth of the ſame King*, *that of the firſt of Queen* Elizabeth, *that of the fifth*, *and that of the eight of the ſame Queen*, (though not all at once, yet as far as concerns the matter in hand, by which you may be aſſured, that the *fragments* of thoſe *Statutes* which remain yet unaboliſhed, are but reſerved for ſome other *opportunity*, as ready for a ſecond and third *ſacrifice*, as thus much of them was for this) by which the *Proteſtant Religion* ſtands eſtabliſhed in this *Kingdom*, and in which the whole work of *Reformation* is conſummate. And all this upon no higher pretence of *Reaſon*, than only a *Reſolution* to do ſo, & not being *adviſed* by their *Divines* to the contrary, and (to countenance the weakneſs of thoſe two *motives*) a *prooffleſs ſcandalous* mention, or bare naming of *manifold inconveniences*, which might as reaſonably be made the Excuſe of *Robbing* and *Murthering* and *Damning* (as far as an *Ordinance* would reach) all men but themſelves, as of *abiliſhing* this *Liturgy*. *Lord lay not this ſin to their charge.*

Sect. 50.

CHAP. II.

Sect. 1. THE Preface to the Directory, being the Orator to perſwade all men to be content with this grand and ſuddain change, to lay down with patience and æquanimity all their right which they had in the *venerable Liturgy* of the Church of *England*, and account themſelves richly rewarded, for doing ſo, by this new framed *Directory*, begins ſpeciouſly enough, by

P. 1. ſeeming to lay down the only *reaſons*, why our *Anceſtors* a hundred *years ago*, at the firſt *Reformation of Religion*, were not only content, but *rejoiced alſo in the Book of Common-Prayer*, *at that time ſet forth*; But theſe reaſons are ſet down with ſome partiality, there being ſome other more weighty grounds of the *Reformers framing*, and *others rejoycing* in that *Book*, than thoſe *negative* ones which that *preface* mentions, *viz.* the perfect *reformation* wrought upon the former *Liturgy*, the perfect *conformity* of it with, and compoſure out of the *Word of God*, the excellent *orders* preſcribed, and *benefit* to be reaped from the uſe of that *Book*, and the *no* manner of *real objection*, or exception of any weight againſt it; All which if they had been mentioned, as in all juſtice they ought, (eſpecially when you report not your own judgments of it, but the judgments of thoſe *rejoycers* of that age, who have left upon record theſe reaſons or their *rejoycing*) this Preface had ſoon been ended, or elſe proved in that firſt part, an anſwer or confutation of all that follows. But 'tis the manner of men now adaies, to conceal all that may not tend to their advantage to be taken notice of, (a practice reproached by

by honest *Cicero*, in his books of offices of life, in the story of the *Alexandrian* Ship-man that went to relieve *Rhodes*, and out-going the rest of his fellows, sold his Corn at so much more gain, by that infamous artifice, though not of *lying*, yet of *concealing* the mention of the Fleet that was coming after) and to cut off the *locks* of that *Samson* whom they mean to bind, pare and circumcise the claws of that creature, they are to combate with; I mean to set out that *cause*, and those *arguments* at the *weakest*, to which they are to give satisfaction. And yet by the way, I must confess, that even these weak arguments which they have named, are to me of some moment, as first, The *redress of many things, which were vain, erroneous, superstitious and Idolatrous*, which argues that all is not now involv'd under any of those titles, nor consequently to be *abolisht*, but further *reform'd* only. 2. That they which did this, were *wise and pious*, which they that were, would never take pains to purge that which was all dross, their *wisdom* would have helpt them to discern that was so, and their *piety obliged* them to reject it altogether, and not to save one *beast*, when all was due to the common *slaughter*. 3. That *many godly and learned men rejoyced much in the Liturgy*, which argues that all was not to be detested, unless either these men now be somewhat higher than *Godly or Learned*, of that middle sort of rationals, that *Jamblicus* out of *Aristotle* speaks of, betwixt God and Man, the τὸν Πυθαγόραν, or unless it be confest, that *many Godly and Learned men* may be mistaken in a matter of this moment, and then these may be also so mistaken at this time.

Having therefore made use of that artifice, mention'd some general slight grounds of mens *approving* and *rejoycing* in the new formed Liturgy, the Composers of that preface mean speedily to weigh them down, with a heap of contrary sad matter, and then leave it to the Readers judgment, whether they are not his friends, thus to disabuse him, and his silly good natur'd ancestors that were thus slightly flatter'd into a good opinion of an inconvenient, if not mischievous *Liturgy*. Great haste is therefore made, and some arts and preparations used, to work upon the *affection* more than *judgment* of the Reader, and this is done by that Rhetorical pathetick stroke [*Howbeit, long and sad experience hath made it manifest*] Words of some consideration and efficacy, but that they have one weak part in them, an *infirmity* that this age is very subject to, that of causeless and groundless *calumny*. For how *long* soever, and to murmurers, and *passionate* lovers of *news* and *change*, how irksom and tedious soever, the experience of this *Liturgy* hath been, 'tis notoriously certain that it hath not been *sad*, save only again to those *evil eyes*; but on the other side, a continual *flood* and *tide* of *joy* to all true *English-men*, to see and observe the prosperity and flourishing of this Church, in a perpetual swelling and growth, ever since the establishing of that *Protestant Liturgy and Religion* together among us, till at last (about the time when this vast calamity brake in upon us) it was grown to such an height, as was certainly never heard of (or by Enemies themselves affirmed at any other time to have been) in this Kingdom, or (were it not a little like *boasting*, to which yet *you have constrain'd us*, I should add) in any other part of *Europe* also for these many hundred years. *Sect.* 2. P. 2.

But what is it that this so falsly supposed *sad experience hath made manifest*) Why, that the *Liturgie used in the Church of England* (*notwithstanding the pains and Religious intentions of the Compilers of it*) *hath prov'd an offence, not only to many of the Godly at home, but also to the Reformed Churches abroad.* *Sect.* 3.

In which words we shall not take advantage of the Confession of the *Religious intentions* of the Compilers of our *Liturgy*, which signifies the *offence* here spoken of in their notion of it to be *acceptum non datum*, *taken* when it was not *given*; nor 2. Oppose those *religious intentions* to the irreligious mistakes of others, and accusations of those things which were so *religiously intended*; nor 3. Compare the reputations of those Persons which compiled that *Liturgy*, whether in King *Edwards* (*Cranmer, Ridley, P. Martyr*) or in Queen *Elizabeths* days (*Parker, Grindal, Horne, Whitehead, &c.*) with the *Members of this Assembly*, much less the *intentions* of them, which in the mouth of Enemies is acknowledged *Religious*, with the intentions of these, which if we may measure by their more visible enterprizes, and the *Covenant* in which they have *associated* contrary to all Laws of God and men, we shall have temptation to suspect not guilty of over much *Religion*, or good purpose to the government of this Kingdom; nor 4 confront the number of those that here are confest to be *pleased and benefited*, against those others that are said to be *offended*, which were argument enough for that which is *established*, that considering the danger of change, it ought in all reason rather to stand to please one sort, and benefit them still, than to be pull'd down to comply with the other. But we shall confine our selves to that which the Objectors principally designed as a *first reason* for which our *Liturgy* must be destroyed, *because*, forsooth, say they, *it hath prov'd an offence, &c.* For the thorow examining of which reason, it will be necessary to enquire into these three things: 1. What they mean by *offence*, 2. What truth there is in the assertion, that *the Liturgy hath prov'd so to the Godly at home, and to the Reformed Churches abroad*, 3. How far that might be a reason of *destroying* that which proves an *offence*.

For the first, the word *Offence* is an *equivocal* mistaken word, and by that means is many times a title of a *charge* or *accusation*, when there is no real *crime* under it; For sometimes, in our *English* language especially, it is taken for that which any body is *displeased* or *angry* at, and then if the thing be not ill in it self, that anger is a *causeless anger*, which he that is guilty of, must know to be a *sin*, and humble himself before God for it, and fall into it no more, and then there need no more be said of such *offences*, but that he that is or hath been *angry* at the *Liturgy*, must prove the *Liturgy* to be *really ill*, (which if it could be done here, the matter of *Offence* would never have been charged on it, for that is set to supply the place of a greater *accusation*) or else confess himself, or those others so *offended*, to have *sinned* by such *anger*. But then 2. If we may ghess of the meaning of the word by the reason which is brought to prove the charge [*For not to speak, &c.*] it is set here to signifie, 1. The burthen *of reading all the Prayers*, 2. The many *unprofitable burthensome Ceremonies*, which hath *occasion'd mischief by disquieting the Consciences of those that could not yield to them, and by depriving them of the Ordinances of God which they might not enjoy without conforming or subscribing* *Sect.* 4.

ſcribing to thoſe Ceremonies. To proceed then to the ſecond thing, what truth there is in this Aſſertion, and view it in the ſeverals of the proof.

Sect. 5. For the firſt of theſe, the *burthen of reading the Prayers*; if that were enough to prove the *Liturgy offenſive*, all Chriſtian vertues would be involv'd in that charge, becauſe they have all ſome burthen and difficulty in them; and for this particular, ſeeing we ſpeak to *Chriſtians*, we might hope that the *Service* would not paſs for a *burthen* to the *Godly* (who are here named) *i. e.* to minds truly devout, if it were longer than it is, and that it may not do ſo, I am ſure it is very prudently framed with as much variety, and as moderate length of each part, as could be imagined, and ſure he that ſhall compare the practices, will find the *burthen* and *length* both to the *Miniſter* and *People* to be as great, by obſerving the preſcriptions in the *Directory*, in the ſhorteſt manner, as this that our *Liturgy* hath deſign'd. 2. For the *many unprofitable burthenſome Ceremonies*. Every of thoſe Epithets is a *calumny*; for 1. They are not many, To the People I am ſure, For *kneeling* and *ſtanding*, which are the only *Ceremonies* in the daily *Service*, will not make up that number (and for the reſt, there is but a ſuperaddition of ſome one in each *Service*.) As for *ſitting bare*, if reaſon it ſelf will not preſcribe that civility to be paid to God in the *Houſe of God* or place of his *preſence*, (where without any poſitive precept, *Moſes*, *Exod.* 3. 5. *put off his ſhoes from his feet*) neither doth our *Liturgy* preſcribe it. 2. They are not *unprofitable*, but each of them tending to advance the buſineſs to which they are annext, *kneeling* to encreaſe our *humility*, and joyn the *body* with the *ſoul* in that duty of *adoration*, *ſtanding* to elevate and again to joyn with the *ſoul* in *Confeſſion* of God and *Thankſgiving*, and the reſt proportion'd to the buſineſs in hand; and 3. If not *many* nor *unprofitable*, then not burthenſome alſo. As for the *diſquieting the Conſciences of many godly Miniſters and People*, who could not yield to the *Ceremonies*; I anſwer, that by what hath formerly been ſaid, and the no objection in this *Directory* againſt any ſuch, it appears that there is no *Ceremony* appointed in our *Liturgy* which is *improper* or *impertinent* to the action to which it is annext, much leſs in it ſelf *unlawful*. And then for *mens Conſciences to be diſquieted*, it argues that they have not, in that manner as they ought, deſired *information*; as for *Miniſters*, we know that all that have been received into that Order, have voluntarily *ſubſcribed* to them, and conſequently have *receded* from their own *ſubſcription*, if they have after refuſed to *conform*. And we deſire to know what tender reſpect will be had to the Conſciences of thoſe, who ſhall ſubmit to your *Directory*, and afterward refuſe to conform unto it. I am ſure the denunciations which we have heard of againſt the *diſſenting Brethren*, about the matter of *Juriſdiction and Cenſures* (and now lately concerning the *depravers* of your *Directory*) have been none of the mildeſt, although thoſe are your own fellow Members, and have aſſiſted you as affectionately in the grand Cauſe as any, and never made themſelves liable to your ſeverity, by having once conformed to you in thoſe particulars. And ſo 3. For *depriving them of the Ordinances of God*, *&c.* if that were the *puniſhment* appointed for the *obſtinate* and *refractory*, 'tis no more than the *Laws* of the Land appointed for their *Portion*, and in that ſure not without an example in *Scripture* and *Apoſtolical* practice, who appointed ſuch *perverſe perſons to be avoided*, which is a *cenſure* as high as any hath been here on ſuch inflicted. What *Ordinances* they were of which ſuch men were deprived, I conceive is ſpecified by the next words, that *ſundry good Chriſtians have been by means thereof kept from the Lords Table*, which muſt needs refer to thoſe that would not *kneel* there, and why that ſhould be ſo unreaſonable, when the very *Directory* lays the matter ſo, that none ſhall receive with them who do not *ſit*, there will be little ground, unleſs it be that no poſture in the *Service* of God can be *offenſive*, but only that of *kneeling*, which indeed hath had the very ill luck of *Socinus*, in his Tract *De cœnâ Domini*, to be turn'd out of the Church as Idololatrical (with whom to affirm the ſame, will be as great a *complyance*, as *kneeling* can be with the *Papiſts*.) And by theſe as *ſuperſtitious* at leaſt, I know not for what guilt, except that of too much *humility*, as being in Maſter *Archer*'s Divinity, as before I intimated, a betraying of one of the *greateſt comforts* in the Sacrament, the *ſitting fellow Kings with Chriſt in his earthy Kingdom*, confeſſing thereby that ſome mens hearts are ſo ſet on that *earthy Kingdom*, that the hope of an *Heavenly Kingdom* will not yield them comfort, unleſs they may have that other in the way to it; and withal telling us, that he and his Compeers are thoſe men.

Sect. 6. Having ſurvey'd theſe ſeverals, and ſhewed how unjuſtly the charge of *Offence* is laid on the *Liturgy*, and how little 'tis prov'd by theſe *Reaſons*, I ſhall only add, that the Propoſition pretended to be thus proved by theſe particulars, is much larger than the proofs can be imagined to extend. For part of the Propoſition was, that the *Liturgy was offence to the Reformed Churches abroad*; To which the [*For*] is immediately annext, as if it introduced ſome *proof* of that alſo. But 'tis apparent that the proofs ſpecified infer not that, for neither *the burthen of reading* is *Offence* to them, nor are *their Conſciences diſquieted*, nor *they deprived of Gods Ordinances by that means*. In which reſpect 'tis neceſſary for us to conclude, that the word *Offence*, as applyed to them, is taken in that other notion, that they are *diſpleaſed* and *angry* at it. To which we then muſt anſwer, that although there is no guilt inferred from the undergoing this fate of being *diſliked* by ſome, but rather that it is to be deemed an ill indication to be *ſpoken well of by all*, yet have we never heard of any Foreign Church which hath expreſt any ſuch *offence*; the utmoſt that can be ſaid, is (and yet not ſo much as that is here ſuggeſted) that ſome particular men have expreſt ſuch diſlike, to whom we could eaſily oppoſe the judgment of others more eminent among them, who have largely expreſt their approbation of it. And 'tis obſervable that *Calvin* himſelf when from *Frankfort* he had received an *odious malitious* account of many particulars in our *Liturgy* (as any will acknowledge that ſhall compare the report then made, with what he finds) though he were ſo far tranſported as to call them *ineptias*, follies, yet adds the Epithet of *tolerabiles*, that though ſuch, they were yet tolerable. And therefore

Vid. Troubl. of Frank. p. 30. &c.

Sect. 7. In the third place, I may now conclude, that if all that is thus affirm'd to prove the *Offence* in the *Liturgy*, uſed in the Church of *England*, were (after all this evidence of the contrary) ſuppoſed true, yet is it no argument to infer the juſtice of the preſent deſign which is not *reforming*, but *aboliſhing* both of that and all other *Liturgy*. Were there *Offence* in *the length of the Service*, that *length* might be reform'd, and yet *Liturgy* remain; were there *offence* in the *Ceremonies*, or *miſ-*

chief

chief in the punishing them that have not *conformed*, those *Ceremonies* might be left free, that *Conformity* be not thus prest, and still *Liturgy* be preserved inviolate. As for the Foreign Churches, 1. I shall demand, whether only *some* are thus offended, or all. Not all, for some of the wisest in these Churches have commended it; and if *some only*, then it seems others are not *offended*, and why must we be so partial, as to *offend* and *displease* some, that we may escape the *offending* others? not sure because we more esteem the judgments of the latter, for by the Apostles rule the *weaker* men are, the more care must be taken that they be not *offended*. 2. I shall suppose that their *Liturgy*, or their having none at all, may possibly *offend* us, and then demand why they shall not be as much obliged to change for the satisfying of us, as we of them? I am ashamed to press this illogical discourse too far, which sure never foresaw such examination, being meant only to give the People a formal specious shew for what is done, a heap of *popular Arguments*, which have of late gotten away all the custom from *Demonstrations*, and then, *Si populus vult decipi, decipiatur*, if the *tame Creature will thus be taken*, *any fallacy*, or *Topick* doth as well for the turn, as if *Euclid* had *demonstrated* it.

In pursuit of this popular Argument it follows, that *by this means, i. e.* of the *Liturgy, divers able and faithful Ministers were debarred from the exercise of their Ministry, and despoiled of their livelihood to the undoing of them and their Families.* To which I answer 1. That if this be true, it is very strange that so few of this present Assembly were of that number. For of them I may surely say *many*, very many in proportion, were not *debarred* of the *exercise of their Ministery*, were not *despoiled of their livelihood*, *&c.* And if any one was, which I profess I know not, I believe it will be found, that the *standing of Liturgy* brought not those inflictions upon him. The conclusion from hence will be, that either these present Assemblers concurred not in judgment with those *many able and faithful Ministers*, (and then why do they now bring their Arguments from them, whose judgment they did not approve and follow?) or else that they were not so *valiant*, as to appear when sufferings expected them, or else that they had a very happy *Rain-bow* hanging over their heads to avert from them that *common storm*. But then 2. It might be considered, whether those mention'd penalties have not been *legally*, and by act of *Parliament*, inflicted on those who suffer'd under them, and then whether that will be ground sufficient to *abolish a Law*, because by force thereof some men that offended against it have been *punished*? 3. Whether some men did not *chuse nonconformity* as the more instrumental to the exercise of their *Ministery*, changing one *Parish* for the whole *Diocess*, and preaching oftener in private *Families*, than any other did in the *Church*, and withal, whether this had not the encouragement of being the more *gainful* trade, of bringing in larger *Pensions*, than formerly they had receiv'd *Tithes*. 4. Whether the *punishments* inflicted on such have not generally been inferiour to the *rigour* of the *Statute*, and not executed on any who have not been *very unpeaceable*, and then whether unpeaceable Persons would not go near to fall under some mulcts, what ever the *Form* of *Government*, what ever the *Church-Service* were, none having the promise of *inheriting* τὴν γῆν, the Land of *Canaan*, an happy prosperous life in this World, but they whose *meekness and obedience to laws* have given them a claim to that priviledge? 5. Whether the number of those, who by *Ordinances* have lately been so *debarred* of *the exercise of their Ministry, and spoiled of their livelihood*, have not been far greater than all those together, that ever the *Liturgy* thus *offended* since the *Reformation*? 6. Whether this *Directory*, should it be establisht, would not be so *imposed*, that they which obey it not, shall be subject to these or the like *penalties*? Sect. 8. P. 3.

'Tis added in the next place to raise the cry, and encrease the *Odium*, and to involve the *Prelates* and *Liturgy* in the same calamity, (for otherwise what hath the *Prelates labouring, &c.* to do with the *Liturgy*) That the *Prelates and their Faction have laboured to raise the estimation of the Liturgy to such an height, as if there were no other worship, or way of worship of God among us, but only the Service-book, to the great hinderance of the Preaching the Word.* To which I answer 1. That this or any other action of the *Prelates*, if supposed never so *true*, and never so *extravagant*, is wholly *extrinsecal* and impertinent to the business of the *Liturgy*, and the more *impertinent*, by how much the more *extravagant*, such actions being easily coerced, and reduced by and according to the *rule*, and such unreasonable enhansements separable, without any wound or violence to the *Liturgy*. Give the *Liturgy* its *due*, not its *usurped* estimation, and we are all agreed. 2. 'Tis here acknowledged that this was but *laboured*, not affirmed that it was *effected*, and then this sure is too heavy a doom on the *Liturgy*, for that their *labouring*; we do not find that Saint *Paul* was struck dead, like *Herod*, because the *Lycaonians* meant and *laboured to do sacrifice unto him*, *Acts* 14. 18. But then 3. he that shall consider who they are which make this *objection*, will sure never be moved by it. For certainly they that have formerly set the prime of their wits and endeavours to *vilifie* and defame the *Liturgy*; and, now that they think they have power, have absolutely *abolisht* it, will go near to be *partial* when they are to judge of the due *estimation of it*; they that declaim at *Bishops* for advancing it, will they be just and take notice of their own *contempts*, which enforced the Bishops thus to rescue and vindicate it? I shall not expect it from them, nor, till then, that they will deliver any more than *popular shews* of truth in this matter. For 4. the Prelates have not raised the book to an *higher estimation* than the Law hath raised it, that is, that it may be *observed* so as may most tend to *edification*, nor do we now desire any greater height of value for it, than you for the *Directory*, I shall add, not so great neither, for we do not exclude all other as *unlawful* as you have done, and then I am confident God will not lay that charge on us, which you do on the *Prelates*, nor any man that shall consider how different our *Titles* are, though our claims not proportioned to them. A piece of *modesty* and *moderation* which we challenge you to transcribe from us. 5. All this all this while is a meer *Calumny*, if by the *Service-Book* is meant the *use of the Prayers* in the *Liturgy*, for no *Prelate* ever affirm'd, or is known to have thought, that there is *no other way of worship of God*, but that among us. But then 6. We add that this way of *publick Prayer by set Form*, the only one establisht by *Law*, (and so sure to be esteem'd by us before any other) is also in many respects the most convenient for *Publick worship*, of which affirmation we shall offer you no other proof or testimony, than what Master *Calvin*, whom before we named, hath given us in *his Epistle to the Protector*, in these words, *Quod ad formulam*, &c. *As for Forms of Prayers, and Ecclesiastical Rites, I* Sect. 9. P. 3.

very

very much approve, that it be set or certain, From which it may not be lawful for the Pastors in their Function to depart, that so there may be provision made for the simplicity and unskilfulneß of some, and that the consent of all the Churches among themselves may more certainly appear; and lastly also, that the extravagant levity of some, who affect novelties, may be prevented. So probable was my conjecture, that at first I interposed, that the men that had here imposed upon their fellows so far, as to conclude the *abolition* of *Liturgy necessary*, were those that undertook to reform *Geneva* as well as *England*, to chastise *Calvins* estimation of it, as well as that of our *Prelates*.

Sect. 10. P. 3. As for that pompous close, that *this hath been to the great hinderance of the Preaching of the Word, and to the justling it out as unnecessary, or at best inferiour to the reading of the Common-Prayer.* I answer, 1. That the *Liturgy*, or the *just estimation* of it, is perfectly uncapable of this charge, it being so far from *hindring*, that it *requires the Preaching of the Word*, assigns the place where the *Sermon* shall come in, hath *Prayers* for a *blessing* upon it. 2. That if any where *Sermons* have been neglected, it hath not been through any default either of the *length* or *estimation* of the *Liturgy*, for these two, if *Faction* and *Schism* did not set them at *odds*, would very friendly and peaceably dwell together, and each tend much to the proficiency and gain which might arise from either; *Prayers* would prepare us to *hear* as we ought, *i. e.* to practice also, and *Sermons* might incite and stir up the languishing *devotion*, and enliven and animate it with *zeal* and *fervency* in *Prayer*. And constantly the more we esteemed the *Ordinance*, and set our selves to the discharge of *the duty* of *Prayer*, the more should we profit by *Sermons* which were thus received into an *honest heart*, thus fitted, and made capable of impression by *Prayer*. These two may therefore live like *Abraham* and *Lot*, and *why should there be any wrangling or controversie betwixt thy Herds-men and my Herds-men?* But seeing it is made a season of complaining, I answer 3. That it is on the other side most notorious that in many places the *Sermon* hath justled out the *Common-Prayers*, and upon such a provocation, (and only to prevent the like partiality or oppression) it may be just so far now to add, that as long as the *Liturgy* continues in its legal possession in this *Church*, there is no other *legal* way (as that signifies, *commanded by law*) *of the publick worship of God among us*, and although that voluntary *Prayer* of the *Minister* before *Sermon*, when it is used, is a part of the *worship of God*, (as all *Prayer* is) yet is it not prescribed by the Law, nor consequently can it without usurpation cut short or take away any part of that time which is by that assigned to the *Liturgy*; *the free-will offerings*, though permitted must not supplant the daily *prescribed oblations*, the *Corban* must not excuse the not honouring of *Parents*, the *customes* which are *tolerated*, must not evacuate or supersede the *precepts* of the Church. As for *Sermons*, which in this period seem the only thing that is here opposed to *Liturgy*, I hope they do not undertake to be as eminent a part of the *worship of God* among us as *Prayer*. If they do, I must less blame the poor ignorant People, that when they have heard a *Sermon* or two think they have served God for all that day or week; nor the generality of those seduced ones, who place so great a part of *Piety* in *hearing*, and think so much the more comfortably of themselves from the number of the hours spent in that *Exercise*, which hath of late been the only business of the *Church* (which was by God instil'd *the house of Prayer*) and the *Liturgy* at most used but as *Musick* to entertain the Auditors till the Actors be attired, and the Seats be full, and it be time for the *Scene* to enter. This if it were true, would avow and justifie that Plea in the Gospel, [*Lord open unto us, for thou hast taught in our streets*] i. e. we have heard thee *Preach* among us. Which sure Christ would not so have defamed with an [*I will say unto them, Go you cursed, &c.*] if it had been the prime part of his *worship* to be such *hearers*; the consideration of that place will give us a right notion of this business, and 'tis this, that *hearing* of *Sermons*, or what else appointed by the Church for our *instruction*, is a duty of every Christian prescribed in order to *practice* or good life, to which *knowledge* is necessarily preparative, and so, like many others, *actus imperatus*, *an act commanded* by Religion; but so far from being it self an immediate or *elicite act* of worship precisely or abstractly, as it is *hearing*, that unless that proportionable *practice* attend it, 'tis but an aggravation and accumulation of our guilts, the *blessedneß* not belonging to the *hearing*, but the [and *keeping the Word of God*] and the *go you Cursed*, to none more than to those, that *hear* and *say*, but *do not*: and for the title of *worship of God*, whether *outward* or *inward* outwardly expresst, *oral Prayer* certainly and *adoration of God* is the thing to which that most specially belongs, as may appear, *Psalm* 95.6. where that of *worshipping* is attended, with *falling down and kneeling before the Lord our Maker*. And even your *Directory*, though it speak extream high of *Preaching the Word*, yet doth not it stile it *any part of Gods worship*, as it doth *the reading the Word of God in the Congregation*, pag. 12. because indeed our manner of *Preaching* is but an humane thing; and the word of man. This I should not here have said, because I would be sure not to discourage any in the attending of any *Christian duty* (and such I acknowledge *hearing* to be, and heartily exhort all my *Fellow Labourers* in their several Charges, *to take heed to Doctrine, to reproof, to Exhortation*, to be as frequent and diligent in it, as the wants of their Charges require of them; and my *fellow-Christians* also, that they *give heed to sound Doctrine*, that they *require the law at the Priests mouth*, as of a *messenger of the Lord of Hosts*, and again to *take heed how they hear*) but the *ἀνωμαλία*, or *impropriety of speech*, that I say no more, that is in this matter discernible in the words of the *Directory*, and the consequent dangers which experience hath forced us to observe in them, who place the *worship of God* especially in *hearing*, have extorted thus much from us, which may be useful to give us a due valuation of *Sermon* and *Prayer*, the former as a *duty* of a Christian, the latter a *duty* too, and an *elicite act*, a prime special part of *worship* also.

Sect. 11. P. 4. And whereas 'tis added, that the *Liturgy by many is made no better than an Idol*. 1. That is a speech of great *cunning*, but withal of great *uncharitableneß*: *cunning*, in setting the words so cautiously thus, not an *Idol*, but [*no better* than] (as they, that will *rail*, but would not *pay* for it, whose *fear* doth moderate the petulancy of their *spleen*, and *covetousneß* keep them from letting any thing fall that the *Law* may take hold of, are wont to do) and yet withal signifying as odiously as if it had been made an *idol* indeed. Whereas the plain literal sence of the words if it be taken, will be this, that an *Idol* is not worse than our *Common-Prayer Book* is to many, or that it is *used* by

by many as ill as an *Idol* is wont to be *used*, which is then the most bitter piece of *uncharitableness*, if not grounded on certain knowledge, and that impossible to be had by others, as could be imagined. The truth is, this *Directory* hath now proved that there is a true sence of these words, the *Compilers* of which have demonstrated themselves to be those many that have made our *Liturgy no better than an Idol*, have dealt with it as the *good Kings* did with the abominations of the Heathens, *brake it in pieces*, *ground it to powder*, and *thrown the dust of it into the Brook*; for *abolition* is the plain sence for which that is the Metaphor. But then 2. 'Tis possible, the *calm* meaning of those *odious* words is no more than this, that many have given this an *estimation* higher than it deserves. If any such there be, I desire *not* to be their advocate, having to my task only the vindication of its *just esteem*; but yet cannot resist the temptation which prompts me to return to you, that some men as near the *golden mean* as the *Assemblers*, have said the like of *Preaching*, though not expresst it in so large a Declamatory figure; and I shall ask, whether you have not possibly given them *some occasion* to do so (as great perhaps as hath been given you to pass this sentence on them) at least now confirmed them in so doing, by applying or appropriating to the *Preaching of the Word* (in the Modern notion of it, and as in your *Directory* it is distinguish'd from *reading of the Scriptures*) the title which Saint *Paul* gives to the *Gospel of Christ*, saying, *that it is the Power of God unto Salvation and one of the greatest and most excellent works of the Ministery of the Gospel*, pag. 27. which former clause of *power of God*, &c. though it be most truly affirmed by Saint *Paul* of their *Preaching the Gospel*, and also truly applyed or accommodated to that *Preaching* or interpreting of Scripture, which is the ἐφαρμογὴ, *the due application* of the Scripture rule to *particular* cases, yet is it not true in *universum*, of all that is now adays call'd *Preaching*, much of that kind being ὄσμη θανάτου, of a mortiferous poysonous savour, not to them *that perish*, but to the most Christian auditory it meets with; and that the railing of every Pulpit-*Rabshekeh*, the *speaking evil of Dignities*, &c. should be stiled *the power of God to Salvation*, I have little temptation to believe. And whether the latter clause be true also, I refer you to Saint *Augustine Ep.* 180. *ad Honorat.* where speaking of *damages that come to the people by the absence of the Minister*, and consequently of the *necessaria Ministeria* the *special useful necessary acts of the Ministry*, he names the *Sacraments and receiving of Penitents, and giving of comfort to them*, but mentions neither *Praying nor Preaching* in that place. I shall add no more, but that some have on these, and the like grounds, been tempted to say, that you Idolize Preaching, because you attribute so much to any the worst kind of that, above what others have conceived to be its due proportion. And yet we hope you think not fit to *abolish Preaching* on that suggestion, and consequently, that it will be as unjust to *abolish Liturgy* on the like, though it should be proved a true one, this being clearly the fault of *Men*, and not of *Liturgy*, as that even now of the *Lycaonians* and not of *Paul*, especially when the many, which are affirmed to have thus offended by Idolizing the *Liturgy*, are said to be *ignorant and superstitious*, whose faults, and errours, and imprudencies, if they may prove matter sufficient for such a sentence, may also rob us of all the *treasures* we have, of our *Bibles* and *Souls* also. For thus hath the *Gospel* been used as a περίαμμα, or charm, and that is but little better than an *Idol*, and so have some *persons* been *had in admiration*, and *believed* as if they were *infallible*, and so in a manner *Idoliz'd* also, and that this should be a capital crime in them, that were thus admired, would be a new piece of severity, that few of *Draco*'s Laws could parallel.

The next charge (which is as an appendent proof of this) is that *the People pleasing themselves in their presence at that Service, and their Lip-labour, in bearing a part in it, have thereby hardned themselves in their ignorance, and carelesness of saving knowledge and true piety.* To this I answer, 1. That 'tis no fault to be so *pleased* with *presence at that service* (the Congregation of many Saints is to any a *pleasing* company) and therefore if it were *immediate* to, and *inseparable* from the *Liturgy*, would not be a charge against it, nor in any probability *hinder*, but *advance* the desire, and acquisition of *saving knowledge and true piety*, which is there proposed, to all that are *present* at the *Liturgy*. But if the phrase signifie being *pleased* with the *bare presence*, or the being *present*, and doing nothing of that they come for, as the *Lip-labour* seems to denote the bare labour of the *lip*, and not joyning any *zeal* or intention of the *heart*, it is then but an *uncharitable censure* again, if it be not upon *certain knowledge*, and if it be, 'tis as incident to that order of the *Directories* proposing, as to our *Liturgy*. One may please himself with a bare *presence at Sermon*, and either sleep it out, or think on some worldly matter; one may say all or most of the *Ministers Prayer* after him, and sigh and groan at every period, and satisfie himself that this is a gallant work of Piety, but truly I would be unwilling to be he that should pass this censure on any, whose heart I did not know (for sure it is not *necessary* that any man should leave his *heart* at home, when his *body* is *present*, or employ it on something else, when his *lips* are busied either in our *Liturgy* or that *Directory prayer*) nor, if I did so, should I think the *Directories* order for *worship* should be rejected for this fault of *others*, if there were nothing else to be said against it. As for *the Peoples bearing a part in the Service*, which seems to refer to the *responses*, this hath had an account given of it already. *Sect.* 12. P. 4.

Only in the whole period put together, this seems to be insinuated, that the *saving knowledge*, and *true piety*, is no where to be had, but in *those Sermons*, which are not ushered in with the *Liturgy*, which we shall not wonder at them for affirming, who have a long time thus perswaded the people, that all *saving knowledge* is to be had from *them*, and their complices, and blasted all others for *carnal* men, of which many *discriminative Characters* were formerly given, as *kneeling* or *praying* at the time of *entrance* into *pue* or *pulpit*, but now it seems the *use* of the *Liturgy* supplies the place of all, as being incompatible with *saving knowledge and true piety*. If this be true, that will be a very popular plausible argument I confess, and therefore I shall oppose unto it, that which I hope will not pass for boast either with *God* or *Angels*, that of the *Sermons* which have been *preacht* since the *Reformation* in this *Kingdom*, and commended to the Press and publick view, very few were preacht by those that excluded the *Liturgy* out of the *Churches*, and that since this *Directory* came into use, and so made a visible discrimination among men, there hath been as much *saving knowledge*, i. e. *Orthodox* *Sect.* 13.

doctrine, and *exhortation to repentance*, *Prayer*, *Faith*, *Hope*; and *Love* of *God*, *Self-denyal*, and *readineſs* to take up the *Croſs*, (duties toward God) and to *Allegiance*, *Juſtice*, *Mercy*, *Peaceableneſs*, *Meekneſs*, *Charity* even to *Enemies*, (and the reſt of the duties toward man) to be heard in the *Sermons* of thoſe that retain the *Liturgy*, and as much *obdience* to thoſe obſervable in the lives of thoſe that frequent it, as is to be met with in the eſpouſers of the *Directory*. If it be not thus, I confeſs I ſhall have little hope, that God will ſuffer ſuch a Jewel as the *Liturgy* is, to continue any longer among us ſo *unprofitably*, and yet if men were guilty of this fault alſo, and the *Liturgy* of the unhappineſs of having none but ſuch Clients, yet would not this be ſufficient authority for any men to *aboliſh* it, any more than it will be juſt to *hang* him who hath been *unfortunate*, or to make any mans *infelicity* his *guilt*. *I beſeech God to inflame all our hearts with that zeal, attention, fervency, which is due to that action of Prayer in our Liturgy, and that chearful obedience to all that is taught us out of his Word*, and then I am ſure that this argument or objection againſt our *Liturgy* will be anſwered, if as yet it be not.

Sect. 14. P. 4. The next Objection is the Papiſts boaſt, *that our Book is a compliance with them in a great part of their Service*, and ſo that they were not *a little confirm'd in their Superſtition and Idolatry*, &c. Where I ſhall 1. demand, is there any *Superſtition* or *Idolatry* in that part of the *Service* wherein we thus comply with them? if ſo, 'tis more than *a compliance with Papiſts*, 'tis in it ſelf a down-right damning ſin; and if there be not, but all that is *Idolatrous* or *Superſtitious* in their *Service* is *reform'd* in ours, then ſure this will be far from confirming them in either of thoſe, if they depend any thing upon our *judgments*, or our *complyance*. 2. 'Tis a little unreaſonable, that they who will not believe the *Papiſts* in any thing elſe, ſhould believe their *boaſt* againſt us, and think it an accuſation ſufficiently proved, becauſe they ſay it; whereas this affirmation of the *Papiſts*, if it be theirs, (and not the *Aſſemblers* rather impoſed upon them) is as *groſs*, though perhaps not as *dangerous* a falſity, as any one which the *Aſſemblers* have condemned in them. For 3. The truth is notorious, that our *Reformers* retained not any part of *Popiſh Service*, *reformed* their *Breviary* and *Proceſſional*, and *Maß-Book*; as they did their *Doctrine*, retained nothing but what the *Papiſts* had received from purer *Antiquity*, and was as clear from the true charge of *Popery*, as any period in either *Prayer* or *Sermon* in the *Directory*; which argues our *complyance* with the *antient Church*, and not with them; the very thing that *Iſaac Caſaubon* ſo admired in this Church of ours, the *care of antiquity and purity*, proclaiming every where in his Epiſtles to all his friends, that there *was not any where elſe in the world the like to be found, nor ever hoped he to ſee it till he came into this Kingdom*. And ſure there is no Soleciſm in this, that we being a *Reformed Church*, ſhould deſire to have *Reformed Liturgy*, which hath always had ſuch a conſent and ſympathy with the *Church*, that it will not be a cauſeleſs fear, leſt the *abolition* of *Liturgy*, as far as God in judgment permits it to extend, (the juſt puniſhment of them that have rejected it) be attended with the *abolition of the Church* in time, and even of *Chriſtianity* alſo.

As for the *confirming of Papiſts in their Superſtition by this means*, I deſire it to be conſidered whether it be a probable accuſation, *viz.* 1. Whether the *rejecting* that which the *Papiſts* have from *antiquity*, as well as what they have *obtruded* on, or *ſuperadded* to it, be a more likely means to win them to hear us or *reform* themſelves, than our *retaining* with them what they *retain* from *Antiquity*, *i.e.* whether a *Servant* (much more whether a *Brother*) that is reprehended as much for his *diligence* as for his *neglects*, for his *good* and *faithful*, as for his *ill* and *falſe* ſervices, be more likely thereby to be enclined to mend his faults, than he that is *ſeaſonably* and *meekly* reprov'd for his *miſcarriages* only? It was good advice in that *antient Epiſtle* to *Polycarpus*, aſcribed to Saint *Ignatius*, Τὰς λοιμοτέρας ἐν πραότητι ὑπότασσε, *meekneß is the beſt means to bring down the moſt peſtilent adverſary*, and the reſemblance by which he expreſſes it as ſeaſonable, Τὰς παροξυσμὰς ἐμβροχαῖς παῦε, *Fomentations are moſt proper to allay any exaſperation of humours*. And 'tis *Hippocrates*'s advice, that the *Phyſician ſhould never go abroad without ſome* μαλάγματα, *lenitives or mollifying applications about him*. It ſeems there was nothing of ſo daily *approved* uſe as thoſe. And that will avow this method of complying with adverſaries, as far as we may, to be a *probable* and a *wiſe*, as well as a *Chriſtian* courſe, to *bring* them *from* their *Superſtition*, and not to *confirm* them in it. And another *uſe* there is wherein the *Papiſts* themſelves confeſs this *complyance* was *Politick*, *to take all ſcruple out of the heads and hearts of the People of England*, concerning the *lawfulneß* of this *Reformation*, (This is the opinion of the *Papiſts*, expreſt in a book call'd *Babel and Jeruſalem*, or *Monarchomachia Proteſtantium*, ſubſcribed by *P. D. M.* but conceived to be *Patiſons*, pag. 314.) *that they might conceive, that the Service and Religion ſtill continued the ſame, but was tranſlated into Engliſh only, for their better edification*, and *ſo*, ſaith he, *it was indeed very politickly handled*. 2. Whether that which drives away *all Papiſts* from *all* kind of *communion* or *converſation* with us, from *all hearing* of our Preaching or Doctrine, be more likely to work them over to our ſide, than that which *permits* them to come to our *Churches* with us? For this is notoriouſly known, that as our *Liturgy* now is, and was framed in Queen *Elizabeths* days, the *Papiſts* did for ten years together, at the beginning of her Raign, come to *Church* with us, and ſo continued, till the *Popes excommunicating the Qu.* and *our Nation*, made it ſo appear *unlawful* for them. And perhaps but appear too, for an account might be given of this buſineſs, that it is no way unlawful (by his own principles) to a *Papiſt*, remaining thus, to come to our *Churches*, and be preſent at our *Liturgy*, and (if that be thought an *objection* or *reproach* againſt us, I ſhall then add) not only to ours, but to that *Service* which is performed according to the *Directory* alſo, the only difference being, that if both by them were conceiv'd *lawful* (as by miſtake, I believe, in them neither now is) our *Liturgy* would be more likely to attract them, than the *Directory*; And this we conceive not ſuch a fault as to offer any excuſe for it, (for if St. *Paul* by being a *Jew* to *the Jew*, could hope to *gain the Jew*, why ſhould not we without being *Papiſts* to the *Papiſts*, but only Chriſtians to thoſe things wherein they are ſo too) expect to *gain* the *Papiſt* alſo) For ſuppoſing this to be, as you call it, *a compliance* with them, ſure 'twere a more *probable gaining way*, than to denounce enmity to all, whom they ever converſt with; I mean to the *primitive Liturgies* for no other crime, but becauſe they made uſe of them. Who are beſt Diviners in this matter, they, or we, *experience* may perhaps hereafter

hereafter prove. In the mean time, I cannot imagine, but *Liturgy*, and *moderation*, and *charity*, may be able to bring in as fair a ſhole of *Proſelytes*, to *convert* as many *Papiſts* to us, or at leaſt to *confirm Proteſtants*, as an *Ordinance for Sequeſtration* of all their Goods, an *Halter*, and a *Directory* will be able to do, yea with an *Ordinance for the Ordination of Miniſters*, by meer *Preſbyters* too, call'd in to aſſiſt them.

And whereas 'tis added in that ſame Section, that *the Papiſts were very much encouraged in that expectation, when upon the pretended warrantableneſs of impoſing of the former Ceremonies, new ones were daily obtruded upon the Church*, 1. I demand on occaſion of that phraſe [*pretended warrantableneſs of impoſing of Ceremonies.*] May any *Ceremonies* be *impoſed* or no? if they may, then an *act* of *Parliament* may certainly do it, and ſuch was that which confirm'd our *Liturgy*, and ſo the *warrantableneſs* not *pretended*; if not, why then do you impoſe *entring the Aſſembly not irreverently*, pag. 10. *and taking their places without bowing?* For that *general*, and that *negative* is notation of ſome *Ceremony*, if it have any ſence in it. The phraſe [*not irreverently*] preſcribes ſome *reverence*, there being no middle between thoſe two, and conſequently the *forbidding* of the one being a *preſcription* of the other. For I ſhall ask, Is keeping on the hat *irreverence* at that time? If it be, then *pulling it off*, or *not keeping of it on* is a *Reverence* then required; And if this be avoided by ſaying, that this is only there *directed* not *commanded*, I reply, that an *Ordinance* prefixt for the eſtabliſhing that *direction*, requiring that what is there *directed*, *ſhall be uſed*, amounts to a preſcription. The ſame may be ſaid of *cauſing the Man to take the Woman by the right hand in Marriage*, in the *Directory*, which is the preſcribing of a *Ceremony*, as much as if the *Ring* had been appointed to be uſed there alſo. 2. I anſwer that we know not of any *Ceremonies* which have been *obtruded* or *forced* on any which the *Law* hath not *commanded*, (or if there had, this had been nothing to the *Liturgy*, nor conſequently to be fetcht in as a part of a charge againſt it;) That of *bowing at the entrance into the Church*, is the moſt likely to be the *Ceremony* here ſpoken of, and yet that is neither a *new one* (never by any *Law* or *Canon* turn'd out at the *Reformation*, but only not then *impoſed* under any Command, and ſince *diſuſed* in ſome places) nor yet was it lately *impoſed* or *obtruded on the Church*, but on the other ſide in the *Canon* of the laſt ſo hated *Convocation*, (which alone could be ſaid to deal with the *Church* in this matter) it was only *recommended*, and *explained* and *vindicated* from all miſtake, and then the practice of uſing of it left to every man's *liberty*, with that caution of the *Apoſtle*, that they that *uſe it ſhould not condemn them that uſe it not*, *nor they that uſe it not*, *judge them that uſe it*. 3. That the warrantableneſs of *impoſing* the former *Ceremonies* was no means or occaſion of *obtruding new daily*, but rather an *hedge* to keep off ſuch *obtruſion*; for when it is reſolved by Law, that ſuch *Ceremonies* ſhall be uſed, 'tis the implicite *intimation* of that *Law*, that all other *uncommanded* are left free, and that, without authority (as the word [*daily*] ſuppoſes the diſcourſe here to mean) no other can be *obtruded*. For ſure 'tis not the quality of *Law* to ſteal in *illegal* preſſures, but to keep them out rather, to *define* and *limit* our *liberty*, not to *enthral* us, to *ſet* us *bounds* and *rules* of life, not to *remove* all ſuch. But then 4. That it may appear of how many *truths* this period is compoſed (every one of them with the help of one ſyllable a [*not*] ſet before the principal Verb, able to become ſuch) I ſhall add that the very *obtruſion* of ſuch *Ceremonies*, if they had been *obtruded*, would never have encouraged a rational *Papiſt* to expect our return to them, but only have ſignified that we meant by complying with them, as far as it was *lawful*, to leave them without excuſe, if they did not do ſo too, comply with us in what they might, and reſtore the Peace and Union of Chriſtendom by that means. This with any moderate *Papiſt* would moſt probably work ſome good, and for the more fiery *Jeſuited*, I am confident none were ever more mortally hated by them, than thoſe who were *favourers* of the *Ceremonies* now mentioned, and for the truth of what I ſay, you are obliged to believe that paſſage in *Romes Maſter-piece*, which you appointed to be ſet out, *wherein the King, and the late Arch-biſhop of Canterbury, were by the Popiſh contrivers deſigned to ſlaughter as Perſons whom they deſpaired to gain to them*: but that any of the now *Aſſemblers* were ſo *hated*, or ſo *feared*, or thought ſo *neceſſary* to be taken out of the way, we have not yet heard, but are rather confident that if a *penſion from Rome*, or a *Cardinals Cap* will keep them longer together to do more ſuch work as this, ſo reproachful to the *Proteſtant Religion*, they ſhould be ſo hired, rather than diſſolve too ſpeedily. I ſhall conclude this with the ſaying of * *Hippolitus* the old Martyr, fit to be confronted againſt this laſt ſort of exceptions againſt *Liturgy*, that in the times of *Antichriſt*, *Eccleſiarum ædes ſacræ tuguriis inſtar erunt*, *pretioſum corpus & ſanguis Chriſti non extabit*, *Liturgia extinguetur*, *pſalmodiæ decantatio ceſſabit*, *Scripturarum recitatio non audietur*, *The Churches ſhall be like ſties*, *the precious body and blood of Chriſt ſhall not be* to be had, *Liturgy ſhall be extinguiſht*, *the ſinging of the Pſalmody ſhall ceaſe*, *the reciting of the Scriptures ſhall not be heard*: whether by that be meant the ſolemn uſe of ſome Scriptures in their Liturgies, as of the *Magnificat*, which may then be ſaid *recitari*, to be *recited*, when they are uſed in the Church ſervice; or whether the bare Leſſons of Scriptures ſuperſeded by Sermons or the like. To which purpoſe the antient Paraphraſt on *Daniel*, *de fine mundi*, hath alſo expreſt himſelf, making the Prophecy of *Dan.* 8. 11. of *taking away the daily Sacrifice*, &c. to have a double completion, one in *Antiochus*, the other in *Antichriſt*, which it ſeems by Saint *Jerome*, moſt of the Antients agreed in; *Hunc locum*, ſaith he, *plerique noſtrorum ad Antichriſtum referunt*, *& quod ſub Antiocho in typo factum eſt*, *ſub illo in veritate dicunt eſſe complendum*, *Moſt of our Writers refer this* verſe 11. *to Antichriſt*, *and that which was done in the type under Antiochus*, *they ſay was to be performed in the truth under him*. And then let it be judged, whether a reformed *Liturgy*, or none at all, have more of *Popery* or *Antichriſt* in it.

Sect. 16. P. 4.

* *l. de Antichr.*

In the next place, 'tis *found out by experience, that the Liturgy hath been a great means to make and increaſe an idle and unedifying Miniſtery, which contented it ſelf with ſet forms made to their hands by others, without putting forth themſelves to exerciſe the gift of Prayer.* To this I anſwer, that thoſe Miniſters are not preſently proved to be *idle and unedifying* which have been content to uſe the *Liturgy*. I hope there may be other ways of *Labour*, beſide that of *extemporary prayer* (which can be no longer a *labour* than while it is a ſpeaking.) For 1. I had thought that theſe men might have acknow-

Sect. 17. P. 5.

ledged Preaching and Catechiſing, the former at leaſt, to have been the *work* of a Miniſter, and that a *edifying work*, and that ſure thoſe men have been *exerciſed* in, who have retain'd the *Liturgy* alſo. 2. *Study* of all kind of *Divine learning*, of which the haters of *Liturgy* have not gotten the incloſure, may paſs with ſober men for a labour alſo, and that which may tend to *edification*, if it have *charity* joyn'd with it, and that may be had too, without hating the *Liturgy*. But then 3. I conceive this *Directory* is no neceſſary proviſion againſt this reproached idleneſs, or unedifyingneſs in any that were formerly guilty of them in the days of *Liturgy*. For ſure the labour will not be much encreaſed to the Miniſter, that ſhall obſerve the *Directory*, becauſe either he may pray *extempore*, which will be no *pains*, but of his *lungs* and *ſides* in the *delivery*, or elſe a form being compoſed by any, according to the *Directory* (which is in effect a *Form* it ſelf,) he may thenceforth continue as *idle* as he who uſeth our *form of Liturgy*, and he which hath a mind to be *idle*, may make that uſe of it, and that you acknowledge, when you interpoſe that caution *p.* 8. [that *the Miniſters become not hereby ſlothful and negligent*] which were wholly an unneceſſary caution, if this *Directory* made *idleneſs* impoſſible; and if a *caution* will ſerve turn, the like may be added to our *Liturgy* alſo, without abrogating of it. And for the *edifying*, I deſire it may be conſidered, whether the *extravagancies* and *impertinencies*, which our experience (as well grounded as that which taught theſe men this myſtery of the *idle unedifying Miniſtry*) bids us expect from thoſe who neglect *ſet forms*, do more tend to the *edifying* of any, than the uſe of thoſe *Prayers* which are by the piety and judgment of our *Reformers* compoſed, and with which the *Auditory* being acquainted, may with uninterrupted devotion go along and ſay, *Amen*.

Sect. 18. P. 5. And whereas 'tis added in this place, that our *Lord Chriſt pleaſeth to furniſh all his Servants whom he calls to that office with the gift of Prayer*. I deſire 1. That it may be ſhewed what evidence we have from any *promiſe* of *Chriſt* in his *Word*, that any ſuch *gift* ſhall be perpetually annext by him to the *Miniſtery*. I believe the places which will be brought to enforce it, will conclude for *gifts of healing*, *making of Pſalms*, and other the like alſo, which *Miniſters* do not now adays pretend to. 2. I would know alſo why Chriſt, if he do ſo *furniſh* them, may not alſo be thought to help them to the *matter* of their Prayers (in which yet here the *Directory* is fain to *aſſiſt* them, and *pag.* 8. ſuppoſes the *Miniſter* may have *need of ſuch help and furniture*,) as well as the *form of words*, in which the *Liturgy* makes the *ſupply*. 3. I ſhall not doubt to affirm, that if the *gift of Prayer* ſignifie an *ability of Praying in publick without any premeditation*, *diſcreetly* and *reverently*, and ſo as never to offend againſt either of thoſe *neceſſaries*, every *Miniſter* is not furniſht with *this gift*, ſome men of very excellent abilities wanting that ſuddain *promptneſs* of *elocution*, and choice of words for all their conceptions; others being naturally *modeſt* and *baſhful*, and not endued with this *chariſma* of *boldneſs*, which is a great part, a ſpecial ingredient of that which is here called the *gift of Prayer*. And even for thoſe which have the former of theſe, and are not ſo *happy* as to want the latter, that yet they are not ſufficiently *gifted for Prayer* in *publick*, experience hath taught us by the very creditable relations of ſome, who have fallen into ſo many *indiſcretions*, that we ſay no worſe, in that performance. 'Tis true that God enableth men ſufficiently in private to expreſs their neceſſities to him, being able to underſtand *ſighs and groans*, when words are wanting, and as well content with ſuch Rhetorick in the Cloſet as any, but this is not peculiar to *Miniſters*, and for any ſuch ability in publick, there will not be the like ſecurity, unleſs the language of *ſighs and groans*, without other expreſſions, be there *current* alſo, which appears by ſome, who are forced to pay that *debt to God* in *that coyn*, having through unthriftineſs *provided* no other; and yet 'twere well alſo if that were the worſt of it, but the truth is, *blaſphemy* is ſomewhat worſe than *ſaying nothing*.

Sect. 19. P. 5. The laſt Objection is, That *the continuance of the Liturgy would be a matter of endleſs ſtrife and contention in the Church, and a ſnare to many Godly Miniſters, &c.* to the end of that page. Where 1. Is obſervable the *temper* and *reſolution* of theſe men, of whom ſuch ſpecial care is taken, which makes it ſo neceſſary for them, not only to *ſtrive and contend*, 1. *againſt eſtabliſht Law*, 2. about *Forms of Prayer*, (which ſure is none of the prime *Articles* of the *Creed*) but alſo to *ſtrive for ever*; which being obſerved, it ſeems 2. That they have a very charitable opinion of all us who are *aſſertors of Liturgy*, that we will never *ſtrive* or *contend* for it, for otherwiſe the *ſtrife* may be as *endleſs* upon its taking away. And ſure in ordinary judging (if they be not ſure that none are *contentious*, but their *favourites*) we ſee no reaſon, why the introduction of a *new way of worſhip*, ſhould not be more *matter of ſtrife*, and ſo alſo a *ſnare* to more (if any can be *enſnared or ſcandalized* but they) than the *continuance* of the *old eſtabliſht Liturgy*. Where, by the way, the *ſnare* they ſpeak of ſeems to ſignifie that which *catches and entraps* their *Eſtates* and not their *Souls*, cauſeth them to be *perſecuted*, *&c.* which is a notable *paralogiſm* and *fallacy* put upon the *Scripture uſe* of that phraſe, if we took pleaſure in making ſuch diſcoveries. But then 3. We deſire experience may be judge, and upon the ſentence which that ſhall give, that it may be conſidered, whether upon the *ballancing* of the *Kingdom*, it will not be found that a far greater number are now at this time *offended* at the *Directory*, and thereby *enſnared* in their *Eſtates*, if they lie within your *power*, than formerly at any time, (I ſhall add in *all times* ſince the *Reformation*, put together) ever were by the *Liturgy*.

Sect. 20. As for the paſſage which is added in the cloſe of this Section, that *in theſe latter times, God vouchſafeth to his People, more and better means for the diſcovery of errour and Superſtition.*] Though this ſounds ſomewhat like to his Divinity who makes the *power of reſiſting Kings*, to be a truth which God pleas'd *to reveal in theſe latter times, for the turning of Antichriſt out of the World, but hid in the primitive times, that Antichriſt might come in*, yet I ſhall not now quarrel with it (becauſe 'tis poſſible it may have another ſence, and I would not deny any thing but what is apparently and inexcuſably falſe) but from thence aſſume, 1. That I hope God *vouchſafeth* theſe *means* to them, that uſe the *Liturgy* alſo; For if it muſt be ſuppoſed a *ſin* to continue the uſe of it, 'tis not, I hope, ſuch a *waſting ſin*, as to deprive men of all grace, even of the *Chariſmata*, which unſanctified men may be capable of, and of *means of knowledge*, which is but a *common grace*, and therefore I muſt hope that the phraſe [*his people*] is not here meant in a *diſcriminative* ſence

ſence (like the *Montaniſts* form of *nos ſpirituales*, in oppoſition to all others, as *animales & pſychici*) to ſignifie only thoſe that are for the *Directory*, for then let them be aſſured, *Gods gifts* are not ſo incloſed, but that *Oxford* is vouchſafed as plentiful *means* for the *diſcovery* of *errour* and *ſuperſtition*, as *London*, and have, among other acts of *knowledge*, diſcovered this one by Gods bleſſing (which again I ſhall mention) that there may be as much *errour* and *Superſtition*, in rejecting of all *Liturgy*, as in retaining of *any*, in *oppoſing* Ceremonies, as in *aſſerting* them, a *negative* (as I ſaid) *touch not*, *taſt not*, *kneel not*, *bow not*, as well as a *poſitive ſuperſtition*; as alſo that there be errours in *practice*, as well as *doctrine* & *infidelities* againſt the Commandments, and Sermon of Chriſt in the *Mount*, as well as againſt the *Creed* it ſelf, and that impoſing of *Laws* on the King and Kingdom by the *Sword*, aboliſhing *Liturgy*, ſetting up *Directories* by that *ſtern* way of argument, thoſe *carnal weapons* of *militia* or warfare, when they are not only *practiſed*, but *aſſerted* for *lawful*, are errours, *damnable* errours alſo, and ſuch as are very near the otdinary notion of *Superſtition*, *the teaching for doctrines the Commandments of men*, I would I might not ſay of------alſo. But then 2. all this being ſuppoſed of Gods *granting better means of knowledge now, than formerly*, I ſhall yet interpoſe, that ſure this is not a truth of an *unlimited* extent, for there have been *Apoſtles*, which had *better means* than *we*, and they that were *neareſt* them, (and knew their doctrines, and practices, better than it is poſſible we ſhould) had ſo alſo, nay *Univerſal Councils* meeting in the Holy Ghoſt, and piouſly and judiciouſly debating, had by the priviledge of *Prayer*, more right to that promiſe of Chriſts *being in the midſt of them*, and *leading them into all truth*, than an *illegally* congregated *Aſſembly*; and all theſe have been greater favourers of *Liturgy* than any of equal authority with them have been of your *Directory*: And 3. if all were *ſuppoſed* and granted which you *claim*, yet ſtill the means of knowledge now vouchſafed, do not make you *infallible*, lay not any *moral* or *phyſical neceſſity* on you to be *faultleſs* or *errourleſs*, and therefore ſtill this may be errour in you as probably, as *Liturgy* ſhould be *Superſtition* in us. And for *gifts of Preaching and Prayer*. I anſwer, if they are and have been truly *gifts*, others of former times may by the *Spirit* have had as liberal a portion of them, as we. For ſure thoſe days wherein the Spirit was promiſed to be *poured out on all fleſh*, are not theſe days of ours, or of this age, excluſively to all others; Of this I am confident, that ſome other ages have had them in ſuch a meaſure, as was moſt agreeable to the propagating of the Goſpel, and if that were then by *forming* or *uſing* of *Liturgies*, why may it not be ſo at this time alſo?

Having given you my opinion of theſe paſſages, and yielded to them for quietneſs ſake, a *limited* truth, I muſt now add, that if they be *argumentative*, and ſo meant as a proof that theſe *Aſſemblers* are likely to be in the right, while they *deſtroy Liturgy*, although all the *Chriſtian World* before them have aſſerted it, this will be a groſs piece of inſolency and untruth together; a taking upon them to be the *only People of God* of theſe *latter times*, nay to have greater *judgment*, *knowledge*, *gifts*, than all the whole *Chriſtian World*, for all Ages together, including the *Apoſtles* and *Chriſt himſelf*, have had. For all theſe have been produced together with the ſuffrage of *Jews*, *Heathens*, *Mahometans* alſo, to maintain *ſet Forms*; and though it be true, that ſome of late have found out many *Superſtitions*, that never were diſcover'd before, one or other almoſt in every *poſture* or *motion* in Gods *Service*, yet this ſure is by the help of an injuſtice in applying without all reaſon that title to thoſe actions, and not by a greater *ſagacity* in diſcerning, making many acts of *indifferent* performance, nay of *Piety* it ſelf, go defamed and mourning under the reproach of *Superſtition*, and not bringing any *true light* into the World, that before was wanting. This one *Odium* faſtened on all *Orthodox Miniſters* in this Kingdom at this time, of *being ſuperſtitious*, and the miſtake of the true notion of the word which hath to that end been infuſed into many, (but is by a *Tract lately Printed* ſomewhat diſcovered) hath brought in a ſhole of *Sequeſtrations of Livings*, which have been very neceſſary and inſtrumental, to the maintaining of theſe preſent diſtempers. And now at length it proves in more reſpects than one, that whatever unſatiate hydropical appetites are tempted to take away, is preſently involved under that title, a name that hath an univerſal *malignity* in it, makes any thing *lawful prize* that is in the company. God will in time diſplay this deceit alſo. *Sect.* 21.

Having mentioned theſe ſo many reaſons of their *aboliſhing our Liturgie*, i. e. their ſo many *ſlanders* againſt our *Church* and *Church-men*, all which if they were true, hang ſo *looſe* and ſo *ſeparable* from *Liturgie*, that they cannot juſtifie the *abolition* of it; At length they ſhut up their ſuggeſtions with [*Upon theſe and many the like weighty conſiderations, and becauſe of divers particulars contained in the Book, they have reſolved to lay aſide the Book*] where if the *many conſiderations* unmentioned be of no more *truth* or *validity* than theſe, and ſo be *like weighty conſiderations*, I acknowledge their *prudence* in not naming them, and think that no part of the World is like to prove the worſe for this their reſervedneſs, only by the way a general charge is nothing in Law, and *in generalibus latet dolus*, is a legal exception againſt any thing, of this nature. But if they have any other which they conceive to be of any weight, they are very unjuſt and very uncharitable to us, thus to *enſnare* our *Eſtates* (the fault even now laid upon the *Prelates*) by requiring our *approbation* of their *Directory*, and conformity of our practice to it, and yet not vouchſafe us that conviction, which they are able, to ſatisfie us of the *reaſons* of their proceedings. But the truth is, we ſhall not charge this on them neither, being made confident by the *weakneſs* of the *motives* produced, that they have not any more *effectual* in ſtore. And for the *particulars* contained in the *Book*, if there were any infirm parts in it, any thing unjuſtifiable, (which we conceive their *Conſcience* tells them there is not, having not in this whole *Book* produced *one*, and yet their *charity* to it not ſo great, as to *cover* or *conceal any ſtore of ſins*) yet would not this infer any more than only farther *Reformation* of the *Book*, which is not the deſign againſt which we now argue. *Sect.* 22. P. 6. P. 7.

And having proceeded to ſo bloudy a ſentence upon ſuch (μαρτυρίας ἐκ δύο, in the Goſpel phraſe) *teſtimonies* and accuſations ſo *unſufficient* and *unproportionable* to ſuch a *condemnation*, they could not but foreſee the opinion that would be had of the action, and the ill and odious conſequents that would attend it, which therefore to keep off, is the next endeavour, by profeſſing that what is done, is *not from any love of Novelty*. And truly 'tis well you tell us ſo, for otherwiſe the ſemblance of *Sect.* 23.

that

that *love* in this and other actions, might have perſwaded us mortals, who ſee but the out-ſides, ſo to judge. And ſtill notwithſtanding the affirmation, (which is not of much value in your own cauſe, unleſs we had more *teſtimonies* of the Authors *infallibility*, than this *Preface* hath afforded us) the conſideration of the *matter* and *terms* of the *change* from what and to what, of the no manner of *advantage* or acquiſition by it to recompence all the *diſadvantages*, the great temerity, if not impiety to boot, in ſeparating from this *national*, and in ſcorning and defying the practice of the *Univerſal Church*, and the great *illegality*, that I ſay no worſe, of your action and the preparatory ſteps of motion to it, may tempt us to affirm, that it muſt needs be a *love of novelty*, even a *Platonick love*, as the phraſe is now adays, a *love of novelty*, as *novelty*, without any other hoped for reward, without any other avowed deſign in ſeeking it, for if there be any other which may be own'd, I am confident it hath already appeared by what hath been ſaid, that this is not the way to it. But then 2. Such a profeſſion as this will not ſure ſignifie much, to *innovate*, and yet to ſay we *love not innovation*, to act with a proud high hand in deſpight of ſo much at leaſt of God, as is imprinted in the *Laws* of man, and our *lawful Superiors*, and then to excuſe it by ſaying *we love not to do ſo*, will but little alleviate the matter before any equal Judge. 'Tis certain there is ſomething unlovely in the reproachful *name of ſin*, how glibly ſoever the *pleaſures* of it go down, yea and even in the *ſin* it ſelf, it hath the *δολας κρητῆρας*, the *two Cups* in *Homer* more truly than that to which he applies it, its *bitter* and *hateful*, as well as its *ſweeter* lovelier parts, *extemplo quodcunque malum committitur, ipſi Diſplicet*, and if men may have leave and excuſe to commit adultery ſo long, till they fall in love not only with the pleaſure of it, but the very *ſinfulneſs* of it, and the *name* and *reproach* alſo, we ſhall give them a good large ſpace of *Repentance*: the ſhort is, the mention of *Novelty* is an evidence that the Compoſers Conſcience tells them, that what they now do is ſuch, and 'tis not their *not loving* it (perhaps *only thinking*, perhaps *only ſaying* they do not *love* it) which will much leſſen the fault, but rather define it to be an act againſt *Conſcience*, to be and continue guilty of ſo huge a *novelty*, when they profeſs they *love it not*.

Sect. 24. The next *envy* that they labour to avoid, is the having an *intention to diſparage the Reformers, of whom they are perſwaded that were they now alive they would joyn with them in this work*. This is another *σοφὸν φαρμακὸν*, to blanch your *actions* with contrary *intentions*, to do that which is moſt reproachful to the *Reformers*, to obliterate, or which is worſe, to defame their memory (whom yet at the beginning you called *wiſe* and *pious*) and then ſay you *intended* them no *diſparagement*, nay to make them repent and retract after their death (*i.e.* to put them in a kind of Purgatory) to undertake for them that they have *changed* their minds, and not only that they are now content to part with that *finally* out of the Church, the ſhort *temporary* loſs of which, one of them (*Arch-Biſhop Cranmer* in one of his Letters publiſht by *Miles Coverdale*) laments, as the ſevereſt part of the Perſecutors tyranny toward him, *viz.* that they would not *permit him the uſe of the Common-Prayer-Book in the Priſon*; but withal that they are grown Zelots too, are content to act moſt *illegally* and ſeditiouſly to *caſt it out*. The judgment of this matter we leave to any ordinary arbitration, 1. Whether it be likely that they would joyn, *againſt Law to take that away*, which *they compiled*, or make all *preſcribed* Forms *unlawful*, who did not think any *fit* in *publick*, but thoſe which were *preſcribed*. 2. Whether any man can have ground of ſuch perſwaſion, when they dyed in the conſtant exerciſe of it, and have ſent them no meſſage from *the dead* of their *change* of mind. 3. Whether it be not ſtrongly improbable, that they of the firſt *Reformation* who in *Queen Maries* days, flying and living in *Franckfurt*, and there meeting with the objections that have been produced by our new Reformers, *maintain'd* the *Book* againſt them all, would now if they were return'd to us from a longer *exile*, diſclaim all that they had thus *maintain'd*. 4. Whether it be not an argument of a ſtrong *confidence* and *aſſurance*, (which is the moſt dangerous Mother of Schiſm and Hereſie imaginable) of *ſtrong paſſions* and *weak judgment*, to think that all men would be of their *ſide* (as *Hacket* thought verily that all *London* would riſe with him, as ſoon as he appear'd in *Cheapſide*) upon no other ground of that perſwaſion mentioned, but only that they are of it, which is but in effect as the ſame *Hacket* did, ſhewing no evidence of his being a Prophet, but only his *confidence*, which produced all kind of direful *Oaths* that he was, and hideous *imprecations* on himſelf, if he were not ſo. That which is added by way of honour to thoſe Martyrs, that they were *excellent Inſtruments to begin the purging and building of his houſe*, may be but an artifice of raiſing their own reputation, who have perfected thoſe rude beginnings, or if it be meant in earneſt, as kindneſs to them, 'tis but an unſignificant *civility*, to aboliſh all the *records* of their *Reformation*, and then pay them a little *praiſe* in exchange for them, *Martyr* their aſhes (as the Papiſts did *Fagius* and *Bucer*) and then lay them down into the earth again, with a *dirge* or *anthem*, *defame* the *Reformation*, and *commend* the *Reformers*; but ſtill to intimate how much *wiſer* or *godlier* you are, than all thoſe Martyrs were.

Sect. 25. Thus far they have proceeded *ad amoliendam invidiam*; Now to the *poſitive motives*, of ſetting upon this great work of *innovation*, and thoſe are, 1. To *anſwer in ſome meaſure the gracious providence of God, which at this time calleth upon them for farther Reformation*: What they ſhould mean by the *gracious Providence of God* in this place; I confeſs, I cannot gueſs, (if it be not a meer *name* to add ſome credit to the cauſe) unleſs it be the *proſperity* and good ſucceſs of their *Arms*; which if throughout this War they had reaſon to bragg or take notice of (as ſure they have not, but of God's hand many times viſibly ſhewed againſt them, in raiſing the low eſtate of the King, without viſible means, and bringing down their mighty ſtrength, as the *Septuagint* makes God promiſe to fight againſt *Amaleck* ἐν κρυφαίᾳ χειρὶ, *by ſecret hand*, by inviſible,) yet ſure would not that *juſtifie* the taking up of thoſe Arms, much leſs be able to *conſecrate* all other ſins, that thoſe *Arms* may enable any to be guilty of. 'Tis the Turks *Divinity*, as before I intimated, to paſs ſentence on the action by the proſperity of the man, *to make one killing of a Father villany and ſacriledge, becauſe the deſign it aim'd at miſcarried, and another of the ſame making, an heroick act, that God was pleaſed with, becauſe it brought the deſigner to the Kingdom.* And therefore, I beſeech you, look no longer on the cauſe through the deceivable and deceitful glaſſes of your conceited *victories*, but through that one true glaſs the word of *Chriſt* in the New Teſtament; and if that *call* you to this *farther reformation*, go on in

Busbequii Epiſt.

Gods

Gods name; But if it be any thing elſe that calleth you, (as ſure ſomewhat elſe it is you mean, for if it were *Gods word*, you would ere now have ſhew'd it us, and here have call'd it *Gods word*, which is plain and intelligible, not *Gods providence*, which is of an ambiguous ſignification) if any *extraordinary revelation* however convey'd to you; this you will never be able to approve to any that ſhould doubt your *call*, and therefore I ſhall meekly deſire you, and in the *bowels of Chriſtian compaſſion* to your ſelves, if not to your *bleeding Country*, once more to examine ſeriouſly, what ground you have in Gods word, to *ſatisfie conſcience* of the lawfulneſs of ſuch *attempts*, which you have uſed, to gain *ſtrength* to work your *Reformation*, and this we the rather deſire to be ſhew'd by you, becauſe you add, that *having conſulted with Gods holy word, you reſolve to lay aſide the former Liturgy*, which cannot ſignifie that upon command of *Gods word* particularly ſpeaking to this matter, you have done it, for then all this while, you would ſure have ſhewed us that *word*, but that the word of God hath lead you to the whole work in general, which you have taken in hand, and therefore that is it, which as *a Light ſhining in ſo dark a place*, we require you in the name of God to hold out to us.

After this there is a 2*d.* motive, the *ſatisfaction of your own conſciences*. This I cannot ſpeak to, *Sect.* 26. becauſe I neither *know* them, nor the *grounds* of them, ſave only by what is here mentioned, which I am ſure is not ſufficient to *ſatisfie conſcience*; (phanſie perhaps it may) only this I ſhall interpoſe, that it is poſſible your own *conſciences* may be *erroneous*, and we are confident they are ſo, and then you are not bound to *ſatisfie* them, ſave only by ſeeking better information, which one would think might be as feaſible a task as *aboliſhing of Liturgy*.

Next a 3*d.* motive is mentioned, that *you may ſatisfie the expectation of other Reformed Churches*; *Sect.* 27. To this firſt I ſay, that this is not the rule for the *reforming* of a *National Church* ἐντοπίαν, and *independent*. And ſuch I conceive, the *laſt Canon of the Council of Epheſus*, will by conſequence conclude this of *England* to be; and its being ſo, is a ſufficient plea, 1. To clear us from all ſhew of *Schiſm* in *Separating* from the *Roman Church* (to which we were not, according to the *Epheſine rule*, *ſubjected* as a *part*) though we *reformed* our ſelves, when the *Pope* vehemently required the contrary, and would not himſelf be *reformed*, and from the *Church univerſal*, of which we ſtill remain a *member undivided*. 2. To anſwer this motive of our *Aſſemblers*, by telling them that in the *reforming* ſuch a *Church* (as this of ours, if not by *others*, yet by *them* is acknowledged to be) the care muſt be, to do what the *head* and *members* of the *Church*, ſhall in the fear of God reſolve to be fitteſt, and not what *other Churches expect*; for if that were the rule, it would be a very *fallacious* and very *puzling* one, the *expectations of ſeveral Churches* being as *ſeveral*, and the choice of ſome difficulty, which of them were fitteſt to be *anſwer'd*. But then ſecondly, what the *expectations of other Churches* have been in this point, or what the *reaſons* of them, we do not punctually know, only this we do, that after your *ſoliciting* of many (which is another thing, ſomewhat diſtant from their *expecting*) we hear not of any, that have declared their concurrence in opinion with you in this: But on the contrary, that in anſwer to your Letter, directed to the *Church* of *Zeland*, the *Wallachrian Claſſis* made this return to you, that they did *approve ſet and preſcribed forms of publique Prayer, as profitable and tending to edification*, (quite contrary to what you before objected of the *Offence to the Proteſtant Churches abroad*, and now of *their expectation*, &c.) and give *reaſons* for that *approbation*, both from Texts of *Scripture*, and the general *practice* of the *Reformed Church*, avouching particularly the forementioned place of *Calvin*, and conclude it to be *a preciſe ſingularity* in thoſe men who do reject them. And now, I beſeech you, ſpeak your knowledge, and inſtance in the particular, if any Church have in any *addreſs* made to you, or *anſwer* to your invitation, ſignified their *expectation* that you ſhould *aboliſh Liturgy*, or their approbation of your fact, able to counterballance this cenſure from the Pen of thoſe your friends thus unexpectedly faln upon you. Some *ingenuity* either of making good your aſſertion of the *Churches*, or elſe of *Confeſſion* that you cannot, will be in common equity *expected* from you.

The *deſires of many of the Godly among your ſelves* (which you mention as a 4*th. motive* for *abo-* *Sect.* 28. *lition*) will ſignifie little, becauſe how many *ſuffrages* ſoever might be brought for the upholding of *Liturgy*, thoſe who are againſt it ſhall by you be called, *the godly*, and that number what ever it is, go for a multitude. But then again, *Godly* they may be, but not *wiſe*, (*piety* gives no *infallibility* of doctrine to the poſſeſſor) at leaſt in this point, unleſs you can firſt prove the *Liturgy* to be *ungodly*; nay they that *rejoyced* in it, were, as you ſay, *godly and learned*, and they that made it, *wiſe* and *pious*, and therefore ſure ſome reſpect was due to the *wiſe* as well as *godly* in the abrogation. And yet it may be added farther, that the way of expreſſing of the *deſires of thoſe* whom you mean by the *godly*, hath been ordinarily by way of *Petitions*, and thoſe it cannot be diſſembled have been oft framed and put into their hands (I ſay not by whom) even in ſet *preſcribed Forms*, not thinking it enough to give them a *Directory for matter*, without *ſtinting their Spirits*, by appointing the words *alſo*. This ſhews that the *deſires of thoſe many of the Godly*, are not of any huge conſideration in this buſineſs, and yet I have not heard to my remembrance of any *Petition*, yet ever ſo inſolent, as to demand what you have done (in anſwer it ſeems to ſome inarticulate groans or ſighs) the *abolition of all Liturgy*.

The laſt motive is, That *you may give ſome publique teſtimony of your endeavours for uniformity in* *Sect.* 29. *divine worſhip promiſed in your Solemn League and Covenant*. To this the anſwer will be ſhort, becauſe it hath for the main already been conſidered. 1. That the *Covenant* it ſelf is *unlawful*, which therefore obliges to nothing but *Repentance*, and reſtitution of a ſtray Subject to his Allegiance to *God* and the *King* again. 2*ly*, That there is one ſpecial thing conſiderable of this *Covenant* which will keep it either from obliging or from being any kind of *excuſe* or *extenuation* of the crimes that this action is guilty of, and that is the *voluntary taking* of that Covenant *on purpoſe*, thus to *enſnare* your ſelves in this *obligation*, to do what ſhould not otherwiſe be done; We before told you, that *Herods oath* would not juſtifie the *beheading of John*; and ſhall now add, that if ſome precedaneous hatred to *John*, made *Herod* lay this *deſign* before-hand, that *Herodias*'s *Daughter* ſhould *dance*, that upon her *dancing* he would be vehemently *pleaſed*, that upon her *pleaſing* of him he would *ſwear to give*

her

her any thing she should ask, even to half his Kingdom, and the same *compact* appoint her to make this Petition, to take *John Baptists head* for her reward, (as 'tis not unlikely but that as *Herodias* was of counsel with her Daughter, so *Herod* might be with *Herodias*) if the *train* I say, lay thus, sure *Herods oath* would take off but little from the Crimson dye of his *murther*, but rather superadd that sin of deep *hypocrisie*, of making *piety*, and the *Religion of oaths*, a servant and instrument to his *incest* and *murthering* of a *Prophet*. And then I shall no farther apply, than by asking this question, did you not take this *Covenant* on *purpose* to lay this obligation upon you, and now pretend that for your *Covenants sake*, you must needs do it? If you cannot deny this, O then *remember Herod*. But if you took the *Covenant* without any such *design*, but now find your selves thus *ensnared* by it, then rather remember betimes to get out of that *snare*, and not to engage your selves faster in it. 3*ly*, I answer, that if by *uniformity* be meant that among our selves in this Kingdom, the taking away of our *Liturgy* by *Ordinance*, while it remains establisht by valid Law, is no over-fit *means* to that end, nothing but a new *Act*, and an *assurance* that all would be obedient to that *Act*, can be proper for that purpose; and I am sure there are some men in the World, whom if such an *Act* displeased, the *obedience* would not be very *uniform*; what ever it may seem to be when better *Subjects* are supposed to be concluded by it. But if it be *uniformity with the best Reformed Churches* (as your *Covenant* mentions) then 1. That *uniformity* in matters of *Form* or *Ceremony* is no way necessary, (*Communion* betwixt *Churches* may be preserv'd without it) nor near so useful as that other among *our selves*, and therefore the bargain will be none of the most thriving, when that acquisition is paid so dear for, *uniformity with strangers*, purchased with *confusion at home*; as bad a market, as unequal a barter, as if we should enter upon a *Civil War*, for no other gain, than to make up a *Peace* with some *Neighbour Prince*; which none but a mad Statesman would ever counsel. But then 4*ly*, The *Covenant for such uniformity*, obliges not to make this *Directory*, which I shall prove, 1. By the verdict of those themselves which have taken the *Covenant*, of whom many I am confident, never conceived themselves thereby obliged to *abolish Liturgy*, there being no such *intelligible sence* contained in any branch of the *Covenant*, any such *intention* of the *imposers* avowed at the giving of it. 2. Because we conceive we have made it manifest, that that part of the *Covenant* which mentions *uniformity with other best Reformed Churches*, doth not oblige to *abolish Liturgy*, not only because the general matter of the *Covenant* refers it to the *Government*, and not to the *Liturgy*, but because the *best Reformed Churches* retain *set Forms of Prayer*; And because this of *England*, as it now stands establisht by *Law*, is the *best Reformed*, both according to that rule of *Scripture*, and standard of the *purest ancient Church*; For which we have also the testimony of *learned Protestants* of other Countries, preferring it before their own, and shall be ready to justifie the *boast* by any *test* or κριτήρια, that shall be resolved on fit to decide this *doubt* or competition between this of ours, and any that you shall *Vote* or *name* to be the best.

Sect. 30. The like challenge we shall also make in return to a *tacit* intimation of yours more than once faln from you in this *Preface*, and in the body of the *Directory*, p. 40. and 73. *viz.* that the *Church of* England *hath hitherto been guilty of Superstition in her Liturgy*. To which we first reply by desiring, that you mention any one particular wherein that accusation may appear to be true, (and we hereby undertake to maintain the contrary against any the learnedst in that *Assembly*) which if you will not undertake to *specifie and prove*, you must acknowledge to be guilty of great *uncharitableneß* in *affirming*. I shall not be so uncharitable as to wish that the judgment of the *Civil Law* may be your doom, and the sentence that belongs to *Superstition* be the reward of your defamation, I shall not say so much as *the Lord reprove*, by way of imprecation, but once more repeat, *Lord lay it not to your charge*.

Sect. 31. Upon these grounds you proceed, that [*having not consulted with flesh and blood, &c.*] This sure in Saint *Pauls* phrase, *Gal.* 1. 16. signifies not *consulting* with men, though *Apostolical*; as *consulting* with them is opposed to immediate *revelation from Heaven*; and then sure your *Assembly* was very *spiritual* and very *heavenly*, for with them you confess to have *consulted*; but if you mean by the phrase, in a larger sence, *earthy or humane interests*, I shall only ask, whether all the actions which have proceeded from you are so visibly divine and unmixt with earth, so apparently uninterested, that your own testimony should be sufficient to give credit to this affirmation?

Sect. 32. Having said this, you proceed to the conclusion, that you resolved *to set up the Directory*, and in it to *hold forth such things as are of divine Institution in every Ordinance, and other things to set forth according to the rules of Christian Prudence, agreeable to the general rules of the Word of God*. And now 'tis a little strange, (but yet that which my temper obliges me to desire may still be my fate, when I fall upon a Controversie with any) that we which have been at such *distance* all this while, should just now *meet* at *parting*, that such *contradictory premises*, should beget the *same conclusion*. For there is not a better Rule in the World, nor any which I would rather chuse to be judged by in this matter, than that which is here proposed by you; Only I desire a little importunately to be advertised, where it is that the *Compilers of our Liturgy* have swerved from it. Where you have swerved, we have instanced in many particulars in our *Answer* to the *Ordinance*, and shall now once for all demand, what *rules of Prudence* oblige you to turn those many severals there mentioned out of the *Service* of the *Church*, every one of them tending to *edification directly*, over and above the agreeableness of each to the general rules of *Scripture*; in particular whether it be agreeable to *Christian Prudence* to abolish a *Liturgy*, which hath been so *piously* and *discreetly* framed, by those who have seal'd our *Reformation* with their *blood*, and instead of it to bring in a *voluntary* way of serving God in a *National Church*, where there be many thousand *Parishes*, and no such promise of divine *inspiration* or *enthusiasm*, but that there may be still some number of those *Ministers*, who will not be able to speak constantly in the Congregation, so as in the *presence* of *Angels* they ought to speak. The experiments that have given us reason thus to fear, and desire prevention of the like, we are again tempted to add unto this Paper, but we delight not to demonstrate them guilty of *Blasphemies*, who have accused us of *Superstition*. We desire this fault may be cured by some milder *recipe*.

As for that which in passing you say, that by your *Directory Ministers may be directed to keep like soundness of Doctrine*, this indeed is a prerogative of the *Liturgy*, (which hath always been used as an *hedg* to keep out *errors*, and to retain a *common profession of Catholick verities*) but cannot belong to your *Directory*, which hath neither *Creed* nor *Catechism*, nor one *Article of Religion*, or *Doctrine* asserted in it, but leaves that wholly to the Preacher whose doctrine that it should be sound at all, or agree with the *doctrine* of all other Preachers, and so be like sound, here is no *provision* made. *Sect.* 33.

We have thus call'd your Preface also to some tryal, and found it of such a composure and temper, 1. So many variations from truth (which one that desires to be civil, must be unjust if he do not call them so) that we cannot with any pleasure give an accompt of our judgment of them. 2. So many unconcluding premises, Affirmations which if they were all supposed true, would never come home to abolition, and among all the heap, so no one truth which is of *importance* or weight toward that conclusion, that now we conceive we have discharged the task, given the Reader such a view of the inward parts of this specious fabrick, that he will not wonder, that we are not so passionately taken with the beauty, as to receive at a venture whatsoever is contain'd in it; For supposing there were never an unseasonable *Direction* in all the Book following, yet the reception of that, being founded in the *abolition* both of *ours*, and of *all* Liturgy, *the Christian prudence agreeable to the word of God*, which is here commended to us, obliges us to stop our ears to such slight temptations, and never to yield consent, to the but laying aside that *form of Service*, which we have by *establisht Law* so long enjoyed, to the great content and benefit of this *Nation*; though God knows some have not made so *holy*, others so *thankful* a use of it, as it deserved of us, some *neglecting* it, others *slandring*, and so many bringing *worldly hearts* along with them, which though they are great evils, under which this divine Liturgy hath suffered, yet being the *infelicities*, not the *crimes*, the *cross* which hath made it like unto our Saviour, in being *spit on*, *revil'd*, and *crown'd* with *thorns* (for such he calls the *cares of this World*, the most *contumelious* part of the *suffering*) and not at all the *guilt* (being wholly *accidental* and *extrinsecal* to it) must never be exchanged, for the *certain evils*, *natural* and *intrinsecal* to the no-Liturgy, and with all the greater mischiefs which may probably *follow* this alteration; for all which patience and submission, we have not the least kind of invitation, save only that of the noyse, and importunity of some enemies, which should it be yielded to, would, I doubt not, be resisted and prest again, with the *Petitions* of many thousands more, for importuning the return and restitution of the Liturgy again; unless by this means the Devil should gain an absolute and total manumission, cast off all his trashes, and presently get rid of both his enemies, *Religion* and *Liturgy* together. *Sect.* 34.

A Postscript, by way of Appendix to the two former Chapters.

THE truth of all which we have hitherto spoken, if we have not sufficiently evidenced it already, will abundantly appear by one farther testimony, which is *authentick* and undeniable to them, against whom we speak. And it is, (what the providence of God, and the power of truth hath extorted from them) their *own confession*, in a Book just now come to my hands, called, a *Supply of Prayer for the Ships that want Ministers to pray with them, agreeable to the Directory establisht by Parliament, published by authority*. From which these things will be worth observing, 1. That the very body of it is a set form of Prayer, and so no *Superstition* in *set forms*. 2. That their *publishing* it by *authority* is the prescribing of that form, and so 'tis lawful to prescribe such forms. 3. That the title, [of *Supply of Prayer*] proveth that some there are, to whom such *supplies* are *necessary*, and so a *Directory* not *sufficient* for all. And 4. that [its *being agreeable to the Directory*] Or as it is word for word form'd out of it, (the Directory turn'd into a Prayer) sheweth, that out of the Directory, a Prayer may easily first be made, and then constantly used, and so the Minister ever after continue as *idle* without exercising that gift, as under our Liturgy is pretended, and so here under pretence of *supplying the ships*, all such idle *Mariners* in the *ship* of the *Church* are supplied also, which it seems was foreseen at the writing that preface to the *Directory*, where they say, the *Minister may, if need be, have from them some help and furniture*. 5. That the Preface to this new Work entitled, *A reason of this work*, containeth many other things, which tend as much to the retracting their former work, as *Judas's throwing back the mony* did to his *repentance*. *Sect.* 1. P. 8.

As 1. *that there are thousands of ships belonging to this Kingdom, which have not Ministers with them, to guide them in Prayer, and therefore either use the Common-prayer, or no Prayer at all. This* shews the nature of that fact of those which without any *objection* mention'd against any Prayer in that Book, which was the only help for the *devotion* of *many thousands*, left them for some Months, to perfect *irreligion* and *Atheism, and not praying at all*. And besides these ships (which they here confess) how many *Land-Companies* be there in the same condition, how many thousand Families which have no *Minister* in them, (of which number the *House of Commons* was always wont to be one, and the *House of Lords*, since the *Bishops* were removed from thence) and to deal plainly, how many Ministers will there always be, in *England* and *Wales* (for sure your care for the *Universities* is not so great as to be likely to work *Miracles*) which will not have *skill*, or *Power*, or *gift* (which you please) of *conceiving Prayers* as they ought to do, and therefore let me impart to you the thoughts of many prudent men (since the news of your *Directory*, & abolition of our *Liturgy*) that it would prove a most expedite way *Sect.* 2.

to bring in *Atheiſm*; and this it ſeems, you do already diſcern and confeſs in the next words, that the no Prayer at all, which ſucceeded the *aboliſhing of the Liturgy, is likely to make them rather Heathens than Chriſtians, and hath left the Lords day without any mark of piety or devotion:* (a ſad and moſt conſiderable truth, which ſome perſons ought to lament with a wounded bleeding conſcience, the longeſt day of their life) and therefore we are apt to believe your charity to be more *extenſive*, than the title of that Book enlarges it, and that it hath deſigned this *ſupply*, not only to thoſe *ſhips* but to all other in the like want of our *Liturgy*. Your only blame in this particular hath been, that you would not be ſo *ingenuous*, as *Judas* and ſome others, that have ſoon *retracted* their precipitous action, and *confeſt* they did ſo, and made *reſtitution* preſently, while you, rather than you will (to reſcue men from heatheniſm cauſed by your abolition) reſtore the Book again, and confeſs you have ſinned in condemning an *innocent Liturgy*, will appoint ſome Aſſembler, to compile a poor, ſorry, piteous form of his own, of which I will appeal to your greateſt flatterer, if it be not ſo low that it cannot come into any terms of compariſon, or competition, with thoſe forms already preſcribed in our Book; and ſo ſtill you juſtifie your error, even while you confeſs it.

Sect. 3. 2ly, That 'tis *now hoped that 'twill be no grief of heart to full Chriſtians, if the thirſty drink out of Ciſterns, when themſelves drink out of Fountains, &c.* which is the ſpecial part of that ground, on which we have firſt formed, and now labour'd to preſerve our *Liturgy*, on purpoſe that *weaker* Chriſtians may have this conſtant *ſupply* for their infirmities, that *weak* Miniſters may not be forced to betray their weakneſs, that they that have not the gift of Prayer (as even in the Apoſtles times there were *diverſe gifts*, and all Miniſters had not promiſe to ſucceed in all, but one in one, another in *another gift by the ſame ſpirit*) may have the help of theſe common *gifts*, and ſtanding *treaſures* of Prayer in the *Church*; and (becauſe there be ſo many of theſe kinds to be lookt for in a Church) that thoſe which are able to pray as they ought, without a form, may yet in publick ſubmit to be thus reſtrained, to the uſe of ſo excellent a form thus ſet before them, rather than others ſhould be thus adventur'd to their own temerity, or incur the reproach of being thought not able; and then this providing for the weak, both Miniſter and People, will not now, I hope, be charged on the Liturgy, by thoſe, who *hope* their *ſupply of Prayer* will be *no grief to others.*

Sect. 4. 3ly, That *theſe Prayers being enlivened, and ſent up by the ſpirit in him that prayeth, may be lively prayers and acceptable to him, who is a ſpirit, and accepts of ſervice in ſpirit and truth.* Where 1. It appears by that confeſſion, that as the place that ſpeaks of *worſhipping in ſpirit and truth*, is not of any force againſt ſet prayers, ſo neither is that other of the *Spirits helping our infirmities*, belonging, as it is here confeſt moſt truly, to the *zeal* and *fervour* and *intenſeneſs* of devotion infuſed by the *Spirit*, (and not to the words wherein the addreſs is made) which if the Spirit may not infuſe alſo, in the uſe of our *Liturgy*, and aſſiſt a *Miniſter* and Congregation in the *Church*, as well and as effectually as a *company of Mariners* in a *ſhip*, I ſhall then confeſs that the *Directory* firſt, and then this *Supply*, may be allow'd to turn it out of the Church.

Sect. 5. Laſtly, *that in truth though Prayers come never ſo new, even from the Spirit, in one that is a guide in Prayer, if the ſpirit do not quicken and enliven that Prayer in the hearer that follows him, it is to him but a dead form, and a very carcaſe of Prayer*, which words being really what they ſay, a *truth*, a perfect *truth*, and more ſoberly ſpoken, than all or any other period in the *Preface* to the *Directory*, I ſhall oppoſe againſt the whole *act of abolition*, as a ground of confutation of the principal part of it, and ſhall only add my deſire, that it be conſidered *what Prayers* are moſt likely to be thus *quickned* and *enlivened by the ſpirit* in the hearer, thoſe that he is maſter of, and underſtands and knows he may joyn in, or thoſe which depend wholly on the *will* of the Speaker, which perhaps he *underſtandeth* not, and never knows what they are, till they are delivered, nor whether they be *fit* for him to joyn in; or in plainer words, whether a man be likely to pray, and ask moſt fervently he *knows not what*, or that which he knows, and comes on purpoſe to pray. For ſure the *quickning* and *enlivening of the Spirit*, is not ſo perfectly *miracle*, as to exclude all uſe of *reaſon* or underſtanding, to prepare for a *capacity* of it; for then there had been no need to have turn'd the *Latine ſervice* out of the Church, *the ſpirit* would have *quickned* thoſe *Prayers* alſo.

CHAP. III.

HAving thus paſt through the *Ordinance* and the *Preface*, and in the view of the *Ordinance* ſtated and ſetled aright the compariſon betwixt the *Liturgy* and the *Directory*, and demonſtrated the *no-neceſſity*, but plain unreaſonableneſs of the *change*, and ſo by the way inſiſted on moſt of the *defects* of the *Directory*, which are the ſpecial matter of accuſation we profeſs to find in it, I ſhall account it a *Superfluous Importunity* to proceed to a review of the whole body of it, which makes up the bulk of that *Book*, but inſtead of inſiſting on the faults and infirm parts of it (ſuch are, the prohibition of *adoration toward any place*, p. 10. that is of *all adoration*, while we have bodies about us, for that muſt be *toward ſome place*; the *interdicting of all parts of the Apocryphal Books*, p. 12. which yet the Antient Church avowed to be read for the *directing of manners*, though not as *rule of Faith:* the ſo frequent mention of the *Covenant* in the directions for *Prayer*, once as a *ſpecial mercy* of God, *p.* 17. which is the *greateſt curſe* could befal this *Kingdom*, and a great occaſion, if not Author of all the reſt, which are now upon it; then, as a means *of a ſtrict and Religious Union*, p. 21. which is rather an engagement of an *irreligious War*; Then, as a precious *band that men muſt pray that it never be broken*, p. 21. which is in effect to pray, that

that they may never *repent*, but continue in *Rebellion* for ever; Then as a *mercy* again, p. 37. as if this *Covenant* were the greateſt *treaſure* we ever enjoyed: Then the praying for the *Armies by Land and Sea*, p. 38. with that addition [for *the defence of the King and Parliament and Kingdom*] as reſolving now to put that cheat upon God himſelf, which they have uſed to their fellow Subjects, that of *fighting againſt the King for the defence of him*, (*Beloved be not deceived, God is not mocked.*) Then affirming that the *Fonts were ſuperſtitiouſly placed in time of Popery*, and therefore the Child muſt now be *baptized in ſome other place*, p. 40. while yet they ſhew not any ground of that accuſation, nor ever will be able to do. Then that the *cuſtoms of kneeling and praying by, and towards the dead, is ſuperſtitious*, p. 73. which literally it were, (*Superſtitum cultus*) if it were praying *to them*, but now is far enough from that guilt. And laſtly, that the *Lords day is commanded in the Scripture to be kept holy*, p. 85. the *ſanctification* of which we acknowledge to be *grounded* in the *Scripture*, and *inſtituted* by the *Apoſtles*, but not *commanded in the Scripture* by any revealed precept. (The firſt that we meet with to this purpoſe, is that of *Ignatius Epiſt. ad Magneſ.* Μηκέτι σαββατίζωμεν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ κυριακὴν ζωὴν ἀγωμεν, *Let us therefore Sabbatize no longer; Let every Chriſtian celebrate the Lords day*, which ſaying of an *Apoſtolick* Writer being added to the mention of the *Lords day* in the New Teſtament is a great argument of the *Apoſtolick inſtitution* of that day, which the univerſal practice of the Church ever ſince doth ſufficiently confirm unto us, and we are content and ſatisfied with that authority, although it doth not offer to ſhew us any *command in the Scripture for it*. And then you may pleaſe to obſerve, that the ſame *Ignatius*, within a page before that place, fore-cited for the *obſerving of the Lords day*, hath a *command for Common Prayer*, and I conceive, for *ſome ſet Forms*; I ſhall give you the words, Πάντες ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ἐν τῇ προσευχῇ ἅμα συνέρχεσθε, μία δέησις ἔστω κοινὴ, ὁ νοῦς, *Let all meet together to the ſame, whether action or place in Prayer, Let there be one Common Prayer, one mind, &c.* and *Clem. Alex.* to the ſame purpoſe, the Altar which we have here on Earth, is the company of thoſe that dedicate themſelves to *Prayers*, as having φωνὴν τὴν κοινὴν ἐν μίαν γνώμην, a *common voice, and one mind*, which cannot well be, unleſs there be ſome *common Form*, by all agreed on.) Inſtead I ſay of preſſing theſe or the like frailties upon this work, which will argue the Compoſers of it to be men and fallible, I ſhall rather deſire to expreſs and evidence my *charity* (and my endeavour to read it without any *prejudice*) by adding my opinion, that there be ſome things ſaid in it (by way of direction for the matter of *Prayer*, and courſe of *Preaching*) which agree with *wholſome doctrine*, and may tend to *edification*, and I ſhall not rob thoſe of that approbation which is due to them, nor conceive our Cauſe to need ſuch *peeviſh* means to *ſuſtain* it; Being not thereby *obliged* to quarrel at the *Directory abſolutely* as a *Book*, but only as it *ſupplants* the *Liturgie* (which, if it had a thouſand more *excellencies* in it than it hath, it would not be *fit* to do.) And being willing to give others an *example* of *peaceableneſs*, and of a reſolution to *make* no more *quarrels* than are *neceſſary*, and therefore *contributing* my part of the endeavour to *conclude* this one aſſoon as is poſſible. And the rather becauſe it is in a matter, which (if without detriment to the *Church*, and the *Souls* of men, the *Book* might be univerſally *received*, and ſo the *experiment* could be made) would I am confident within very few years aſſoon as the *pleaſure* of the *change* and the *novelty* were over, prove its own largeſt confutation, confeſs its own *wants* and *faults*; and ſo all but *mad men* ſee the error, and require the *reſtitution* of *Liturgie* again. This I ſpeak upon a ſerious obſervation and pondering of the *tempers* of men, and the ſo *mutable* habits of their *minds*, which as they are εὐμετάβολοι, *eaſily changed from good to evil*, ſo are they (which is the difference of *men* from *lapſt Angels*) παλίμβολοι, *eaſily reduced alſo* to their former ſtate again, when *reaſon* comes to *them in the cool of the day*, when the *heat* of the *kindneſs* is paſt, and a *ſatiety* haſtning in its ſtead, or if it prove not ſo well, yet *falling from one change to another, and never coming to ſtability*. How poſſible this may prove in this particular, I ſhall now evidence no farther, than by the parallel *vehement diſlikes*, that the *Presbyterial* Government hath already met with among other of our *reforming Spirits*, very liberally expreſt in many Pamphlets which we have lately receiv'd from *London*, but in none more fully than in the *Epiſtle* to the *Book* entituled, *John Baptiſt*, firſt charging the *Presbyterians* (who formerly exclaimed againſt *Epiſcopacy for ſtinting the Spirit*) *that they began to take upon them to eſtabliſh a Dagon in his Throne, in ſtinting the whole worſhip of the God of Heaven, &c.* and in plain words without *mincing* or *diſſembling*, *that they had rather the French King, nay the great Turk ſhould rule over them, than theſe*. The only uſe which I would now make of theſe experiments is this, to *admire* that *bleſſed excellent Chriſtian grace* of *obedience*, (and *contentment with our preſent lot*, whatſoever it be, that brings not any neceſſity of ſinning on us.) I mean, to commend to all, in matters of *indifference*, (or where *Scripture* hath not given any *immediate rule*, but left us to obey thoſe who are ſet over us) that happy choice of ſubmitting, rather than *letting looſe* our appetites, of obeying, than preſcribing; A *duty*, which beſides the very great *eaſe* it brings with it, hath much of *vertue* in it, and will be abundant *reward* to it ſelf here on Earth, and yet have a mighty *arrear* remaining to be paid to it in Heaven hereafter; which when it is heartily conſidered, it will be a thing of ſome difficulty to *invent* or *feign* a heavier *affliction* to the *meek and quiet ſpirit*, a more *enſnaring* piece of *treachery* to the Chriſtian Soul, (I am ſure to his *Eſtate* and temporal proſperity) than that of *contrary irreconcileable commands*, which is now the caſe, and muſt always be, when *Ordinances* undertake to ſuperſede *Laws*, when the inferiour, but ore-ſwaying power, adventures to *check* the *Superiour*. Of which ſubject I have *temptation* to annex a full tyde of thoughts, would it not prove too much a παρεργὸν, and be moſt ſure to be ſo eſteemed by them to whom this addreſs is now tendred. The good *Lord of Heaven and Earth incline our hearts to keep that Law* of his, ἥτις ἐστὶν ἐντολὴ πρώτη ἐν ἐπαγγελίᾳ, Eph. 6. 2. *which is a prime Commandment*, and that with a *promiſe* of ſecular Peace and abundance *annext* (if not confined) to it.

Strom. l. 7.

To conclude therefore, and ſum up all in a word; We have diſcover'd by this brief ſurvey, the *reaſonableneſs* of this act of *Gods Providence*, in permitting our *Liturgy* to be thus *defamed*, though in all reaſon the *Liturgy* it ſelf *deſerve* not that fate, the *no-inconveniences* ſo much as pretended to ariſe from our *Liturgy*, to which the *Directory* is not much more liable, the *no-objection* from the

The Concluſion.

word of God against the whole or any part of it produced, or offered by you, the no manner of the least or loosest kind of *necessity* to abolish it, the perfect *justifiableness*, and withal *usefulness of set forms* above extemporary effusions, the very many particulars of eminent *benefit* to the Church, and of *authority* in it, preserved in our *Liturgy*, but in the *Directory* totally omitted, and that in despight of all *Statutes* both of *King Edward* and *Queen Elizabeth*, by which the *Reformation* of this Church is *established* among us, and I trust shall still continue, notwithstanding the opposition of those who *pretended kindness*, but now run riot against this *reformation*; we have shewed you also the true grounds of our *ancestors rejoycing* in our Liturgy, instead of the partial imperfect account given of that business by your *Preface*; the wonderful *prosperity* of this Church under it, contrary to the pretended *sad experience*, &c. and withal we have made it clear, that all the exceptions here proposed against the *Liturgy*, are perfectly vain and causless; as *that it hath prov'd an offence*, &c. the ordinary crime *charg'd* on those actions that are *lyable* to no other, and so that *offence without a cause*; *that this offence hath been by the length of the service*, which will only offend the prophane, and withal, is as observable in your Service; *by the many unprofitable burthensome Ceremonies*, which have been shewed, neither to be *many*, nor *unprofitable*, nor *burthensome*; *by the disquieting of Consciences*, *i.e.* only of the *unquiet*; *by depriving them of the Ordinance*, *i.e.* those who would rather lose the *Sacrament* than receive it *kneeling*, or reverently; *that the offence was extended to the Reformed Churches abroad also*, and yet for that no one proof offered, nor Church named that was so *offended*: and if there were, yet still this supposed *offensiveness*, no just plea for any thing but *Reformation*. So also *that by means of the Liturgy*, *many were debarred of the exercise of their Ministry*, the suggestion for the most part a meer calumny, and that which was true in it, ready to be retorted upon these Reformers; *that the Prelates have labour'd to raise the estimation of the Liturgy too high*, yet that no higher than you would the value of your *Directory*, to have it the rule for the manner of publick worship, or if they did; that is the fault of those *Prelates* not of the *Liturgy*; who yet were said but to have *labour'd* it neither, not to have *effected* it, and even that labour or desire of theirs, to have amounted no higher, than *Calvins* Letter to the *Protector* would avow; *that this hath been to the justling out of Preaching*, which is rather a special help to it, and prescribes it, and allows it its proper place, but hath oft the ill luck to be turn'd out by Preaching; *that it hath been made no better than an Idol*, which if it be a fault in the *Liturgy*, is far more chargeable on the *hearing* of Sermons; *that the people please themselves in their presence, and lip-labour in that service*; an uncharitable judging of mens hearts, and a crime to which your *Directory* makes men as lyable as the *Liturgy*; *that our Liturgy is a compliance with Papists*, *and so a means to confirm them in their Idolatry*, *&c.* whereas it complies with them in nothing that is *Idolatrous*, *&c.* and by complying with them, where they do with antiquity and truth, it is more apt to convince them of their errors, and by *charity* to invite, than by *defiance*; *that it makes an idle Ministry*; which sure the *Directory* will not unmake, being as fit for that turn, either by forming and conning the Prayer there delineated, or by depending on present conceptions, as the Liturgy can be; *that it hinders the gift of Prayer*, which if it signifie the elocution, or conception of words in Prayer, is not peculiar to the Minister, and for any thing else, hindring it no more than the *Directory* doth; *that the continuance of it would be matter of endless strife*, *&c.* which sure 'tis more reasonable to think of an introduction of a *new* way of Service, than the retaining of the *old*; *that there be many other weighty considerations*, *and many particulars in the book*, *on which this condemnation is grounded*, and yet not one of these mention'd, but kept to *boyl* in their own breasts, if there be any, or which is more likely, falsly here pretended to *inflame* the reckoning; *that they are not mov'd to this by any love of novelty*, and yet do that which is most *novel*; *that they intend not to disparage the Reformers*, and yet do that which is most to their *disparagement*; *that they do this to answer Gods providence*, which never call'd them to this work; *to satisfie their own conscience*, which if Erroneous, must not thus be satisfied; *to satisfie the expectation of other Churches*, which expect it not, or if they did, might rather conform to and *satisfy* us; *and the desires of many of the Godly at home*, whose piety is no assurance that their desires are reasonable, and yet are not known to have expresst any such desires; *that they may give testimony of their endeavours for uniformity*, whereas with other Churches, there is no such necessity of *conforming* in such matters, and within our selves, nothing is so contrary to uniformity, as this *endeavour*. And Lastly, we have learnt from them a rule by which they pretend to form their *Directory*, the agreeableness to *the Word of God and Christian prudence*, and are more confident to justify our *Liturgy* by that rule, against all disputers in the World; And having now over and above all this, a plain confession under their own hands, in their *Supply of Prayer*, to justify all that we pretend to, and so being saved the pains of any farther superfluous confutation, we shall now leave it to the judgment of any rational Lay-man in the *New Assembly*, to judge betwixt us and his fellow-members; whose pretensions are most moderate in this matter, whose most like Christian, those that are to rescue and preserve, or those which to destroy. Thus in the *Council of Nice*, holden before *Constantine* and *Helena*, in a controversy of great importance, *Craton* and *Zenosimus*, not only *Lay-men* but *Heathens* were appointed Judges or Arbitrators, only on this ground, because *Craton* a Philosopher would not possess any worldly goods, and *Zenosimus* in time of his Consulship, never received present from any, saith *Jacobotius*: thus also *Eutropius* a *Pagan Philosopher*, was chosen umpire between *Origen* and the *Marcionites*, it being supposed, that such an one was as fit to understand their several claims, and judge according to Allegations and proofs as any; And if we fall or miscarry before such an *Aristarchus*, I shall then resolve, that a *Covenant* may *wast* a soul, even drive the man into the *field* with *Nebuchadnezzar*) deprive it of those *κοιναὶ ἔννοιαι*, common principles of discourse, (by which, 'till it be debauched, it is *ἀληθείας κριτικὴ*, *able*, in some measure, *to judge of truth*, proposed and debated before it) and then I shall hope for more candor in the business from an *intelligent heathen*, than from him. My only appeal in that case shall be to Heaven, that the Host of Angels, may by the Lord of that Host be appointed, to guard and assist that cause, and those Armies whose pretensions in this, and all other particulars, are most righteous, and most acceptable in his sight.

De Concil. l. 2. c. 6.

Al. Aphrod. in Top.

Do not err my beloved Brethren.

Now the Lord of all mercies, and God of love and peace, grant us to be like minded in all things, that we may joyn with one heart, and tongue, to praise him, and worship him, to bless him, and to magnifie him for ever.

FINIS.

CON-

CONSIDERATIONS

OF

Present use, concerning the danger resulting from the change of our

Church-Government.

TO him that being satisfied in judgment of the *lawfulness* of *Episcopal Government*, doth yet conceive that the parting with it is no *change* of *Religion*, and consequently, that the standing for it at this time, when it is opposed, is but the preferring the interests of some considerable men before the convenience and common wishes of all, I earnestly desire (in the bowels of compassion to my bleeding Country, and from a sincere passionate wish that the *cure* of this dangerous wound may not be a *palliate imperfect cure*) to present some few sad considerations, which I shall cast under two heads (proportionable to the two parts of the former ungrounded suggestion;) the one, *That parting with the present Government is no change of Religion*; the other, *That standing for it at this time, is the preferring the interest of some before the common wish of all*, the peace of this Nation.

Concerning the former, I offer to consideration, First, whether the *Government* of the Church be not a considerable part of *Religion*? That it is so, I shall make appear by these reasons. 1. That *Government* is as necessary to the *preservation* of the Church, as *Preaching* the Gospel was to the *plantation* of it, and that therefore it was always the Apostles practice, assoon as ever they had converted a City or Province, or any considerable number of men in it, to leave it in the hands of some faithful persons, to *dress*, and *tend*, and *water*, what they had thus *planted*; and therefore though it be *possible* for a *Christian* to be deprived of this benefit, and yet to remain *Christian* (as to *want* some limbs, or to *abound* to monstrosity in others, is yet reconcileable with *life* and *being* of a man) to retain the *doctrine* of Christianity without any *Government*, to be a Christian in the Wall or in the Wilderness, a *Stylita* or *Anachorite* Christian (in which case there is no doubt the *use* of the very *Sacraments*, instituted by Christ himself, would not be *necessary* to *Christianity*) yet would it be little less than fury for any to design or hope the *prosperity* or *duration* of a Church, or visible society of such Christians, without this grand *necessary* (though not of *single being*, yet) of *mutual preservation*, this *principle*, not of *essence* but of *continuance*, without which (it is the learned *Breerewoods* observation from Saint *Augustine*) that the preservation of a *Church* was once by *experience* found to be an *impossible* thing, no other engine being able to repair the want, or supply the *place* of that.

A second reason may be drawn from the concurring *pleas* of all the most distant *pretenders* for the several forms of Government in the *Church*, as well those that have espoused the *Papal*, the *Presbyterial*, the *Independent*, as those which are for the present *English* Form by *the King and his Bishops*, *&c.* all vehemently contending for the necessity of that Government, which they affect in the Church, and none so calm or modest in their claims, as the Assertors of the English Prelacy: which moderation or want of heat, is sure one reason that so many Sons of this Church are now tempted to think Government so *inconsiderable* a thing, and so *extrinsecal* to Christianity; though this thought thus grounded, be a double injustice. 1. In suspecting that *truth*, for want of *asserting*, which is therefore not so vehemently *asserted*, because it is supposed *truth*. 2. Incouraging *heat* and *violence* of disputers (the greatest plague in a Church) by shewing them that the *Eagerest* pretenders shall be most *heeded*, and that *meekness shall not inherit the earth*, though both *David* and *Christ* promised it should.

A third argument may be had from the judgment of our *State*, which hath thought fit to make the *Government* of the Church, matter of one of the *Articles of our Religion*, and so to join in honour the care of it with the care of the *Doctrine*, and to require as strict a *subscription* to the establish'd *Government*, as to the rest of the 39. heads of *Doctrine*, by which you may evidently see, that to change the *Government* is to change the *Doctrine*, and where Doctrine and Government both are changed, can we possibly think the Religion to be the same? I shall add no more *proofs* of this, because I conceive them *unnecessary*; the contrary misapprehension being, as I suppose, not grounded by *Arguments*, but of its own accord arising from an *ἀπειρία*, *an experiment*, which many men, especially *persons of quality*, think they have made, that in their whole lives they never reaped any benefit from *Government*, never received any accession or increase to their spiritual weal from that, as from the *Doctrine* and *Liturgy* of the Church, they acknowledge to have done. To this ground of misprision, as being perhaps the τὸ ἄτοπον τῆς ἀγνοίας, the cause of the whole mistake, it will not be amiss to make some answer.

1. That

1. That many benefits we receive from *Government*, which we do not *viſibly diſcern*, and that therefore when we *diſcern* our ſelves to have received ſome growth, and cannot but know that it was wrought by *means*, we ſhould rather confeſs our want of *ſenſe* or gratitude to the *true means*, than imagine thoſe not to have been the *means*, only becauſe we have not that *ſenſe* of them.

2. That thoſe means which have been more *viſible* to us, the diſpenſation of the Word and Sacraments, have been reacht out to us by the hand of *Government*, to which therefore we owe our acknowledgments in the ſecond place for our *preſervation* and *growth*, as to the hand of ſupreme providence for our *being* or *life* ſpiritual.

3. That if the *benefits of Government* have not been really very *diſcernible* and *notable to all*, that is not yet in any juſtice to be imputed to any *defect* that way in Government it ſelf, to any *barrenneſs* in the nature or particular temper of it, but to ſome *default* (which will deſerve obſerving and reforming) in the *Perſons*, either of the *Rulers*, or of *thoſe* which are *under rule*, or of a third ſort whoſe duty it is to be the Rulers *Perſpectives* and *Otacouſticks*, to preſent to their knowledge, the wants of Inferiours, which till they are *known*, are not likely to be *repaired*. The defaults in each of theſe ſeverals are, or may be, ſo many, and ſo obvious to common obſervation, that it will be much more reaſonable for each to reſolve to *amend* his part for the future, and ſo to make it a buſineſs of *Reformation*, than to charge the defaults of perſons to the deſaming of Government, and ſo to *undervalue* and *ſcorn* what our ſins firſt, then our phanſies have *defamed*.

The comfort is, that it hath been the *clemency*, as well as the *ſloth* or *cowardiſe* of Governours, which have deprived men of the great fruits of Government; and if it may be agreed that it is very expedient, and will be taken in good part, that Governours hereafter be more *ſevere*, as well as more *diligent*, more *couragious*, as well as more *laborious*, in uſing the *Weapons of their warfare*, to *cut* off or to *cure*, without any reſpect of perſons, whereſoever there is need of them; I ſhall hope this Objection will *then* be throughly anſwered, if as *yet* it be not.

A ſecond conſideration apportioned to the former head will be this, whether (ſuppoſing Government of the Church to be a conſiderable part of Religion) the change of it from eſtabliſhed Epiſcopacy to any other (namely to that of *Presbyterie* by many, without any *Superiour* over them, or as that is oppoſite to *Epiſcopacy*) be not a ſin againſt *Religion*? That it is, or will be ſo, I ſhall endeavour to convince the *gainſayer* by theſe ſteps or degrees of proof, which though perhaps not each ſingle, yet all being put together, will, I believe, where *prejudice* doth not hinder, be ſufficient to do it.

1. Becauſe this Government by *Biſhops*, ſuperiour to *Presbyters*, is of *Apoſtolical inſtitution*. But this being an affirmation, as demonſtrable by Eccleſiaſtical Records, as any thing can be, or as the Canon of Scripture which we receive, is demonſtrated to be the Canon of Scripture, and in regard it hath by others been ſufficiently proved, I ſhall therefore wholly ſpare the repeating of that trouble, and add unto it, 2. That it hath the *example*, though not the diſtinct precept of Chriſt, who with his twelve *Apoſtles*, and the many other *Diſciples* in time of his reſidence upon Earth, ſuperiour one to the other, are the Copy, of which the *Biſhops*, *Presbyters* and *Deacons* in the following age were a tranſcript, who are therefore by Saint *Ignatius*, Saint *Johns Contemporary*, allowed to receive honour, the *Biſhops* as *Chriſt*, the *Presbyters* as the *Apoſtles*, the *Deacons* as the *Seventy*. 3. That as far as concerns *ſuperiority* of one order to the other (which is ſufficient to eject the Presbytery which ſuppoſes an ἰσοτιμία, or *equality* of all) it is authorized by ſacred Scripture-practice, where it appears, that when *Judas* fell from his orb of motion, the *dignity* of being one of the twelve, is by the direction of the Spirit, and by lot beſtowed upon *Matthias*, who, though before a Diſciple of Chriſt, was not till then aſſumed to that *dignity*. Fourthly, that ſuppoſing it to be in this manner *Apoſtolical*, there is little colour of reaſon to doubt, but that the preſerving of it is of as great moment as many *doctrines* of Chriſtianity, not only becauſe many *doctrines* were not ſo *explicitely* delivered by Chriſt, but that they needed farther *explicating* by the *Apoſtles*, (and are therefore by the Church grounded not in any words of the *Goſpel*, but in the *Epiſtles* of the *Apoſtles*) but alſo becauſe it was in Gods *providence* thought fit that *Government* ſhould be ſetled not by *Chriſt perſonally*, but by the *Apoſtles*, that is, *mediately* by Chriſt, as doctrine was by Chriſt *immediately*. Chriſt in his life-time gives them the ground of a Church, divine truth, the *word of his Father*, the acknowledgment of which is *the Rock on which his Church is built*; on this the Apoſtles are to build, and gather members, and to ſettle the whole edifice κατὰ τάξιν, or *ordinately*; and that they may not err in that work, the *Holy Ghoſt* is promiſed to *deſcend* upon them, and Chriſt by that power of his to be with them in eminent manner, εἰς συντέλειαν τοῦ αἰῶνος, *to the end of the world*. And *Government* being neceſſary to this ſetling, was undoubtedly thus referred and left to them by *Chriſt*, and ſo their authority in inſtituting that which they inſtituted, as evidently deduced from *Chriſt*, as their power of *preaching* what they preached, or *baptizing* whom they baptized. And having gone thus far, I cannot but reſume my *conſideration* thus far made more *conſiderable*, and appeal to any ſober conſcience, whether it be not ſome irreligion, thus to diſplace or remove that which the Apoſtles (to whom only by Chriſt it was intruſted) according to Chriſts own Samplar and Scripture-grounds, thought fit to ſettle in the Church, ſuppoſing it to be a matter of Religion which is ſpoken of, as before we proved; nay, whether if an *Angel from Heaven* were to be *anathematized for teaching any other doctrine than what* an Apoſtle had taught, it would not be matter of juſt *terrour* to any that ſhould have any part in the guilt of inſtituting any other Government than that which the Apoſtles had inſtituted, eſpecially when the acts of *Councils* tell us, that what St. *Paul* denounces againſt the *heterodox* Angel, the Church did practiſe againſt *Aerius*, anathematized him for impugning this Government, which now we ſpeak of. And if ſtill the Authority of all this be blemiſht by this one *exception*, that this inſtitution of the Apoſtles is not affirmed in *Scripture*, or there commanded to poſterity to *continue*, and retain for ever;

Acts 1.

To this I anſwer, by ſaying that which may be a fourth Argument to prove the irreligiouſneſs of ſuch change, That there is as much, or more to be ſaid (in both thoſe reſpects, both for *mention*

of

of this *inſtitution in Scripture*, and for *Apoſtolical precept for continuing* of it) for this *Government*, as for ſome other things whoſe change would be acknowledged very irreligious. I will only inſtance in one, the inſtitution of the *Lords day*, of which there is nothing can be ſaid to the ſetting up the *Authority* and *immutability* of it, which will not be ſaid of *Epiſcopacy*. A *ground* of it there was *in nature*, ſome *Time* to be ſet apart to the ſpecial publick ſervice of God; and the like *ground* there is *in nature* for this, that ſome *Perſons* ſhould be deſigned to, and rewarded for the ſpecial publick ſervice of God. A *pattern* of that there was among the *Jews*, one day in the ſeven deſigned for Gods *Quotum* or portion; the like *pattern* there is among the *Jews* for this; a Government by *High-Prieſts*, *Prieſts* and *Levites*. That was an inſtitution not of *Chriſt* in his life-time immediately, but of the *Apoſtles*, after his departure inveſted with ſuch power; the like inſtitution there is of this by the ſame *Apoſtles* after Chriſts aſcenſion, directed and aſſiſted by the *Holy Ghoſt*. The *occaſion* of pitching on the firſt day of the week, was a ſolemn action of Chriſt his *Reſurrection* on that day; the *occaſion* of this, the ſeveral diſtinct orders in the Church in Chriſts time, *Chriſt*, *Apoſtles*, *Diſciples*, and the manifeſt ſuperiority of him before all of them (who affirms himſelf their *Lord*, even when he ſpeaks of his office miniſterial, his *coming to Miniſter to them*) and of the *Apoſtles* before the *Diſciples*, as even now was ſhewed. The mention of that was found once in the *Revelation* diſtinctly, κυριακὴ, *the Lords day*, and twice or thrice in equipollent terms, *the firſt day of the week*; and the mention of Epiſcopacy is as clear, *the Angel of the Church of Epheſus*, &c. in the *Revelation* (which hath been cleared by irrefragable evidence to belong to this matter) and the *Ruling Elder* in Saint *Paul*, that muſt have *double honour*, and *Titus left in Crete to ſet in order the things that were wanting, and to ordain Elders in every Church*; and many other more clear mentions of the ſeveral titles and offices of *Biſhop*, *Presbyter*, and *Deacon*, than there is of the name and duties of the *Lords day*. The *obſcure mentions* of that in the Scripture were *explained* in the Writings and Stories of the firſt age of the Church, particularly in the *Epiſtles* of *Ignatius*; and the *obſcurities* of the ſacred Texts concerning *Epiſcopacy*, are as clearly *explicated* and unfolded by the ſame *Ignatius*, even in every one of thoſe *Epiſtles* of his which *Vedelius* (as great an enemy of this Order as *Geneva* hath produced any) after his *fiery trial* of that Author hath acknowledged to be his. *The uſe* of that continued from the *Apoſtles* time (though not univerſally till the *Jewiſh Sabbath* was fairly laid aſleep) till theſe days in the *univerſal Church*, and all *particular Churches*, that we read of; and the like uſe and practice of this continued *univerſally* without any exception from the *Apoſtles* time, till this day in the *univerſal Church*, as that ſignifies the *Eaſtern* and the *Weſtern* Church, and in each particular Church, till about this laſt *Century*, and in this of ours from the plantation of the Goſpel till this day. Theſe are parallels enough to even the ballance (and I profeſs to know no one more, which might weigh it down on that ſide) and to make it now ſeaſonable to demand, whether it would not be thought an act contrary to Religion (whether that ſignifies Chriſtian *Piety*, or *meekneſs*, or *awe*, to all that is *Sacred*) for any particular national Church, or part thereof, without any more warrant than is now offered for this preſent change, to remove the ſervice of God from the *Lords day* to any other day in the week, (which ſure is as ſmall a difference, as that betwixt *Presbyterial* and *Epiſcopal* Government can by any be conceived to be) or inſtead of our *firſt day* of the week, to ſet apart either an *eighth* or a *ſixth* day, and ſo to change that *Apoſtolical inſtitution*. If *that* ſeem ſtrange, or be ſtartled at, as unfit to be ventured on, or yielded to, I ſhall deſire the ſame plea may be entred for *this*, and that conſcience may be ſecured, that either both are lawful, or that the difference is clear, and the advantage on the *Lords days* ſide, or that it may be reſolved that *this* is unlawful as well as *that*.

A fifth Argument will be this, That the making (or yielding to) this change will be a ſcandal (very worthy to be conſidered) in them that ſo *yield*, toward thoſe which *oppoſe* this Government as unlawful; for this yielding will be an appearing acknowledgment, that their contrary pretenſions are true, and ſo a confirming them in their *error* (which is no light one, but the ſame for which *Aerius* was, and any another oppoſer would certainly have been anathematized, and turned out of the *Catholick* Church for an *Heretick*,) which is one ſpecial kind of *Scandalizing*, or occaſioning the fall of our Brethren, and withal a nouriſhing them in their *uncharitable opinion*, not only of us, but of the ancient Fathers of the Church (who were all *Antichriſtian* if this be ſo) which is another *cauſing my Brother to offend*: nay, a kind of countenancing that *unchriſtian* (I am ſure *unproteſtant*) *Doctrine*, of the lawfulneſs of *taking up Arms*, againſt lawful Superiours and eſtabliſh'd Laws, and propagating our opinions in Religion by that means, which perchance ſome may be betrayed to by this *example*, others brought to believe conſentaneous to *Proteſtant Doctrine*, if they which are thus guilty be thus gratified; which as it were a *change* in our *Doctrine*, if it were *really acknowledged*, ſo is it, in this reſpect, another act of *Scandal*, if it thus *appear* to be *acknowledged*, and that which would make any Heathen Prince unwilling to embrace our Religion, if this diſloyal perſwaſion were conceived to be a part of it.

A ſixth Argument (which to me is of no ſmall force) I will yet but name, and refer it to others to conſider of, That no man is a *Prieſt*, or lawfully ordained Miniſter of any Chriſtian Church, but he that is *called* and *ſent* by *God*; that there is now no way in this Kingdom, to have that *calling* or *miſſion* duly, but from *Biſhops*, who are the only perſons who have their power of Ordaining others, *given* to them in their aſſumption to that Order, by thoſe who had it before, and can derive it from the *Apoſtles*, who had it *immediately* from *Heaven*: and whatſoever other power a *Prieſt*, or *Presbyter*, may be thought or ſaid to have common with a *Biſhop*, it is yet the conſtant judgment of the univerſal Church, for 1500. years, that this of Ordination is not competible to one or more *bare Presbyters* without a *Biſhop*, and it will be eaſie to ſatisfie any reaſonable man in whatſoever may be produced of ſound, or probability to the contrary: and therefore if any Office, or Order, or Miniſtry in the Church be conſiderable, this which is the ſtanding well-head and ſpring of all the other, muſt be thought ſo alſo.

Having premiſed theſe Arguments of ſo much weight, ſufficient to ſupport the burthen deſigned to them, I ſhall add, *ex abundanti*, ſome inferiour ones (though they amount not ſo far, as alone

of

of themſelves to conclude it direct irreligion, yet to add to the former heap ſome aggravations. As,

1. That to yield to this change, is to *diſclaim* thoſe bleſſed means of Gods *providence* which brought us to our *Baptiſm*, to all our ſpiritual life and growth that we have attained to; and that is a great ingratitude to that Government.

2. It is an act of *pride* and *inſolency*, to prefer any ſcheme of *humane* and *modern* invention before that which the *Apoſtles*, the *Primitive*, and (for ſo many years) the *Univerſal Church* had authorized; and therefore I could almoſt adventure to believe, that the framers of the *Covenant* had obliged themſelves ſecretly to maintain Epiſcopacy by putting in thoſe words [*the beſt Reformed Churches*] that I might eſcape thinking them ſo *inſolent* as to prefer any Churches before thoſe which they cannot but know have uſed *Epiſcopacy*.

3. It is a great *tempting of Gods providence*, in not being contented with that Form which hath proſpered ſo happily with us, and the whole Chriſtian World, though ſubject (as all that is humane, or mixt with fleſh, is; even the very *grace* of God in us) to be abuſed, and putting it to the adventure, whatſoever inconveniences the next may be ſubject to. Of the *inconveniences* that Presbytery doth infallibly bring along with it, and the *unreconcileableneſs* of them with *Monarchical Government* in the State, ſufficient evidences have been given; and if there were no other but this, that the endeavouring to bring it in at this time, hath brought this tempeſt and *συσμὸς* upon this Kingdom, and that this hath been but the general conſequent of that Government whereſoever it hath but begun to heave, caſting out Peace, and obedience to lawful authority together, it would well deſerve to have this mark of reprobation or non-election ſet upon it, if it were but for this, that the proſperity of ſuch attempts ſhould not encourage others to the like. This and the like inconveniences are of ſuch weight, that for men to be willing to exchange the *certain* benefits of the one, for the *uncertain* advantages and ſtrongly-probable calamities of the other, is a ſin that may *provoke* and *tempt* God to puniſh them yet further with greater and unexpected curſes, and therefore may deſerve in its place to be conſidered.

4. It is an Act of *infidelity* and practical *Atheiſm* (for thoſe eſpecially who being convinced with the former reaſons to acknowledge any irreligion or ſin in ſuch change) to ſacrifice any thing to our own preſent conveniences, to make any change in ſacred matters, meerly out of intuition of our own ſecular advantages; *Atheiſm*, in thinking that God cannot as eaſily blaſt that convenience ſo acquired, as thoſe many which came more directly to our hands; and *infidelity*, or *diſtruſt*, in thinking that God will not in his time give thoſe conveniences and advantages (if they be ſuch indeed) by means perfectly *lawful*, which now we covet by *unlawful*. To which might be added the wants and omiſſions of thoſe duties of *confeſſion of Chriſt*, in not defending and ſtanding to thoſe truths which we are convinced to be ſuch, in time of their being oppugned and perſecuted; *ſelf-denial*, in not depoſiting our own carnal ſecular aims and intereſts, and *of taking up the Croſs*, in not ſuffering willingly and chearfully when it lies in our way to the performing of any act of obedience to Chriſt. But I would not inlarge to theſe, but only conclude this proof with a fifth *difficulty* of ſeparating *ſin* from *changes*, when they are great, and in matters of weight. It is the wiſe mans advice that occaſioned this obſervation; *My Son, fear thou the Lord and the King, and meddle not with them which are given to changes:* The changes are ſure changes in Government, and thoſe are named indefinitely, without any *reſtraint*, and the *medling* with them *that are inclined to* ſuch, is oppoſed both to Piety and Loyalty, *Fearing of God and the King*.

I have done with the conſiderations proportioned to the firſt part of the ſuggeſtion, I proceed to the view of the ſecond part of it, and there the conſideration ſhall be only this, whether,

The change of this Government, be not a *common intereſt of all*, as well as of thoſe who are *now Clergy-men*. That it is ſo, may appear probable, becauſe the *revenue or honours* which belong to them in Government are not the ſole, or main part of *Government*; there is a *weight* and *office*, which our fore-fathers thought worthy to be *encouraged* and *rewarded* with thoſe payments, and if any man ſhall think them ill proportioned, I ſhall not doubt to tell him Saint *Chryſoſtomes* judgment, *that the burthen of a Biſhop was formidable, even to an Angel to undergo*, and if the corruption of latter times be affirmed to have changed that ſtate of things, I anſwer, That the reſtoring Epiſcopacy to its due *burthen* as well as *reputation*, were a care worthy of Reformers, and it is ſo far from my deſire that any ſuch care ſhould be ſpared, that it is now my publick ſolemn Petition both to God and man, that the *power of the Keys*, and the exerciſe of that Power, the due uſe of *Confirmation*, and (previous to that) examination, and tryal of youth, a ſtrict ſearch into the manners and tempers, and ſufficiencies of thoſe that are to be admitted into holy *Orders*, and to be licentiate for *publick Preachers*, the *viſitation* of each Pariſh in each Dioceſs, and the exerciſe of Church-diſcipline upon all offenders; together with *painful*, mature and ſober *Preaching* and *Catechiſing*, ſtudies of all kinds, and parts of Theological Learning, Languages, Controverſies, Writings of the Schools and Caſuiſts, *&c.* be ſo far taken into conſideration by our Law-makers, and ſo far conſidered in the collating of Church-preferments, and dignities, ſo much of Duty required of Clergy-men, and ſo little left *arbitrary* or *at large*, that every Church-*preferment* in this Kingdom may have ſuch a due *burthen* annexed to it, that no *ignorant* perſon ſhould be *able*, no *lazy* or *luxurious* perſon *willing* or *forward* to undergo it. And if this might be thus deſigned, I ſhould then reſolve, that the direct contrary to the fore-mentioned ſuggeſtions would be truth, that the ſetling and continuing of this preſent *Government* would prove the *common intereſt* of all, and only the *Burthen* of thoſe *few* that have thoſe painful offices aſſigned them; and leſt any man think this word a *boaſt* (which I can ſafely venture with the World at this time, and not have reaſon to fear a *ſurpriſal*, or being taken at my word) I ſhall venture another offer in the name of my Brethren of the Clergy; (not that I have took their particular Votes, but that I perſwade my ſelf ſo far of their Piety,) That rather than the *Glory* ſhould thus *depart from Iſrael*, by the Philiſtims *taking the Ark of the Lord*, laying waſte this flouriſhing Church of ours, or transforming it into a new guiſe, every one ſingle of us, that have any poſſeſſions or titles worthy any mans envy or rapine, and ſo are thought now by our own intereſts

to

to have been bribed or fee'd Advocates in this cauſe, may forthwith be deprived of all that part of the Revenues of the Church, wherein we are legally inveſted; and he that ſhall not chearfully reſign his part in the *preſent* proſperity of the Church, on the meer contemplation and intuition of the *benefit* that may now, and *after his life*, redound to *others*, let him have the guilt of *Achans wedge* laid on him, and the charge of being diſturber of the State. I hope we have *learnt* to *want as well as to abound*, and to truſt God (that can *feed* the *young Ravens* when the old have expoſed them) for the feeding of us, and our Families, though all our preſent means of doing it were taken from us. If this may ſerve turn to ſatisfie the *thirſt* of thoſe that *gape*, and the ſuſpicions of thoſe that *look unkindly* on us, we offer to free you from all blame of *Sacriledge*, or *oppreſſion*, or *injuſtice* (from one of which, no other means imaginable can free a *change* of Government) by our own voluntary *Ceſſion* or *reſignation*, as far as our perſonal intereſts reach: and ſhall think the peace of this State, and continued proſperity of this Church, a moſt *glorious* purchaſe, moſt *cheaply* bought, if it be had upon ſuch terms as theſe. And if the Function it ſelf, with the neceſſary adjuncts to it, be not ſwept away in the calamity, we ſhall be perfectly pleaſed whatſoever befal our *Perſons*, and deſire, that trial may be made of the *Ingenuity* of Clergy-men, whether they have not thus far *profited* under *Gods rod*, as to be willing to yield to any poſſible propoſition (which will bring no guilt of ſin upon our conſciences) toward the averting the judgments of Heaven, which are now (I wiſh I might ſay *for our ſins only*) moſt ſadly multiplyed upon this Land.

FINIS.

OF THE

POWER

OF THE

KEYES:

OR OF

Binding and Looſing.

---

1 Cor. 11. 31.

Εἰ ἑαυτοὺς διεκρίνομεν οὐκ ἂν ἐκρινόμεθα.

THE

PREFACE.

THAT *the prime Act of Power enſtated by* Chriſt *on his* Apoſtles, *as for the* governing *of the* Church, *(and exorciſing or baniſhing all devils out of it) ſo for the effectual performing that great act of Charity to mens ſouls, reducing pertinacious ſinners to* repentance, *ſhould be ſo either wholly dilapidated, or piteouſly deformed, as to continue in the* Church *only under one of theſe two notions, either of an empty piece of* formality, *or of an* engine of State, *and ſecular contrivance, (the true* Chriſtian *uſe of* ſhaming *ſinners into reformation, being well-nigh vaniſhed out of* Chriſtendom) *might by an alien, or an heathen, much more by the pondering* Chriſtian, *be conceived very ſtrange and unreaſonable, were it not a little clear, that we are faln into thoſe times of which it was foretold by two* Apoſtles, *that in* theſe laſt days, there ſhould come ſcoffers, walking after their own luſts: *the* Pride *and contumacy (which have almoſt become the* Genius) *of this profane polluted age, heightning men to an* Atheiſtical *fearleſs* ſcoffing *and ſcorning of all that pretends to work any cures, to lay any reſtraint on them, to rob them of any degree of that licentiouſneſs, which is become the very religion, and doctrine of ſome (under the diſguiſe of* Chriſtian liberty) *and* (the Lord be merciful unto us) *the* practice *of moſt ranks of* Chriſtian Profeſſors. *This is the more ſad and wounding a conſideration, becauſe it was antiently reſolved, that* Chriſtianity *where ever it entred in its purity, did plant all manner of exact and ſtrict conſcientious walking, all* humility, meekneſs, purity, peaceableneſs, juſtice, charity, ſobriety, *imaginable; that* wickedneſs *and diſſolution of manners was to be lookt on, as the only hereſie, (and therefore* Simon Magus, *the* Nicolaitans, *and* Gnoſticks, *with other their neareſt followers, that led the* Van *of* hereticks *in* Epiphanius, *are notoriouſly known to have been perſons of the moſt vitious debauched, libidinous lives) and* good life *revered as the only* orthodox profeſſor; *from whence (as nothing can be more conſequent, ſo) I ſhall deſign to infer no farther concluſion, than only this, that they which live ill in the profeſſion of a* moſt holy faith, *(or farther than ſo, embrace and diſſeminate doctrines which tend to the diſſolution of mens lives, making the* good ſpirit *of* God *the* author *or* cheriſher *of any of their unchriſtian enterprizes) but eſpecially they that diſcharge and baniſh out of the Church thoſe means which might help to make the generality of* Chriſtians *better, have the ſpirit of* Antichriſt *working in them, even when they think themſelves moſt zealouſly buſied in the beating down his kingdom. What thoſe* means *are which might moſt effectually tend to the amending the lives of* Chriſtians, *I ſhall need no farther to interpoſe my judgment, than* 1. *by ſubmitting it to* Chriſts, *who put the* Keys *into the* Apoſtles *hands, on purpoſe as a means to exemplifie the end of his coming,* Σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός, *Matt.* 18. 11. to ſave that which was loſt, *not to* uſurp *authority over the temporal power or ſword, and like an* apoplectick palſie-fit, ἐκπλήττειν ἢ παραλύειν, *to* invade, *or* ſmite, *or* diſſolve *the ſinews of civil government or peace, ('tis a moſt ſacred truth, that the* ſpiritual *hand hath no manner of* juriſdiction, *nor was ever believed to have for the firſt* 1100 *years, over* Princes *in their temporals, and the compoſition of the* Anglican *Church moſt perfectly, I had almoſt ſaid, peculiarly acknowledges it) nor again to give an office of* ſplendor *or grandeur to the Clergy, an authority valuable only from the ability of hurting others, or magnifying our ſelves over them, (which where it is pretended to, is indeed ſomewhat of the making of the heathen* ἄρχοντες *and* κατακυριεύοντες, *that* lorded *it over Gods heritage, ſerved themſelves, either their* purſes, *or their* ambitions, *or their* paſſions *out of the ſubjects under them) but as Chriſt ſaith* διακονεῖν, ἢ διακονηθῆναι, *to* adminiſter *charitably to them in the matters of the higheſt alloy, the divineſt, valuableſt charity of* not ſuffering ſin upon the brother, *Levit.* 19. *And* 2. *by minding my ſelf and others, what the* Apoſtles *ſay of this power, that* it was given them πρὸς οἰκοδομήν, to build up the Church of Chriſt *by it in general, and in particular* παιδεύειν, *to* diſcipline them, *whom no fairer means would work on, and* teach them *not* to blaſpheme *in words or actions, to work them off from all lees of ſpeculative, but eſpecially of practical Atheiſm. That theſe are the* [not weak or carnal weapons of the Churches warfare, but mighty to bring down every ſtrong hold] *i. e. the moſt contumacious, ſtout, impenitent ſinner, that doth but acknowledge the truth of the* Goſpel, *I ſhall anon have leiſure*

to ſhew you. In the mean, the only deſign of this Præloquium *is, to awaken, (if it be poſſible) the drowſie world, and quicken them ſo far from the mortified, putrefied ſtate of ſin and ſtupidity, as to be willing but to hearken to* Chriſt *himſelf, when he comes but on a meſſage of mercy to them, to* redeem them from iniquity, and purifie to himſelf a poſſeſſed purchaſed people (*or the people which he had purchaſed for that one end that they might be*) zealous of good works. *If this general propoſal, (ſo pertinaciouſly decryed by our actions) might once be thought worth the hearing, then ſure* Chriſts *peculiar way and method of working this cure would be thought of ſome uſe, and advantage alſo; not lookt on as a meer engine, or artifice of ambitious men, as they cannot be blamed to conceive it, who think it doth any way entrench on thoſe regalities which are placed by* God, *I moſt willingly profeſs to believe, far above the reach of any humane authority,* ſolo Deo minores, *or elſe ſuppoſe it a tyrannizing, or triumphing over the moſt inferiour offender, (he that can take any* carnal *or* ſenſual *pleaſure in the exerciſe of thoſe* Keys, *in the uſing that ſharp engine of ſurgery, or ever draw it but in meer neceſſary charity, (to* edification, *and* not to deſtruction) *as one of the* בני רמים *ſons of blood, not fit to be admitted on a common* Jury, *much leſs advanced to be a ſpiritual* Judge) *but as a moſt ſovereign medicinal* Recipe, *that which hath the inſcription of* Chriſt *on it; not as of a* Lord, *but as a* Jeſus; *not as a* Law-giver, *but as a* σωτὴρ *and* ἰατρὸς, *a* Saviour *and a* Phyſician *of ſouls. And this peculiar way is the power of* binding and looſing, *(the ſubject of this enſuing Diſcourſe) which that it may be reſtored to its full vigor in this* Church *again, and (where-ever ſobriety ſhall adviſe) by addition of* pœnitential Canons *be reformed or regulated, and being put into the* primitive Channel, *may there be permitted to ſhew forth it ſelf in the native purity and brightneſs, and ſo being ordered according to* Gods deſignation, *obtain* Gods bleſſing *to make it effectual to its end, (the almoſt only piece of* reformation *which this* Church *of* England, *as it hath been long, and as yet ſtands eſtabliſhed by* Law, *may juſtly be thought to ſtand in need of) ſhall be the prayer of him, who profeſſes to love and admire the beauty of this Fabrick, even when it lies polluted in its blood, and to wiſh no greater bleſſing to its deareſt* Friends, *or, for whom he daily prays, moſt implacable* enemies, *than (that of old* Bartimæus *for himſelf,* Lord, that they may receive their ſight) *that the* ſcales *may* fall off *from all our eyes, that we may ſee and value what is ſo illuſtriouſly conſpicuous, and eſtimable in it ſelf, and not ſo blear our ſight with the obſervation of the miſcarriages in this kind, as not to diſcern or value the deſignation; which, if the abuſes, and exceſſes, and miſtakes (that have crept in in that matter) were timely diſcerned, and removed, and that which is* Chriſtian *and* Apoſtolical *revived, and reſtored in prudence and ſobriety, might yet again ſhew the world the uſe of that* Prelacy, *which is now ſo zealouſly contemned, and recover at once the* Order, *and the* Eſtimation *of it, ſet more* Saints *on their knees, in petitions for the* reducing *and reſtoring, than ever employed their hands towards the* ſuppreſſing *of it. I ſhall no longer need to detain the Reader in his entrance, having no uſe of any popular* topicks *to court, or get advantage on his affections, but deſiring only to treat with his reaſon (as that is elevated by* Chriſt) *his more noble maſculine faculty, and* 1. *From the inſtitution of* Chriſt *to ſhew him the benefit that will accrue to that better part of him, by continuing within ſubjection to this government: and* 2. *By the peculiarity of the Fabrick of this excellent (yet eſtabliſht)* Church *of* England, *to challenge the moſt ſharp-ſighted oppoſition to ſhew where the due execution of this power according to* Law, *can provoke him to any thing, but* charity *and* gratitude, *both to the* Saviour *that deſigned, and to the* Prelate *that is his* Angel *in conveying this ſeaſonable* mercy *to him; and more generally, where, or in what point of conjunction, or motion, it can any way enterfere, or diſturb the civil intereſt. Which it would be hard to affirm, of any other* national Church in Europe, *which hath any power either of repreſſing Hereticks, or of reforming, or but of* ſhaming *notorious offenders, left in it. The* Lord *grant us unprejudicate honeſt hearts to judge uprightly of it, and every one of us, that* κόσμος πολυτελὴς, precious ornament, 1 *Pet.* 3. 4. (*inſtead of that* πορφύρα τῦ σκότους, *that* bravery of hell *in* Macarius, *that the proud ſinner is ſo well pleaſed with*) *I mean that* meekneſs and quietneſs of ſpirit, *to think ſome others may poſſibly* diſcern *betwixt* good and evil, *as well as our ſelves; and when that prayer is once heard, I ſhall then ſuppoſe that* κρεῖττον *that hath given* Themiſtocles *the* πρωτεῖα *or prehe-minence over his fellows in the* Judgment *of all poſterity, (viz. that every man named him next after himſelf) will certainly end the preſent* Church-controverſie *of theſe ſad times. A* moderate Epiſcopacy, *with a ſtanding aſſiſtant* Presbytery, *(and* * *every of thoſe aſſigned his full task and province of employment alſo) being the only fourth, which as it will certainly ſatisfie the deſires of thoſe whoſe pretenſions are regular and moderate, (having by their ſtudy of learning and* Chriſtianity, *attained to ſome meaſure of that grace which* Ariſtonymus *of old recites among the benefits of* Philoſophy, βιῶσαι ἀρκούμενον τοῖς παροῦσι, τῶν ἀπόντων μὴ ὀρεγόμενον) *craving nothing more, and in many things leſs than the ſtanding Laws of the Land allow them, ſo will it appear to be that which all other parties can beſt tolerate, and which next himſelf, both* Presbyterian *and* Independent, *and* Eraſtian *will make no queſtion to chuſe and prefer before any of the other pretenders.*

Tit. 2. 14.

* Vid. Con. of preſent uſe concerning change of Church-government. p. 16.

This,

This, I conceive, is not by me magiſterially dictated, but already demonſtrated à poſteriori, *by the experience which the few laſt months have yielded us, ſince the pretenſions of the* Prelacy *grew weaker, and of the other three more flattering and hopeful one againſt the other. Where in every turn of the* trembling motion, *that which hath feared moſt to be ſupplanted by either of the other pretenders, hath been content to acknowledge, that their coſt and induſtry in the* eradication *of* Prelacy, *is not likely to be rewarded in this life, but with ſorer preſſures, or more dangerous looſeneſs, than that which formerly they had mourned under: And for a demonſtration* à priori, *I ſuppoſe it ſufficient, if it be but calmly conſidered, that the ſeveral excellencies of the other three, by which they ſet themſelves out amiable and deſirable to admirers or followers,* (*the* Presbyterians ſharpneſs *and ſeverity againſt all ignorance and ſin, the* Independents zeal *againſt* mixt Congregations, *and the* Eraſtians *care that the* civil power *may not be entrencht on, and that they that might receive* benefit *by the Word and Sacraments, ſhould by no means be* interdicted *the uſe of them*) *may all and each of them be found* (*at leaſt, as* in mixture, refracted *and*) *compounded in this fourth: Which to ſhew particularly, would require a length beyond the bounds of this Preface, and on that civility to the Reader, it is now omitted, as alſo that I may not ſeem to have miſtaken the point of the preſent Controverſie; which certainly among the quickeſt ſharpeſt deſigners or managers of it, is not, what are the* uſes *and excellencies of this power, but what the propereſt* ſeat, *who the fitteſt to be intruſted with it.*

One thing yet more there is, which in this matter will deſerve to be conſidered, viz. *the* Conſcience *of* Our Soveraign, *in order both to our* common duty *to Him, and to an honourable and durable peace, toward which how near ſoever we conceive our ſelves advanced by* providence, *we cannot reaſonably expect the ſure bleſſing of* God, *to conſummate and crown our hopes, if we do not,* φιλοτιμεῖσθαι ἡσυχάζειν, *in the* Apoſtles *phraſe, i.e. uſe all the expedients, that any* ambitious *man would employ to the attaining his worldly deſign, I mean, all that prudence will ſuggeſt, and ſober* Chriſtians *conſcience not reject, to the making up a happy compliance with him; in a word, if we do not all by moderate lawful means* love and follow peace, *and* conſider them who have the legal power over us.

O that we would know, at leaſt in this our day, the things belonging to our peace, *before that fatal voice go out,* But now are they hid from our eyes.

OF

OF THE
POWER of the KEYES,
OR OF
Binding and Looſing.

FOR the clear ſtating of this point, there is but one Method ſeaſonable, (becauſe but one *aſteriſm* that hath any *powerful influence* upon it) the conjunction of the ſeveral paſſages in the *New Teſtament* about the *donation* and *exerciſe* of this *power*, For in matters of *Chriſts inſtitution*, which have no foundation in the *Law* of *Nature*, it muſt needs be improper for *reaſon* to interpoſe and aſſert, or define what that accounts moſt agreeable, (for that is to *ſubject* to our tribunal, not the acts of his *juſtice*, which God hath been willing to yield us, *Iſa.*5.3. and *Ezek.* 18. 25. and in them to appeal to our own reaſon; but the acts of his *wiſdom*, (for ſuch are all his inſtitutions) which God will not allow us to judge, or diſpute, *Rom.*9.20.) any farther than by *diſcourſe* to conclude from the *context*, and words of that *inſtitution*, what is moſt agreeable to the importance of thoſe words, and by way of *advice* to *direct* us, to compare our conceits with the doctrines of thoſe, who were neareſt to the times of that *inſtitution*, and might probably know more of it (and be more inſtrumental to us for the deciding any difficulty) than thoſe that being farther removed, look on at that greater diſtance. And therefore, as in the buſineſs of the *Sacrament of the Lords Supper*, the ſureſt courſe to compoſe the Controverſies, and ſatisfie the ſcruples of men in that point, were to reduce it to its *principles*, and to reſolve by conſent to aſſert no more in that point (as matter of faith at leaſt) than might be naturally and infallibly concluded from the places of *Scripture* concerning the *inſtitution*, *uſe* and *nature* of that *Sacrament*, or the *antient primitive* underſtanding of thoſe places, and natural deductions from them (for the reducing of which operation to practice, an attempt hath been made in another place) ſo will it be the moſt probable towardly courſe, I conceive, leaſt ſubject to any dangerous miſtake, to reſolve and obſerve in this buſineſs.

Pract. Cat. l. 6.

CHAP. I.

Sect. 1. AND then the firſt thing obſervable will be, that the three only places to be met with in the *Goſpel* concerning this *inſtitution* (*Matth.* 16. 19. *Matth.* 18. 18. *John* 20. 23.) are no two of them fully parallel to one another, or co-incident; I mean no two of them narrations of the ſame one ſpeech of *Chriſt*, but (as by the occaſion and circumſtances of *time* and *place* it will appear) each delivered by *Chriſt* at a ſeveral time; the firſt *Matth.* 16. 19. was upon occaſion of *Peters confeſſion*) a promiſe of what ſhould be conferred afterwards upon him by way of reward and encouragement [*I will* (not yet *de præſenti*, I do, but *de futuro*, I will) *give thee the Keys*, &c. and then ὃ ἐὰν δήσῃς, *whatſoever thou ſhalt*, &c.] In like manner as *Matth.* 19.28. Thoſe which had parted with all to *follow Chriſt*, and undertook his diſciple-ſhip, are promiſed by way of *reward*, that they ſhall in the παλιγγενεσία (i. e. the *new age*, or *ſtate*, beginning after *Chriſts Reſurrection*) *ſit upon twelve thrones* and *judge*, &c. *i. e.* have every one of them, not *Peter* only, under and after Chriſt, a *juriſdiction* and power in the *Church*, ſomewhat proportionable to that of the ſeveral *Phylarchæ*, or *rulers of the Tribes* among the *Jews*. The ſecond *Mat.* 18. 18. was an exemplifying of that glorious truth, *ver.*11. that Chriſt came σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλὸς, *to ſave that that was loſt*: upon the heels of which bare aſſertion, follows firſt a *Parable*, *v.*12,13,14. (a ſpecial piece of *Chriſts Logick* and *Rhetorick* to prove popularly, and ſo to *perſwade*, and then *v.* 15. the *inſtitution* of a piece of *diſcipline* perpetually to continue in the *Church* of his plantation, as moſt eminently *inſtrumental* to that deſign, *the reducing obſtinate ſinners to repentance*. The conſideration of which one thing, that theſe *Keys*, when *Chriſt* was gone, were to continue imployed on that ſame great work, or deſign, which brought *Chriſt* into the world, *the ſaving of ſuch as were loſt*, will be able to ſet a competent value on this *Inſtitution*, and reſcue it from the contempts and ſcorns, which the impious world is pleaſed to make its portion; very agreeable to that greater *ſtratagem* of Satan, who by complying with our *wiſhes* and

and our *intereſts*, eaſily prevails with vitious men, to believe neither *reſurrection*, nor *judgment to come*; and this, as it is noted by the *Fathers*, the κοινὸν δόγμα καὶ νόμος ἐς ἀκολάστους καὶ λάγνους φιλῶ, *the only beloved doctrine of the effeminate and voluptuous.* The third place *John* 20.23, is apparently part of Chriſts ſpeech to all his *diſciples*, (after his reſurrection, and his having confirm'd them all but *Thomas*, in the truth of it, *v.* 20.) and was a kind of farewel to his *Church*, and an actual *inauguration*, or conſecration of them from diſciples into Apoſtles, as μαθηταὶ diſciples, *v.* 20. and ἀπέσταλκε *ſent*, *v.* 21. put together do import, (and the τοὺς σὺν αὐτοῖς, they that were with them, *Luke* 24. 33. doth not contradict, for there is no mention of theſe words, of *Binding* and *Looſing* in that *Goſpel*, and if there were, it would not follow that the power of *binding* was delivered to that mixt company, any more than the *power from on high* was promiſed to them, *v.* 49. which ſurely belonged only to the *Apoſtles*, as will appear by the words immediately precedent, ὑμεῖς δὲ ἐστε μάρτυρες, being rightly interpreted, [and *be ye witneſſes of theſe things*] i. e. of his death and reſurrection, which we know was peculiarly the office of the *Apoſtles*) which being a ſolemn donation was ſet out by a ſpecial ceremony, *viz.* that of Chriſts *breathing* upon them, a ſignificant one to expreſs the τὸ πνεῦμα, the *eternal breath* or *ſpirit of God*, which he would ſuddenly pour on them, and for it * prepares them by this λάβετε πνεῦμα ἅγιον, *receive the holy Ghoſt*, (which were the words annext to that ceremony, the words of *Conſecration*, the ſame that we now retain in the *Ordination* of a *Prieſt*) *whoſe ſins you do remit*, (or ἂν τινων ἀφῆτε ἁμαρτίας, *if you do remit any mens ſins*) *they are remitted to them, and if you do retain any, they are retained.*

From all which Three thus compared, the firſt general reſult is this, That the power of *binding* and *looſing* is a ſolemn *privilege* or ‖ *Prerogative* of the *Church of Chriſt*, thrice inſiſted on by our *Saviour*, 1. By way of *Prediction*, that he would confer it, *Matth.* 16. then *ſecondly*, by way of a more particular deſcription of the *manner*, and direction for the *end* and *uſe* of it, *Matth.* 18. And *thirdly*, by a *preparatory kind* of *inſtating them* in this *power*, an initial inveſting them with this *ſacred ghoſtly authority*, John 20. (immediately before his final departure from the world) which ſeemeth to have been * *throughly perfected and compleated*, when after his aſcenſion, the *holy Ghoſt* did viſibly *deſcend* upon thoſe to whom theſe words were by *Chriſt* then delivered [*Receive the holy Ghoſt*, &c.] This formal compleat inſtating of this power (of *binding* and *looſing*) upon them, and not only the giving of thoſe gifts of tongues, &c. being a main branch and effect of this *deſcending*, and *their receiving of the holy Ghoſt*, according to that of *Iſai.* 32. if you compare *v.* 1. of the [*King and Princes ruling in judgment*, prophetically intimating *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles*,] with *v.* 15, and 16. where the deſcent of the Spirit is mentioned as a preparative to the exerciſe of that *judicative power*, and ſo *Epheſ.* 4. *he gave gifts unto men*, *v.* 8. and *gave ſome Apoſtles*, &c. *v.* 11. And this I conceive will direct us to the importance of thoſe words. *Luke* 24.49. [*I ſend the promiſe of my Father upon you*] ſo as they may be parallel with this place, *John* 20. 23. *receive the holy Ghoſt.* No doubt that *promiſe of the Father* was the *holy Ghoſt*, John 15. 26. and the [*I ſend upon you*] (both as a *verbum ſolenne*, I *ſend*, i. e. I *inſtate* on you, and that in the preſent I *ſend*, not in the future, *I will ſend*) all one with the [λάβετε *receive* him] and ſo the *power from on high*, in the end of the verſe, clearly ſignifies that *viſible miſſion of the holy Ghoſt*, which they were to *expect*, as the means of compleating this donation; and ſo 'tis clear by comparing it with *Acts* 1. 4. and 8. where the ſame phraſes are uſed. And therefore *John* 20. 21. immediately before the [*receive the holy Ghoſt*] he ſaith, *As my Father ſent me, ſo ſend I you*, intimating that as at his *miſſion* to his office he was *anointed with the holy Ghoſt*, Acts 10. 38. viz. *upon his Baptiſm*, Luke 3. 22. (whereupon 'tis ſaid, *that he by the ſpirit caſt out devils*, Matth. 12. 28. which is clearly ſymbolical, and parallel to his *looſing*, or *remiſſion of ſins* (ſo the Apoſtles at their *miſſion*, or entrance on their power, ſhould be *anointed* alſo.

* τὸ δὲ [λάβετε] πνεῦμα ἀντὶ τοῦ γίνεσθε ὑπηκόοι τοῖς τὸ λαβεῖν πνεῦμα. Theop. in Joh. 20. *The Words* [*receive the holy Ghoſt*] *ſignifie, be you ready to receive him.* *Sect.* 2.

‖ ἐξουσία ἀφίεναι καὶ λυσιτ. Theoph. in Mat. 16. in the ſence of ἐξουσία Joh. 1. 12. *for privilege, or right, or power.*

* ἐμπνεύσας, ἵνα τὴν πλείαν δωρεὰν τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος αὐτοῖς ὑμῶν, παυτὸν δὲ τῷ πνεύματος ἔμελλε δώσειν, ἀλλὰ πρὸς ὑποδοχὴν τοῦ πνεύματος ὑπηδύνεν αὐτοὺς ποιῶν. Theoph. in John 20. *The perfect gift of the holy Ghoſt was diſtributed to them in the Pentecoſt, a preparative only adminiſtred to them in that breathing.*

CHAP. II.

HAving proceeded thus far by way of *general precognition*, that which is behind, will, I conceive, be moſt *intelligible*, if it be reduced to theſe few heads. 1. *On whom this power was beſtowed.* 2. *In what it conſiſts.* 3. *To what uſe 'tis deſign'd, and to what ſort of men it belongs* objective, *or who are to be bound and looſed.* 4. *What is the real effect of it, or what conjunction it hath with binding and looſing in Heaven.* *Sect.* 1.

For the *firſt*, though to him that conſidereth the place of *Matt.* 18. alone by it ſelf, (which is an obſcure place) the matter be not ſo clear to whom this *power* was given by *Chriſt*, and though thereupon ſome miſtakes have ariſen, and *occaſion* of conceiting this *power of binding*, &c. to be inſtated by *Chriſt* on the whole *aggregate* of any *particular Church*, yet ſurely the matter will be ſufficiently clear, if (as it is moſt reaſonable) we firſt allow that *obſcure* place leave to borrow *light* from the two other moſt evident ones (and not obſcure the more evident by that:) and ſecondly (after we have brought that light to it) obſerve, what glimmerings of *light* we ſhall be able to diſcern (by that help) even in that obſcure place it ſelf, which will (as the weak *light of the Moon* with that *treaſure of light*, borrowed from the *Sun*, added to it) become by this means exceeding *light ſome*. For although theſe three places are not parallel one to the other, in reſpect of the *times*, and *occaſions* of delivering them, and other circumſtances, yet there is no doubt, but they belong all to the ſame *general matter*, *the power of binding*, &c. And that being (as it is apparent even by that of *Matt.* 18. 18.) *inſtated* not on the whole world, or *community of men*, but *determinated* to ſome *peculiar ſubject*, there is all reaſon to reſolve that that *ſubject*, though diverſly expreſt, is yet the ſame in all *Sect.* 2.

thoſe

those places, unless some evidence of Scripture or authentick testimony of *antient Church*, or *practice* shall demonstrate the contrary; which that it doth not, will (as far as concerns the *Scripture*, which deserves our first search) be thus cleared, by considering the several places.

Sect. 3. And first, *Matt.* 16. 19. which was occasioned thus; *Christ* examining his disciples what opinion they had of him, is answered by *Simon*, that *he was the Christ, the Messias, the Son of the living God*, *v.* 16. upon which *Christ* pronounceth him a *blessed person*, as having received that *supernatural gift of Faith from God himself*, which no humane means could have helpt him to; and upon this changes his name from *Simon Bar Jona* (the only name he had, *ver.* 17.) to *Cephas* in *Syriack*, that is πέτρα in *Greek*, or, as *Homer* and other good Authors, and (which bears most affinity with the dialect of this book) the author of the second book of *Mac. c.* 4. 41, used in the masculine πέτρος, signifying a *rock* or *stone*, to intimate that he should be (as a foundation or strong rocky stone in a building is a principal ingredient in the building, and a means of the future stability of it, *Matth.* 7. 27. the *storm* and *flouds* and *winds* came upon it, *and it fell not*, because τεθεμελίωτο ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν, *it was founded on such a firm rocky stone*) a principal part, call it *foundation*, or *rock*, or *pillar* of that *Church* of Christians, which partly by this *confession* of his, here recorded to all posterity, and partly by his *future teaching*, he should be a means to *erect* for *Christs* service: and then being so glorious an *Instrument* of *converting* so many, *Christ* is pleased to give him the *Keys of this Kingdom*; λέγει τὸ, δώσω σοι, ἐξουσιαστικῶς, ὥσπερ γὰρ πατὴρ δέδωκέ σοι τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν, οὕτως ἐγὼ τὰς κλεῖς. *Theophil.* in *Matt.* 16. *authoritatively he gave him the keys, as his Father had done the Revelation*, ἐξουσίαν ἀφέσεως, &c. as he goes on, a *power of binding and loosing*, &c. so ἁμαρτιῶν συγχωρήσεως καὶ ἐπιτιμήσεως, *the pardoning and punishing of sins*, in a word, *a spiritual grace or power*, or jurisdiction over these future Converts of his (as generally in the *Apostles* times, and after, he that *converted* any country or *chief* city in his *Apostleship*, was setled as their *Bishop* or Governour in spiritual matters, and so continued all his life, unless having setled them, he thought good to commit that office, and power to some body else, that so he might be the more free to go and *preach* and convert more) though not as *yet*, because they were not by him as *yet converted*, yet by way of promise *in diem* to be performed, when time should serve; *I will give thee the keys, and whatsoever thou shalt bind*, &c. The sum is, *Peter* was to be an *Apostle*, and to do wonders in *converting* whole nations to *Christ*, and among those whom he thus *converted*, *Christ* promises that he should have a *Jurisdiction*, a power to govern, and *discipline*, and *censure*, as there should be occasion in those Churches.

Sect. 4. This being thus promised to *Peter*, as *a chief Apostle*, and *Confessor of Christs*, not *exclusivè* by way of exclusion, that none should have this *power* but he, but *honorificè* by way of honour mentioned first to him by the privilege of πρωτοκλησία, of being (as I conceive he was) the first that was call'd, but more peculiarly as a *reward* of his notable *confession*, *ver.* 16. is by *Christ* a little before his parting from the world, after his resurrection *Joh.* 20. 23. actually instated both on him, and * the rest of the *Apostles*, who were to joyn in the same office with him of *begetting* unto *Christ*, and *educating* those which were so begotten, of *converting* and preserving, or governing, and in order to that end were to have their several Provinces assigned them (ὁ μὲν τοῦτο, ὅδε ἐκεῖνο λαβὼν τὸ μέρος, saith *Chrys.* every of them his *distinct part*) for *Preaching* first, as afterward for *Jurisdiction*; which I shall adventure to affirm not improbable to be the meaning of πορευθῆναι εἰς ἴδιον τόπον, *to go to his own place*, Act. 1. 25. applying it not to *Judas*, but to *Matthias*, or the ἵνα ἓν ἐκλέξῃ, *him that should be chosen*, and so again most probably of the κλῆρος καὶ διακονίας καὶ ἀποστολῆς, *the part, or lot, or portion of Ministry and Apostleship*, in the beginning of the *verse*, (the former of them belonging to the *Office* of *Preaching* peculiarly, the latter to that of *Governing* also) distributed to each, either by *lot* or by *joynt consent*, and *designment* of that great πρεσβυτέριον, the *Colledge* of the *Apostles*; It being most proper and according to analogy, that the κοπιῶντες ἐν διδαχῇ those which had *laboured and toiled in the word and doctrine*, for the *converting* and begetting men to *Christ*, should be also thought worthy of the διπλῆς τιμῆς, or πρωτοτόκια, the elder brothers privilege and prerogative, to be rulers or Masters of the family after the fathers departure, and so be endued with a *paternal power* of *chastisements* (i. e. discipline) and *Government* for the keeping of them in some compass, within the terms of a peaceable, holy, ‖ truly-Christian *Congregation*; and therefore after the (πέμπω ὑμᾶς John 20. 21. *I send you*) (the form of words, that made them *Apostles* answerable to the שְׁלִיחִים *nuntio's*, messengers among the Jews, and not far unlike to the *Proconsuls* sent *out*, though on a quite distant errand of secular power, among the Romans) immediately follows the ἐνεφύσησε, *he breathed on them* (proportionable to God's course of making a *living soul*, Gen. 2. ver. 7. *by breathing on* him the *breath of life*) and said, *Receive the holy Ghost*, *If you remit any mens sins, they are remitted*; *if you retain, they are retained*; which words were apparently delivered, (and in them this *power*) to as many as were breathed on, *i. e.* to as many as were * sent by *Christ*, and indeed to no more, unless either first by way of *Communication* from them, to their successors, or secondly by special immediate vocation from Heaven, by the *bath col*, as the Hebrews phrase is, *the daughter of thunder*, i. e. *voice from Heaven* sent to consecrate them. Thus St. *Paul* who was none of the twelve, yet speaking of the Power of *excommunicating*, saith, it was *given to him* (to him not as a *successor* of the *Apostles*, but *to him* as one *called immediately from Heaven*) *by the Lord or by Christ*, 2 *Cor.* 13. 10. In a word, it was by *Christ* immediately then given to the *Apostles* all and each of them, and to none else, till *Matthias* was received into the place of *Judas*, and St. *Paul* was afterward *extraordinarily* designed, and called unto the same *office*, together with *Barnabas*, *Act.* 13. 2. proportionably it may seem to what befel the twelve *Patriarchs*, *Ephraim* and *Manasses* being taken in, in *Josephs* stead that died, as these two in the place of *James* the brother of *John*, who was *cut off*, before he came to do that work to which he was sent, *the preaching to all Nations.*

Those two places thus agreeing on the *Subjects* of this *power*, or *objects* of this *donation*, 'tis already more than probable, that the third witness producible, will agree with those two, or if it seem otherwise, sure 'twill not be thought reasonable, that these *two* shall be forced and violenced, to consent to that, which is but an alien sence, by some *Interpreters* imposed upon that *third*.

This

* Εἰ γὰρ καὶ πρὸς Πέτρον μόνον εἴρηται, τὸ, δώσω σοι, ἀλλὰ καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς ἀποστόλοις λέλεκται· ὅτι ἐκεῖνον, ἂν τινων ἀφῆτε, &c. Theoph. in Matt. 16. p. 94. *Though 'twere said only to Peter* [*I will give thee*] *yet 'twas given to all the Apostles: When? when he said, If you remit any mans sins.* John 20. 23.

‖ καθάπερ τὶς βασιλεὺς ἄρχοντα ἀποστέλλων, ἐξουσίαν εἰς τὸ δεσμωτήριον ἐμβαλεῖν καὶ ἀφεῖναι δίδωσιν, ὕστερον καὶ τέτυς ἐκπέμπων, πάντα ἐκείνῳ τῇ δυνάμει, Chr. in Joh. 20. *As a King that sends out rulers over Provinces, gives them power to cast in Prison, and to let out; so sending the Apostles he endues them with this power.*

* πᾶσι τοῖς ἀποστόλοις. Theoph. *To all the Apostles.*

This third place I shall set down at large, because I acknowledge there is some *difficulty* in it, Matt. 18. 15. *If thy brother shall offend against thee*, it seems the place belongs not primarily, (but only *patritate rationis*, by *analogy of reason*) to all sins in the latitude, but peculiarly, to *trespasses or personal injuries* done by one *brother*, one *Christian* to another; as besides the expres words *v.* 15. (*If thy brother trespas against thee*) is more clear by St. *Peter's question* to the same purpose, *v.* 21. (*How oft shall my brother trespas against me, and I forgive him?*) *Go and reprove* ἔλεγξον, *i. e.* either *reprehend him* for it, (as the word is used sometimes when 'tis joyned with παιδεύω, *chasten* or discipline, *Heb.* 12. 5. *Apoc.* 3. 19. or again ἔλεγξον *, *make him sensible* of the wrong he hath done thee, or as it may be rendred, ‖ make him *ashamed* of his fact) *betwixt thee and him alone*, (*i. e.* do thy best by *private admonitions* to bring him to a sense) *If he hear thee* (be thus wrought on) *thou hast gain'd thy brother*; *gain'd him*, first to thy self (gotten a *friend* instead of an *enemy*;) and secondly to Christ, *gained* a *Convert*, a *Proselyte* to him, and this also a great acquisition to thee, to have had the honour of doing that glorious thing, and of being capable of the *reward* of them, *that convert any to right eousness*. *Sect.* 6.

* ἔλεγξις, φανέωσις ἢ καταμήνυσις, *Phavor.* ἐλέγχω, τὸ καταμηνύω ἀτίμημα πνὸς εἰς φῶς ἄγω, &c.

ἁπλῶς τὸ ἀληθὲς φανερόω, ib. and so John 3. 20. *he that doth evil cometh not to the light, lest his deeds should be reproved,* ἐλεγχθῇ [*discovered*] in our margent, and therefore 1 *Cor.* 14. 24. when 'tis said of the *unbeliever*, that he is *convinced of all*, &c. 'tis added *v.* 25. *Thus are the secrets of his heart made manifest*; so *Ephes.* 5. 13. *All things that are reproved, or discovered, are made manifest by the light; for whatsoever doth make manifest, is light.* ἐλεγχθῆναι, αἰσχυνθῆναι, & ἔλεγχος ἀεὶ αἰσχύνης πέπλος, & ἐλέγχειν ἀντὶ τοῦ αἰσχύνειν, Phavor.

But if he hear thee not, if this first *method* of thy *charity*, and discipline of this calmer making succeed not, another assay must be made, another artifice used, *Take with thee* (ἔτι farther, or over and above) *one*, or *two*, that *in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established*, *i. e.* that the thing which thou layest to his charge, be so *confirmed*; according to that *Joh.* 8. 17. *The testimony of two men is true*, i. e. of *sufficient authority* in law) according to an Hebraism, whereby, נאמן, ἀληθὲς *true*, among the Greek translators signifieth πιστὸς fit, to be *credited*) that so either by the *testimony* of these as *witnesses*, he may no longer be able to deny the fact (as *Heb.* 6. 16. an *oath* is said to be εἰς βεβαίωσιν, for *establishing*, or *confirmation*, in that it is ἀντιλογίας πέρας, an *end of affirming and denying*; the thing so *established* (βεβαιωθὲν or σταθὲν) by *oath*, cannot be *denyed*, or the parties denial will no longer stand him in stead) or by authority of these he may be induced (as the *Judge* is on the accused, *Deut.* 19. 15. *Heb.* 10. 28.) to give *sentence* on, to *condemn himself*; which if it may be obtained, is the prime end of all these charitable artifices, to bring the injurious to a *sight* and *shame*, the best preparatives to reformation; To which purpose is that of *Tertullian*, Apol. c. 39. *Disciplinam præceptorum inculcationibus densamus*, *We thicken the doctrine of precepts with ways of inculcating*, *i. e.* press them to reformation, whom our doctrine will not prevail on; where he mentions these three degrees, *exhortationes*, *castigationes*, *censura*; *exhortations* and *chastisements*, and then *censure*. *Sect.* 7.

By what hath been said of this place, and in it by observing the method of the first and second admonition, you will by the way understand the meaning of that *obscure* verse in Saint *Paul*, 2 *Cor.* 13. 1. *This third time I come unto you*; *in the mouth of two or three witnesses shall every word be established*, &c. It refers clearly to this usage of the *second admonition*. St. *Paul* had *written before*, or perhaps had admonished them before at his second being among them, which was as it were the first single *admonition*, which *ver.* 2. he calls (προείρηκα *I told you formerly*;) but that prevailing not, he now before his third coming, warns them again, either ὡς παρὼν τὸ δεύτερον, προλέγω I give you *warning*, *as* I did when I was the *second* time among you, but now more solemnly, as in the presence of two or three witnesses, or else προλέγω τὸ δεύτερον, I *foretel* you this *second time*, ὡς παρὼν, by this Epistle which is all one *as if I were present* and did it personally, this being to supply the place of the *taking with him* ἔτι ἕνα ἢ δύο, *one or two more*, as appears by the addition of these very words, which are in *Matt.* [*in the mouth of two or three witnesses*, &c.] which is, you see, the stile and character of the *second admonition*: This by the way. *Sect.* 8.

But if he hear not them (παρακούσῃ αὐτῶν, if he be still refractory, either through *non-conviction* of the fact, or *non-contrition* for it) if this *second* admonition be not in event εἰς οἰκοδομὴν, 2 *Cor.* 13. 10. to *edification*, or *instruction*, if it work not on him, *then tell it to the Church*, (I shall tell you what that is presently) and *if he hear not the Church*, (continue his refractoriness still) *let him be unto thee as a heathen or a publican*] which may possibly signifie, that in that case thou hast *liberty* to implead him, as thou wouldst do any *heathen*, in any foreign *heathen* Court for that *injury*, that *trespas* done to thee, which was at the first mentioned. For certainly though it were unlawful for a *Christian* both here and 1 *Cor.* 6. 1. to implead a Christian for a *personal trespas* before a *heathen tribunal*, yet to deal thus with a *heathen* (or *publican*, which was in account the same) was not either by *Christ*, or the *Apostle* counted unlawful (but only the ἀδελφὸς μετ' ἀδελφοῦ, i. e. *Christian with Christian*, v. 6.) and consequently with a *perverse refractory brother*, whom you see *Christ* gives leave to account and deal with, as with an *heathen or publican*, it would not be unlawful also; But another *interpretation* I shall not doubt to propose, and prefer, that by *heathen and publican* may be meant a *desperate deplored sinner*, such as the *Rabbins* call חטא i. e. ἁμαρτωλὸς *a sinner*, as in the Gospel γυνὴ ἁμαρτωλὸς, a deplored *sinner*; Thus in *Musar*, *If he will not then*, (i. e. *when two or three friends* have been taken to be present at his *admonition*) *be reconciled*, go and *leave him to himself*; *for such an one is implacable*, and is called חטא, of whom again 'tis there said, *Si nec hoc modo quicquam profecerit*, i. e. *adhibitis amicis*, if this second admonition do no good, *debet eum pudefacere coram multis*, *he must be ashamed before many*, (which may be the meaning of *Dic Ecclesiæ*, *tell it to the Church*, as will anon appear by 1 *Tim.* 5. 20.) And this interpretation of that phrase will seem most probable, if you mark 1. That τελῶναι & ἁμαρτωλοὶ *publicans and sinners* are frequently joyned together in the *Gospel*, as once *publicans and harlots*, those γυναῖκες ἁμαρτωλοὶ *sinner-women*. 2. That the heathen are call'd κοινοὶ *sinners*, as when 'tis said that *Christ* was by the *Jews delivered into the hands of sinners*, i.e. *Romans heathen*, and in St. *Paul* [*not sinners of the Gentiles*] and then those words, [*let him be to thee a heathen and a publican*] will sound no more, but [*give him over as a desperate deplored sinner*] to whom those privileges of a *Christian* (*viz.* of not being impleaded before an *heathen tribunal*) &c. do not belong, *i.e.* leave him to himself. This sure is the simplest rendring of the place; and then he that is such, that is capable of that denomination, is *Sect.* 9.

certainly fit, and ripe for the *cenſures* of the *Church*, which follow in the next verſe, and are appointed to go out againſt this *refractory incorrigible*.

Sect. 10. For ſo immediately it follows, *Verily I ſay unto you*, who are thoſe *you*? why 1. in the plural number [ὑμῖν.] Secondly, ὑμῖν μαθηταῖς *to you diſciples*, the ſame that were after made *Apoſtles*, (for ſo in the firſt verſe προσῆλθον οἱ μαθηταὶ, the *Diſciples came to him* with a queſtion, and *v.* 3. he ſaid, *verily* I ſay *to you*, i. e. to *you Diſciples*, and *ver.* 12. τί ὑμῖν δοκεῖ; *what do you think?* asking the *Diſciples*, or appealing to their own *judgment*, and ſo ſtill the ſame auditors continued, and his ſpeech addreſt to them, *I ſay unto you Diſciples*) *whatſoever you ſhall bind on earth*, &c.

Sect. 11. After this, it follows *ver.* 19. *again I ſay unto you, that if two of you ſhall agree upon earth*, &c.] Many falſe illations are by men of different perſwaſions made from theſe words, which will all vaniſh, I conceive, and the truth be diſinvolv'd, if the Reader will not deſpiſe this one *obſervation*, which I ſhall offer to him; and it is this, that the method oft-times uſed in Scripture is, (when it hath propoſed one or two ſeverals to ſpeak of) to reſume the *laſt firſt*, and ſo orderly *to go back*, till it come to the *firſt*, to which you may accommodate that expreſſion, and deſcription of Gods *method* in other things. *Many that are laſt, are firſt* (*the laſt in propoſing*, firſt in *handling* or reſuming,) *and the firſt laſt*.

If there be two things mentioned one after another, and any occaſion to add any thing on each of them, then I ſay the obſervation is, that the Scripture ſometimes uſes to *reſume* the ſecond firſt, and the firſt after that. And ſo if there be more than two. I ſaid this was *oft-times* the manner and ſtile of Scripture, and to make good my obſervation, I am a little obliged to go out of my way, and preſent you with ſome *examples*. Three viſible ones I ſhall firſt offer you out of one book, the *Epiſtle* to the *Hebrews*. Firſt, Chap. 5. where in the four firſt verſes there are three things propounded of an *High Prieſt*, 1. That *he offer for ſin*, and negotiate the cauſe of men *with God*. 2. That he be *compaſſionate toward ſinners*, and to that end be himſelf *infirm*, and *offer for himſelf* as well as for the people. 3. That he be *called to this office by God himſelf*. To theſe three the *author* ſpeaks particularly (and applies them to Chriſt) in the remainder of the *Chapter*, by way of ὑπόδοσιν, or ὑπόμνησις, to the laſt, firſt, v. 5,6. *So likewiſe Chriſt glorified not himſelf to be made an high Prieſt*, &c. To the ſecond next, ver. 7, 8. *who in the days of his fleſh offered up prayers, and ſupplications, with ſtrong crying and tears to him that was able to deliver him out of death*, (as when he *commended his ſpirit into Gods hands*, and *cryed with a loud voice*, *Matth.* 27. 50. *Mar.* 15. 37. *Luke* 23. 46. at the delivering theſe words) *And* * *was heard, for, or by his piety*, through the great *ardency* of that his prayer (expreſt both by the *loud voice* in three *Evangeliſts*, and by the *bodily worſhip*, *bowing of his head*, in the fourth, *Joh.* 19. 30.) or as it may more probably ſignifie, *He was delivered from his fear*, i. e. from that which he *feared* and prayed againſt. *And though he were a Son, yet from the things he ſuffered, he learnt obedience*, (whether to God thus deſigning him to thoſe *ſufferings*, and to that office of *hearing* prayers, or to men, by giving them *audience* in their prayers, as ὑπακοὴ ſignifies, ſo to *hear*, as to *anſwer* a requeſt; or, which is the more probable interpretation, *learnt by his ſufferings* (even that of death it ſelf) in *obedience* to his Fathers will, which *he that was a ſon* was fain to undergo, what a difficult thing obedience is, eſpecially exact obedience at ſuch a time as that, when, as 'tis oft, death muſt be taken in the way to obedience; This being moſt proper to teach him *compaſſion* to ſinners, v. 2.) And then the author returns to the firſt, laſt, v. 9. *Being made perfect he became the author of eternal ſalvation*, &c.

* εἰσακουσθεὶς ἀπὸ τῆς εὐλαβείας.

Thus ſecondly, *Heb.* 9. 1. the *author* having named two things, the δικαιώματα λατρείας, the *ordinances of worſhip*, and the ἅγιον κοσμικὸν, he dilates firſt of the latter of them, v. 2,3,4,5. *For there was a tabernacle made, the firſt*, &c. and *after the ſecond vail, the tabernacle*, &c. and *over it the Cherubims of glory* ſhadowing the ἱλαστήριον the (not *mercy-ſeat*, but) * *covering* of the *Ark*, &c. all theſe belonging to the ſecond particular; and then afterwards he comes back to the former, the *ordinances of worſhip*, ver. 6. *Now when theſe things were thus ordain'd, the Prieſt went alwaies*, &c.

* So כפרת from כפר (which ſignifies both to propitiate and to cover) is here to be rendred *covering*, and though the Greek be ἱλαστήριον from the former ſence of the word, yet being to denote a part of the *Ark* in this place, it muſt be taken in the other ſence of the *Hebrew*, and rendred, as if it had been χαλαστήριον, As 'tis *Exod.* 26. 34. and 30. 6. or as the *Hebrew* כפרת if it had been retained, would have imported.

So thirdly, *c.* 10. 33. the author having mentioned two acts of *ſuffering* in them, the firſt *perſonal* in themſelves, by *reproaches*, and *afflictions*, the ſecond by way of *ſympathy* with their Apoſtle, κοινωνοὶ τῶν οὕτως ἀναστρεφομένων, partakers with, or *relievers* of others that ſo lived; in the next verſe he reſumes both again, but firſt the latter, *For ye had compaſſion of me in my bands*, v. 34. and then ſecondly, the former, *took joyfully the ſpoiling of your goods*.

This is farther evidenced by an example in this *Goſpel*, *Matth.* 7. 6. *Give not that which is holy unto dogs, neither caſt your pearls before ſwine, leſt they tread them under their feet, and turning again, tear and rend thee*. Where there is no doubt, but the former of theſe latter ſpeeches belongs to the latter of the former, and the latter of the latter to the former of the former; *per modum regreſſus*, by way of *going backward* thus, *leſt the Swine tread the pearls under their feet*, and *leſt the Dogs rend and tear thee*. For it is not the manner of *ſwine* to fall upon men, and tear them, but of *dogs*, it is, and it is not the manner of *dogs* to *tread* a thing *under their feet*, but of *ſwine* it is. So *Rom.* 2. 12. having affirmed two things, the firſt of the *Gentiles* that had *not the Law*, that they ſhould *periſh without* it; the ſecond of the *Jews* that had the *Law*, that they ſhould be *judged* by it; he ver. 13. ſpeaks firſt of the ſecond, *For not the hearers of the Law*, &c. and then v. 14. of the firſt, *For when the nations*, &c. So the 2 *Cor.* 2. 15. St. *Paul* having mentioned the σωζομένοις firſt, and then the ἀπολλυμένοις, *them that are ſaved*, and *them that periſh*, he goes back, v. 16. Firſt to the latter of them, to thoſe *a ſavour of death unto death*, but to theſe *a ſavour of life unto life*; So in the *Epiſtle* to *Philemon*, v. 5. *hearing of thy love, and faith which thou haſt towards the Lord Jeſus, and towards all the Saints*, 'tis apparent that the *Lord Jeſus* is the object of the *faith*, and the [*all Saints*] the object of the *love*. So again *Rom.* 14. having ſet down two heads of diſcourſe, that the *ſtrong ſhould not ſet at nought the weak*, nor ſecondly the *weak judge* or condemn the *ſtrong*, ver. 3. he reſumes the latter firſt, ver. 4. *who art thou that judgeſt?*

judgest? and then *ver.* 10. returns to the former, and *thou why dost thou set at nought thy brother*? So *Matth.* 12. 22. *the blind and dumb both spake and saw*, i. e. the *blind saw*, and the *dumb spake*. So chap. 23. 16. Christ having mentioned *swearing by the Temple* first, and then by the *Altar*, *ver.* 18. he after resumes them both again, *v.* 20. and first that of the *Altar*, and then of the *Temple* after it. So also in the same chap. 23. 25. *Christ* having mentioned first the *outside of the cup or platter*, and then the *inside*, *v.* 26. he returns first to the *cleansing of the inside*, and then the outside of it. So 1 *Cor.* 6. 11. after the general of *washing*, which contains the two subsequent, *sanctifying*, and *justifying*; the mention of our *Lord Jesus Christ*, which is first named, must belong to the *latter* of the two, that of *justification*, and the *Spirit of our God* to the former, that of *sanctifying*. So 2 *Pet.* 3. when the Atheists objection consists of two parts, first that God hath not made good his *promise* concerning his *coming*, *v.* 4. and secondly as a proof of that, that there hath been no sensible mutation since the beginning of the world, in the latter part of the verse; the Apostle makes answer first to the latter, *v.* 5, 6, 7. and then comes back and satisfies the former also *ver.* 8. &c.

Other examples of this observation I shall leave the Reader to observe, when he reads the *Scripture* more ponderingly, and only proceed, to help him to take notice of it in the point in hand. Three cases, it is apparent, are here mention'd orderly by our *Saviour* in the matter of *trespass*, 1. *Telling the trespasser* of his fault *between him and thee alone*. Secondly, *taking one or two with thee*, to do it more convincingly, and with greater authority. Thirdly, *telling the Church* of it. Having said somewhat to each of these, as he delivered them in the three first verses 15, 16, 17. he resumes the matter again, and speaks first to the last of them, *v.* 18. telling them, what, after the not succeeding of the third admonition, the *Apostles* and their *successors* are to do, when the cognizance of this injury and contumacy comes before them, (which, that in every case of trespass, it always should, I conceive, doth not hence appear to be necessary, save only in case that the magistrate or *secular* tribunal be *heathen*, because that supposition may perhaps be the ground of the *sit tibi Ethnicus*, on which this other is superstructed) viz. *excommunicate* such a *refractory* till *reformation*, and then upon that, *absolve* him again, and [*verily I say unto you, whatsoever you shall bind on earth*, &c.] From this view it is not irrational to conclude, that the ἐκκλησία and the ὑμεῖς, the *Church*, and the *Disciples* (considered prophetically under the notion of *Apostles*, i. e. *Founders* first, then *Governours* of *Churches*) may in that place signifie the same thing. So saith St. *Chrys.* in *Mat. Hom.* 6. εἶπε τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, τουτέστι τοῖς προεστῶσι, *Tell it to the Church*, i. e. to *the president and rulers of it*; and *Theoph.* in *Matt.* 18. ἐπὶ τῶν ἐκκλησίας προεδρων, &c. the *Church* for the *rulers of the Church*; To which purpose it is observable, what *Kimchi* a *Jewish* learned *Rabbi* hath affirmed, that the *Governours*, and *Rulers* are oft meant by the *word* קהל, ἐκκλησία, or *Congregation*, and so the word *People*, *Ex.* 4. 29. doth clearly signifie, the *Elders*, not all the *People*, *Ex.* 3. 16. Agreeable to which is the inscription of the *antient Apostolical Epistle* of *Clemens Romanus* to the *Corinthians*, ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ Θεοῦ παροικοῦσα Ῥωμὴν, *The Church of God that dwells at Rome*, meaning I conceive by the title [*the Church*] himself (who wrote the *Epistle*, and was chief there, or *Bishop* at that time) and the other *Clergy* with him; for so the other part of the inscription [τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ Θεοῦ παροικούσῃ Κορινθον, *to the Church of God at Corinth*] is after explained by him, in the words Ἐπισκόποις, καὶ διακόνοις, *to the Bishops, and Deacons*; but if this will not be acknowledged, then by ἐκκλησία I shall give you leave to understand any *meeting*, or Congregation of pious men, either a *consessus Presbyterorum*, *a Colledge of Presbyters*, which were ordinarily assistant to the *Bishop* in the antient *Church*, or possibly the whole or any part of the *people* convened, whose authority or consent may work somewhat upon the offender, as S. *Paul* conceives it were apt to do, when he commands *Timothy*, ἁμαρτάνοντας ἐνώπιον πάντων ἐλέγχειν, *to rebuke the offenders before all men*, i. e. in the presence of the community of the people, 1 *Tim.* 5. 20. and perhaps when he speaks of the ἐπιτιμία ἡ ὑπὸ τῶν πλειόνων, 2 *Cor.* 2. 6. *the rebuke that was by or under the many*, though it be not certain whether that signifie the *chastisement*, (as our *English* reads) *punishment* and *censure* inflicted by the *Presbytery*, or ὑπὸ under them, those assisting or joyning in the censure, σκληραγωγίαι, acts of *Canonical severity*, (which in case of sorrow and relenting of the offender upon *rebuke*, or admonition before ejection out of the Church, were wont to be thought sufficient without *excommunication*; and after *excommunication*, as in this place to the *Corinthians*, if they were submitted to, were sufficient, though not presently to restore him to the *Communion*, yet to make him capable of being prayed for by the Church, 1 *John* 5. 16. and to be delivered from the stripes of *Satan*, the diseases that the *delivering to Satan* in the *Apostles* times brought upon them;) or whether, as the words may be rendred, it import the *rebuke*, or reproof, viz. the third *admonition*, (or the second given by the *Bishop*, which was equivalent to that) which was ὑπὸ *under*, or *in the presence of many*, viz. of the people or Congregation. The former of these sences seems more agreeable to the place to the *Cor.* the latter rather to belong to that in 1 *Tim.* and so that which even now in *Musar* was *coram multis*, *before many*, and in S. *Paul* (if not ὑπὸ πλειόνων *under many*, yet) ἐνώπιον πάντων, *in the presence of all men*, *Christ* may here express by ἐκκλησία *the Church*; This interpretation being admitted, or not rejected, it then follows commodiously, and reasonably in the text of the *Evangelist*, that after the matter is brought to them (i. e. to those *many*) or after this act of *reproof*, or *rebuke before them*, and upon continued *refractoriness* to these last *admonitions*, then the ὑμεῖς (that sure is) the *Apostles* or *Governors* of the *Church*, the *Pastors*, (which cannot be in any reason excluded from under the former word ἐκκλησία *Church*, whatsoever it signifies) and those already promised this *power*, v. 16. may, or shall *bind*, or *excommunicate* them. And that is the sum of the 18. verse in reference to the 17. and then *v.* 19. *Again I say unto you*, (or as a very * ancient Manuscript, and some printed copies read it, πάλιν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, *again verily I say unto you*, (that second *verily* noting the speech to be of a new matter) *that* if *two of you shall agree upon the earth*, or here below, (in reference to the second thing mention'd, *v.* 16. *take with you one or two*) *concerning any thing*, *which they shall ask*, (or as it is possible, the *Greek*, ὃ ἐὰν αἰτήσωνται may be rendred, *whereto they shall be required*) *it shall be done unto them of my Father*, &c. *For where two or three are gathered together in my Name, there am I in the midst of them*, which words are brought to give authority to the solemn *admonitions* of the second order (addrest by the injur'd man, accompanied with *one* or *two* assistants, or witnesses to inforce them) by telling them, that as the *consessu trium virorum*,

Sect. 1.

* In Coll. Magd. Oxon.

virorum, the *assize of three men* among the *Jews* had some *power*, so shall any *two* or *three Christians* be considerable in this matter, joyning in such a reprehension, having the priviledge of Gods presence, (as in their prayers thus united, so also in this act of united *admonition*) to give them authority assistance, and blessing; for, first, God is to be thought to be in *the midst of them* (as that *fourth* person added to the three children in the *furnace* (and the *face of that fourth like the Son of God*, to be *present* with them (as it is 1 *Cor.* 5.4.) in this his ordinance, in this piece of *Discipline* appointed by him; whereupon the παρακοὴ the *refractorineſs* of the transgressor is become so much the greater in this case; and besides, secondly, if upon *admonition*, they shall be hearkned to, it will be in their power to *pray* for the penitent trespasser, (as *Jam.* 5.16.) and that *prayer* of theirs joyned with the injured person is likely to be more effectual than a single *prayer*, and so in both these respects a greater weight is set on the παράκλησις *the taking of one, or two with him.* Thus having returned to the second of the three, in the second place, and dispatched that, the *method* would direct to go on to the *first* again in the *third* place, but instead of that, St. *Peter*, it seems, asks again about it, how long a man is to *forgive* private *injuries*; and the answer in the following words supplieth the place of having proceeded to that, and serves for the conclusion of the whole matter.

Sect. 13. The result then of this whole Chapter is this, that of the three places of the *Gospel* concerning the donation of the *power* of *binding* and *loosing*, two of them at the first sight most clearly convince, this *power* to be given to the *Apostles* as *Governours* of the *Church*, (which will not be communicable to any, but either to others that are κλητοὶ ἀπόστολοι also, set apart to the *office*, immediately by *Christ*, or to their *successors*; *Dominus in Evangelio potestatem Apostolorum eorumque successorum annuntians, ait, Quorum peccata*, &c. *Christ setting down the power of the Apostles and their successors, saith, whose sins you remit*, &c. * *Eutychiani Epist. Episc. per Siciliam An. Dom.* 275. and ὅτι κατὰ Πέτρον ἐπισκοπῆς ἀξιωθέντες χάριτος. *Theoph.* in *Matt.* 18.) and the *third* upon a thorow consideration doth the same also. For this we have the plain testimony of *Theophylact* on that place *Matth.* 18. πᾶσιν ἀποστόλοις δίδοσθαι. πότε; ὅτε εἶπεν, ἂν τινων ἀφῆτε, &c. *The power of binding and loosing was given to all the Apostles; When? why, when he said, whose sins ye remit, they are remitted*, &c. i. e. in this place of St. *John*; and again, [καὶ δώσω] μέλλουσα χρόνον συμαίνει, τυτέστι τὸ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν. [*and I will give*] it *signifies the future*, i. e. *the time after the resurrection*, which is that in St. *John* also; and again on *Matt.* 16. ἔχουσιν ἐξουσίαν ἀφίναι καὶ δεσμεῖν, where the *binding* in St. *Matt.* and the *remitting* in St. *John are put together, as belonging to the same matter*: and it is confirm'd by no mean authority that of St. *Paul* himself, of himself, 2 *Cor.* 13.10. where speaking of these *censures*, (noted there by ἀποτόμως χρῆσθαι, *using excision*, and καθαίρεσις, which is all one, and which, it seems, he as an Apostle was to use among them, he, not the *Congregation*; οὐ φείσομαι *I will not spare*) he addeth κατ' ἐξουσίαν ἣν ἔδωκέ μοι ὁ Κύριος, *according to the power that Christ hath given me*, (which sure was not peculiar to him, but common to the rest of the *Apostles*, which had it before him, and in a more ordinary way) and *v.* 3. he distinctly calls it, *Christ speaking in him*, a high expression, making every such act of *judicature* in him, an act of *Christ*.

* Bin. To. 1. Concil. f. 170.

CHAP. III.

Sect. 1. THE only difficulty remaining in the point, will be, who are the *Apostles successors* in that *power*, and when the question is asked of that *power*, I must be understood of the *power* of *Governing* the *Church* peculiarly (of which the *power of the Keys* was, and is a principal *branch*) for it must again be remembred, that the *Apostles* are to be considered under a double notion: 1. As *Planters*, then as *Governours* of the *Church*. The title of Ἀπόστολος in its literal notation of *Missus*, *sent*, (*Embassador* or *Messenger*) belongs peculiarly to the former of these, and so though it have some extraordinary privileges annext to it, necessary to the work of *planting*, (as the gift of tongues, the power of *working miracles*) which ennobles it beyond the order of *Governours* in the *Churches* since their plantation, yet in the persons of the *Apostles*, it was but a precedaneous power, *preparatory* to that other of *Ruling* or *Governing*, which no doubt is the reason, that *Chrysost.* calls *Ignatius* the martyr, both ἀπόστολος and ἐπίσκοπος, *an Apostle* and *a Bishop*, and perhaps is the meaning of that saying of an *Anonymous* writer, in * *Photius* ὅτι ὁ ἀπόστολος Τιμόθεος ὑπὸ τοῦ μεγάλου Παύλου καὶ χειροτονεῖται καὶ ἔφεσίων μητροπόλεως ἐπίσκοπος, καὶ ἐνθρονίζεται, *That the Apostle* Timothy *was by Saint* Paul *ordained, and enthronized, or seated Bishop of the Metropolis of the Ephesians*, i. e. that he that had helped to *plant Churches*, and so was an *Apostle sent* out to that purpose, was at length ordained *Bishop* to *govern* that of *Ephesus* being *planted*. Which distinction being premised, the question will now more easily be satisfied, being proposed in these terms, [Who were the *Apostles successors* in that power, which concerned the *governing* these *Churches* which they had planted] And 1. I answer, that it being a matter of fact, or story, later than that the *Scripture* can *universally* reach to it, cannot be fully satisfied, or answered from thence, any further than the persons of *Timothy*, or *Titus*, &c. and the several *Angels* of the *Churches* in the *Apocalypse* (who are acknowledged by all the antients to be *single persons*, that had *power* over all others in those *Churches*,) but will in the full *latitude* through the *universal Church* in those times, be made clear from the next evidences, that we have, *viz.* from the consent of the *Greek* and *Latin* Fathers, who generally resolve, that *Bishops* are those successors. This I shall not be so unreasonable as to attempt to prove at large through the writings of those Fathers, but content my self with one or two of the first of them.

* Bibl. num. 254.

Sect. 2. Of this number I conceive the testimony of *Clemens Romanus* in his *Epistle* to the *Corinth.* (which hath been so often of late produced) might to any disinteressed person be allowed to have some

ſome force in it; where ſpeaking of the *Apoſtles*, he ſaith, *that they foreſeeing that there would be contention and emulation*, περὶ ὀνόμα[τος] & ἐπισκοπῆς *about the name of Epiſcopacy*, i. e. the *power* of governing *Churches*, as *name* and *thing* is all one in Scripture ſtyle, or (as ὄνομα may denote ἀξίωμα) *about the dignity of Biſhops*, or *Epiſcopacy*, διὰ ταυτὴν αἰτίαν, πρόγνωσιν εἰληφότες τελείαν, καθίσ[α]ν τοὺς προειρημένους, καὶ μεταξὺ ἐπινομὴν δεδώκασιν, ὅπως ἐὰν κοιμηθῶσι διαδέξωνται ἕτεροι δεδοκιμασμένοι ἀνδρες τὴν λειτουργίαν αὐτῶν. *And therefore they conſtituted or ordained ſuch and ſuch perſons, and for the future* (as μεταξὺ ſignifies in the words immediately following, and as *Act.* 13. 42. it ſignifies εἰς τὸ μέταξὺ) *gave them a liſt*, i.e. either a *ſucceſſion* and continuation *of ſucceſſors*, (as when *Heſychius* (and out of him *Varinus*) renders ἐπινομοι, κληρονόμοι, perhaps it may be a falſe print, as there be many in the edition of that book, for ἐπινομὴ, κληρονομία, but howſoever the *Analogy* from thence may extend to this alſo, that as ἐπίνομοι ſignifies κληρονόμοι, ſo ἐπινομὴ will ſignifie κληρονόμια *inheritance*, or *ſucceſſion*) or elſe ἐπινομὴν *a roll* or *Matricula* of the *Rulers* of the *Church*, that in which the whole *Eccleſiaſtical* Senate was ſet down (antiently called κάνων, and ἱερὸς κατάλογ&, and ἱερατικὸς) or again, *a diſtribution*, from ἐπινέμω *diſtribuo*, according to which, ἐπινέμεσις in *Heſychius* is ἐπιμερισμὸς *diſtribution*, i. e. a *note diſtributing* theſe to the office of *Biſhops*, thoſe to that of *Deacons* in all Churches; or laſtly, it may be ἐπινομὴν a *command* or *direction* for the future, *viz.* that when they ſhould dye, other approved men might ſucceed them. To which affirmation of *Clemens*, when I have added, (that which all *Eccleſiaſtical Stories* have made familiar to us) that there were preſerved in ſeveral *Churches* ſuch * *rolls* and *catalogues* of *Biſhops* beginning from the *Apoſtles* in each See, I ſhall conceive that that of *Clemens* was a pertinent teſtimony to this purpoſe; eſpecially when 1. St. *Jerome* himſelf ſaith that the ſuperiority of Biſhops was inſtituted to take away *Schiſm* (when one ſaid, *I am of Paul*, &c. which was in the *Apoſtles* time) which *Clemens* here affirms in the ſame manner, and on the ſame occaſion, (and uſes it as an argument againſt thoſe who being (two or three of them) ſupported by the people, raiſed a faction againſt the Biſhops, and thruſt them out) and when 2. in the front of that *Epiſtle* there is mention of ἐπίσκοποι and διάκονοι: and when 3. the voice of *antiquity* is ſo clear, that ‖ *Clemens* himſelf was one of thoſe *Biſhops* (an Adjutor of the *Apoſtles* in their life time, and after the departure of *Linus*, and *Cletus*, the only one that retained the name of *Biſhop* in *Rome*, all others being ſtiled *Presbyters* only) that * *Vedelius* at *Geneva* hath at large acknowledged it, *Exercit. in Ignat. Epiſt. ad Mar. Caſſabol. c.* 3. P. 57.

* Διὰ τοῦτο τὸν τοσοῦτον ἀπὸ τῶν Ἀποστόλων κατέχει κλῆρον Ἐλεύθερ&. *Ircn.* lib. 3. cap. 3. & ſucceſſiones Epiſcoporum quibus Apoſtolicam, quæ in unoquoque loco eſt, Eccleſiam tradiderunt, Ib. lib. 4. cap. 63. ‖ τοῦτο τοίνυν ἀπὸ τῶν Ἀποστόλων ἡ ἐπισκοπὴν κληροῦ Κλημὴς, *Ircn.* lib 3. cap. 3. * *Solus Clemens ſuperſtes, ſolum Epiſcopi nomen retinuit, tum quia inter adjutores Apoſtolorum ſolus ipſe reſtabat, tum quia jam invaluerat diſtinctio Epiſcopi, & Presbyteri, ita ut cæteris Eccleſiæ Romanæ Presbyteris qui cum ſolo Clemente eſſent, nomen illud non fuerit tributum.*

After *Clemens* (an aſſertor at once, and example of this truth) I muſt next appeal to the Martyr *Ignatius* himſelf alſo Biſhop of *Antioch*, that lived in the *Apoſtles* age, and is by the enemies of *Epiſcopacy* diſcerned to be ſo full a treaſure of this truth (and of others in this kind) in ſo many notable paſſages, that there hath been no way (imaginable by thoſe who reſolve to have it otherwiſe) to reſiſt the plainneſs of his authorities; but firſt by * ſcoffs and defamations; Secondly, by ‖ confident rejecting of our whole *volume* of his *Epiſtles*, as ſpurious, and of a later birth; and thirdly, by ſome very ſlender ſhews of proof, that they are ſo. One ſpecial of this ſort (which I ſee lately made uſe of by *Salmaſius*, and for which it * now appears he was beholding to a ſight of *Blondels* book, not then printed) I ſhall mention, to remove prejudices, and it is this; that in the *Epiſtle* to the *Magneſians*, he diſtinctly calls *Epiſcopacy* νεωτερικὴν τάξιν, which, ſaith that *learned Grammarian*, ſignifies it to be a *new Order*, and he attempts to prove it, becauſe τάξις, ſaith he, cannot be referred to the *age*; and νεωτερικὸς ſignifies καινὸς, agreeable whereunto he interprets νεωτερικὰς ἐπιθυμίας, 2 *Tim.* 2. 22. to be *novæ*, or *novarum rerum cupiditates*, *new deſires*, *or of new things*. *Sect.* 3.

* *Ignatius* ἀκαίρως ἐν καίρῳ ubique inculcat Epiſcoporum ſupra Presbyteros gradum eminentem. *Salmaſ. appar. ad l. de prim. Pap.* p. 55. ‖ *Non eſſe Ignatium tam certò ſcio quàm me hæc ſcribere*, ib. p. 58. *non eſſe Ignatium luce clarius eſt, &c. nemo mihi unquam perſuadebit*, &c. p 56. * *Hac argumenta præſtantiſſimo Salmaſio nuper probata gaudeo*, Blondel. Apol.

The dealing of this *learned Grammarian* in this buſineſs will be ſufficiently ſtrange to him, that conſiders the whole matter. I ſhall only (in paſſing) give ſome few hints of judging it, by telling you firſt, that the generality of *Copies* read not νεωτερικὴν τάξιν but νεότητα, *the youth of the Biſhop* (and no one of the *Greek* editions hath ſo much as mention'd any various lection in that place, till now the *Florentine* or *Laurentian* copy hath given us that variety.) Secondly, that the whole context of the *Epiſtle* drives to this of νεότητα, as even this author confeſſes, by ſaying, that he perſwades them to receive their *Biſhop*, and give him honour, *quamvis ætate juniori*, *though he were younger* than they, and again that he goes on to tell them, καὶ ὑμῖν δὲ πρέπει μὴ συγχρᾶσθαι τῇ ἡλικίᾳ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου, *that it becomes them not to be too familiar with the age of their Biſhop*. But then beſides this, thirdly, the vulgar, and even *Geneva* edition reading νεότητα, back it with citations of places of *Scripture* pertinent only to that ſence, as that *Wiſdom is not always with the hoary hair*, &c. Fourthly, that other reading is not avowed by, or cited from any *Greek manuſcript*, but only that in the *Laurentiana Bibliotheca*, and the old *Latin*, made uſe of by the moſt *Reverend Primate of Armach*, which is directly tranſlated out of it, and ſo doth not at all add to the authority. But then fifthly, if that reading of νεωτερικὴ τάξις ſhould be acknowledged, yet would it conclude nothing againſt the Order of *Biſhops* in thoſe firſt times. For 1. what if it were a new *Order* in *Ignatius* his time? that were pretty antient, *Ignatius* living with the *Apoſtles*; for that it was written by ſome body elſe above 200 years after *Chriſt*, will want ſome other probation. Secondly, there is no neceſſity that νεωτερικὴ τάξις muſt ſignifie *a new order*, for although, as he ſaith, τάξις doth not ſignifie *age*, nor νεωτερικὸς *young*, but may be interpreted καινὸς *new*, &c. yet we are not bound to accept that interpretation of it, when the *Context* of the *Epiſtle* belongs to another matter, and when another interpretation of this phraſe may be given, which (if that reading were acknowledged) will reconcile all difficulties; For why may not τάξις ſignifie *ordination*? and νεωτερικὴ that, that belongs to a νεώτερ&, or a *young man*, and ſo it ſhall be the *Ordination of a young man*, or a *young mans* being *Biſhop*, which might have been apt to provoke contempt

in

in interiors, if that good *Martyr* had not fortified them againſt that temptation. And laſtly for the interpretation of that place of St. *Paul* to *Timothy*, it is ſo *new*, and ſo irrationally preferr'd before the ordinary one, that one may juſtly conclude, 'twas *prejudice*, and willingneſs to find an example for his *novelty*, that made him think of this; for why ſhould not the *luſts* (there appointed to be avoided) be *youthful luſts*, or ſuch as *young* men are ſubject to? why *new luſts*; or *deſires of new things*? were not the *old* ordinary *luſts* (ſo frequent among *young* men) fit enough to be avoided? might any other be enjoyed, ſo they were not *new*? I am ſorry I have inſiſted ſo long on ſo weak an *objection*, and yet it is the beſt that that *learned* man (ſo much looked on, and believed in this matter by thoſe who deſire change) hath produced, on which to build all his confidence, that thoſe *Epiſtles* are not

* Grot. diſcuſſ. Δαλ. p. 400.

Ignatius's: And 'tis a little ſtrange that another learned man * *And. Rivet* ſhould ſpeak of *Epiſcopacy* as of a *novel order*, and add [*ſive τάξις, ut loquitur Ignatius, νεωτερικὴ*] making *Ignatius* to ſay this, which if he doth, then is not only his *Illuſtriſs. Salmaſius* deceived, but alſo *Epiſcopacy* muſt be acknowledged in *Ignatius*'s time, in which if it were acknowledged to be *novel*, it will ſtill be antient enough; and ſo 'tis indeed by that author confeſt (perhaps by incogitancy) in the next page, when he acknowledges, that the cuſtom of *Presbyters joyning with the Biſhop in impoſition of hands on a Presbyter* (which ſure is to ſuppoſe, not to deny the office of *Biſhops*) *ex veteris ævi reliquiis manſit*, and ſpecifies what age he means, by [*juxta illud Apoſtoli per impoſitionem manuum Presbyterii*] wherein yet it had been more ingenuous to have rendred *μετὰ cum*, and not have chang'd it into *per* quite contrary to the text; but this by the way. As for that other argument added by *Salmaſius*, that in that *Epiſtle* to the *Magneſians* there is mention of the word *σιγὴ* (as when he ſaith that *Chriſt* was not, *λόγῳ ἀπὸ σιγῆς προελθὼν*) by which he concludes that *Epiſtle* written after *Valentinus*, whoſe *Idiom* that was; If the argument were concluding, (as ‖ *If. Voſſius* in his late *Edition* hath ſufficiently proved it is not) it cannot ſure be in force againſt us, who find no ſuch thing, in our former *Greek copies*; or, if we did, could readily acknowledge any ſuch paſſage to be *ſuppoſititious*, and thoſe few words taken into the text out of the *margent*, without caſting away the whole *volum* of *Epiſtles*, in that fit of jealouſie, or rage; If I could diſcern in that writer any other ſhew of argument againſt that general opinion, which the *Chriſtian* world hath had of theſe *Epiſtles*, I ſhould proceed to the weighing of it. But now upon the Edition of *Blondels* book (out of which *Salmaſius* only brought us ſome gleanings) we find a great deal of pains taken to caſt off thoſe *Epiſtles*; and it is very obſervable, firſt that he that hath taken in all the antient *Church* writers into his catalogue (even *Hermas* himſelf without any note, or character of *Apocryphal* ſet upon him) and out of each of them laboured (though very improſperouſly) to gather ſome honey to his hive, ſome word or other, that might look like an accordance with that opinion which he aſſerts out of St. *Hierom*, and, it ſeems, had skill enough to make even *Tertullian*, *Irenæus*, and *Cyprian*, (and many others that have innumerable manifeſt places againſt the *ἰσοτιμία* or *equality* of *Biſhops* and *Presbyters*) inſtrumental to his deſign, was not able to find one ſentence in *Ignatius*, which might be perſwaded to be uſeful to him, and therefore hath expreſt that ſeverity on him, that he hath not thought reaſonable on any other, even thoſe which all antiquity hath rejected; So partial and unequal is the mind of man, when that *ἀμετρία ἀνθολκῆς* (that I ſay no worſe) hath the ruling of our *counſels*. The exceptions which this learned man hath made againſt *Ignatius* being the author of thoſe *Epiſtles*, are 1. *Scriptionis genus affectatum, an affected kind of writing, pompous Epithets* (which, ſaith he, could not agree with an *Apoſtle panting in the chains of Martyrs*) ſuch as *θεοφόρῳ*, &c. *ἀνλίψυχῳ*, *ἀνθρωπόμορφῳ*, and among them *πολυπληθία*, *ἀχαυχησία*, *παραϋπάδεια*] the very naming of which, I ſuppoſe, doth ſhew the frivolouſneſs of the charge, and weakneſs of the inference from it; For ſure an author may uſe compounded words, (yea and words of his own making, as, I ſuppoſe, St. *Paul*'s *ἐλαχιστότερῳ* is acknowledged to be, and yet many of theſe recited from thoſe *Epiſtles* are not) without the crime of affectation, as well as St. *Paul* might his *ἀθλησιομάχησα*, *συμάχοι*, and the like: and though a *holy Martyr in his chains* may not be allowed the vanity of *affectation*, as that hunts for glory from men, yet ſure he may be allowed to have elevated affections, and by the command of them, to uſe expreſſions which are not vulgar and *ordinary*. The ſecond is his *barbarous words ἄκκεπλα δεπούσιλα, δεσέρσως, ἐξεμπλάριον*, which indeed are *Latin* words made *Greek*, but ſo there are many more in the *New Teſtament*, inſtead of thoſe four charged on *Ignatius* as barbariſms, theſe fifteen, which are ready at hand to me, (I will not take the pains to ſeek for others) *μίλιον, ἀσσάριον, κήνσος, κοδραντὴς, δηνάριον, λεγεὼν, πραιτάριον, κεντυρίων, φραγέλλιον, Ἰουδὰς, κολωνία, μάκελλον, μεμβράνα*, and many as *Latinizing* (i.e. *barbarous*) *phraſes ἱκανὸν ποιεῖν, ἔχειν παρηγμένον, λαβεῖν τὸ ἱκανὸν, σὺ ὄψει, δὸς ἐργασίαν*, and the like. And 'tis a little ſtrange how this learned man hath minced this matter, confeſſing indeed that there is *δηνάριον* in the *Goſpel* (naming only one of ſo great a number) and *δηναριεύειν* in *Hegeſippus*: and for the excuſe of that one word in *Hegeſippus*, adding that *he was at* Rome *from the year* 150 *to* 170. whereas this liberty might be allowed either *Ignatius*, or *Hegeſippus*, without having been ſo long at *Rome*, as well as the Writers of the *New Teſtament*, which have three times more of ſuch words than he cites out of both of them. The third is, ſeveral paſſages, *quæ incommodè dicta videri poſſunt, which may ſeem incommodiouſly ſpoken*, (and if it be but [*ſeem*,] and that but [*may ſeem*,] and at laſt but [*incommodiouſly ſpoken*,] ſure this charge will not wound deep) *& comparationes non exactæ ad amuſſim, compariſons not drawn by the rule exactly*, (and truly the *Martyr* that was not to be permitted to have the vanity to *affect*, might as well be thought not to have the leaſure to take the *line and the plummet*, and delineate every expreſſion ſo exactly; But what are the miſcarriages, and defects in this kind? why, that he calls the *Spirit σχοινίον* a *cord*, and *Faith ἀναγωγεὺς*, the *Leader*, whence, ſaith he, in *Ignatius*'s eſteem, *Fidei potior quàm Spiritus functio, Faith hath a nobler office than the Spirit*. But why may not I more truly ſay, that the advantage in that compariſon is given to the *Spirit*, becauſe that is ſaid to *draw*, when Faith doth *lead* only? 'Tis certainly clear that his anger was very cauſeleſs, who could quarrel at that doctrine, which is in effect no more than this, That the *Word* of God apprehended by *Faith* doth lead us our way to Heaven, and the *Spirit of God* is the *cord* to *draw* us thither. 2. That he calls his *bands πνευματικὰς μαργαρίτας ἐν δὶς γένοιτο ἀναστῆναι, ſpiritual jewels*, in which *he wiſhes he might riſe*, whereas ſaith *Blondel*, *there is nothing properly ſpiritual in the bands which wicked men put on the body of a Martyr*, and *no hope*

Euſeb. l. 3. 27.

that

that he ſhould riſe in thoſe bands. But ſure his ſufferings may be called his *bands*, and thoſe be matter of joy, and ἀγαλλίασις to his *Spirit*, more than all the *Gemms* to the moſt vain-glorious worldling, and this be very commodiouſly expreſt by thoſe words, and then ſure he might *wiſh*, (though not *hope*) (and γένοιτο is no more) to have this matter of *joy continued* to him, and ſo that he *might riſe with them.* 3. That he uſes σαρκικὸς and πνευματικὸς ſo oft; What a cruelty upon a patient *Martyr* is this, not to give him leave to uſe ſuch frequent innocent words as theſe frequently, as well as St. *Paul* is allowed the very ſame, and ψυχικὸς and πνευματικὸς, &c. theſe are certainly ſtrained exceptions, the learned man was at great leaſure to quarrel, when this provocation was accepted. 4. That when *Baptiſm* is called ὅπλα *weapons*, he calls *Faith* ὡς περικεφαλαία, *as an helmet*; *love*, ὡς δοῦ *as a ſpear*; *patience*, ὡς πανοπλία *as a compleat armour. For* * *what, ſaith he, doth faith and love*, &c. *confer to him that is already armed by baptiſm? and if patience be the Chriſtians compleat armour, what new advantage hath he by having a helmet from faith?* but why may not *Baptiſm* be called *weapons* in the *plural*, and every of thoſe *graces* profeſt and vowed in *baptiſm*, have their ſeveral uſes in the after life? and ſure the *armour* of *baptiſm* is not ſo perfectly of proof, but that there is need of the exerciſe of every one of thoſe *Chriſtian* vertues to hold out againſt the impreſſions of *Satan*, which are like to be ſo oft repeated; and if *faith* do not *defend the head*, and *charity the heart*, and *patience and perſeverance* every part of the body, *i.e.* every action of the future life, that ſubtle enemy may chance to wound us mortally. As for *the new advantage of faith to him that hath the compleat armour of patience*, the *author* of that *Epiſtle* ſaith no ſuch thing, but on the other ſide firſt requires the *helmet* of *faith*, and then the πανοπλία of *patience*, that ſure is *the arming of all parts*, which were not before armed, and that may go for an addition, as *perſeverance* is to *ſanctity*, and as our *Saviour* ſaith of his believers, that he that *endureth to the end ſhall be ſaved* 5. That 'tis *not likely that preſently after Ignatius coming into Aſia, Biſhops, Presbyters and Deacons ſhould be ordained* ejus rogatu, *at his intreaty*, qui ad Antiochenos Aſianorum gratulatorias Epiſtolas deferrent, *who ſhould carry the gratulatory Epiſtles of the Aſians to the Chriſtians of Antioch.* I ſhall only ſay to this 1. that they were ordained to ſome other end beſide this, yet might perform that task alſo, and that very ſolemnly: 2. that a *probable* argument, or a conceived *improbability* againſt a narration of a matter of fact (which relies not upon a confluence of all *probabilities*, but only on the authority of the relator) is of all other the moſt unconvincing; there was nothing ever done 1600 years ago, but a good phanſie will obſerve ſome *improbability* in it, and the matter of *fact* being ſtill but one, when the *poſſibilities*, which never did come to paſs, are infinite, ſome one of thoſe *poſſibilities* may perhaps become at a diſtance, to him that knows nothing of the fact (but would perſwade others that 'twas never done) tolerably *probable* alſo. 6. That he bids follow the *Biſhop as Chriſt did his Father: and the Presbytery*, ut Apoſtolos, *as the Apoſtles, and ſaith that he that doth any thing clancularly without the Biſhops knowledge, is to be thought* διαβόλῳ λατρεύων *to ſerve the Devil:* whereupon, ſaith he, *An Epiſcopos ullos Presbyterorum comparatione Dominos, imo Deos, à Chriſti martyre habitos credere par eſt? Is it fit to believe that any Biſhops in compariſon to Presbyters ſhould be counted Lords, yea Gods by that Martyr of Chriſt?* But ſure this is to pervert and torment the ſence of that Martyr; For to bid *follow Biſhops as Chriſt did his Father*, is far enough from making *Lords*, or *Gods* of them: nay if the compariſon were bound to hold that way, it were more proper to prove the ἰσοτιμία or *equality of Biſhops and Presbyters*, for ſure Chriſt was *equal* with his *Father:* and 'tis obſervable that in the place of *Polycarp* ſet down by this learned man, *p.* 15. when *obedience is required to Presbyters and Deacons as to God and Chriſt*, he finds no fault with it, though that be the very thing actually ſaid by *Polycarp* of *Presbyters* and *Deacons*, that here he unjuſtly firſt impoſes on, then accuſes in *Ignatius*'s words of *Biſhops*, which yet are only for the manner of performing the obedience due to *Biſhops, as Chriſt obeyed his father*, and cannot be extended to any equalizing the *Biſhop* to *God*, or the leaſt appearance of doing ſo. 'Twere too long to go thorow, and render formal anſwers to the reſt of the heap of exceptions, which are every one ſingle ſo ſlight, and of no value (and conſequently the total of them will not amount any higher, it being not in the power of 1000 *probables* to become one *demonſtration*, or to be equipollent to one, much leſs of a few ſlight *improbables*) that 'tis clear the *number* of the exceptions was the thing depended on, and not the *weight* of them: Witneſs theſe four more, that ſhut up the rear: 1. That he ſaith that *all pious men are changed* εἰς νέαν ζυμὴν *into a new leaven*, which he thinks inconvenient, when St. *Paul* calls the *Godly* ἀζύμους *unleavened*, whereas *Chriſt* being by *Ignatius* in the next word expreſſed to be that νέα ζυμὴ *new leaven*; there is then nothing fit to be quarrel'd in it, unleſs *to grow in grace*, and the practice of all *Chriſtian* duties (which is the meaning of that expreſſion) be an inconvenient advice. 2. That he bids *fly to the Apoſtles* ὡς πρεσβυτερίῳ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, *as to the Presbytery of the Church*, whereon having reſolved that by the *Apoſtles* he muſt mean the *Apoſtles writings*, (becauſe in the *ninth of Trajan* then paſt all the *Apoſtles* were dead) he concludes that the *Author* of that ſaying *makes no more of the Apoſtles writings, than of the Congregations of men ſubject to errour.* Where in all ſober reaſon and equality, if the *Apoſtles* ſignifie the *Apoſtles* writings, then the πρεσβυτέριον ἐκκλησίας need not ſignifie any other latter *Presbytery*, but thoſe *Apoſtles* themſelves, who when they wrote thoſe *writings*, were the Chriſtian *Sanhedrin*, or *Presbytery of the Church*, which was to decide all their controverſies in *Religion.* 3. That writing to *Polycarp, tanquam ad plebeium neſcio quem, as unto an ordinary perſon*, he ſaith, τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ προσέχετε, *obſerve your Biſhop*; as if forſooth the *Epiſtle* written to *Polycarp* might not be written to the *Church* under him alſo, to whom 'tis clear that *plural* precept [προσέχετε] muſt belong, and not to any *one* man, though he were never ſuch a *Plebeian.* 4. That he ſaith he will *flatter*, nay, if *they will not, force* the *wild beaſts to kill him, which*, ſaith he, *is like the deſperabunda ſæculi mancipia, the moſt deſperate ſlaves among the Heathen.* As if theſe fervent expreſſions of deſire to ſuffer for *Chriſt* were thus to be deformed, and charged againſt a pious man. After all this unprovoked *ſeverity*, one act of *grace* and *mercy* theſe *Epiſtles* are vouchſafed from this *Author*, viz. that he contains himſelf from making uſe of one paſſage which *ſuppoſititionis earum argumentum videri poſſit, might ſeem an argument of the ſuppoſitionſneſs of them*; (and yet no greater an argument than that, [*multa quæ incommodè dicta videri poſſunt*] made up a great number of arguments even now) the paſſage is, that he *diſputed profeſtly* againſt the δοκηταὶ, thoſe that affirm'd *Chriſts humanity to have been but an appearance*, no reality, for

* *Quid enim Fides, &c. conſerunt jam per Baptiſmum armato? Si Chriſtiani πανοπλία Patientiæ eſt, quid novi jam accedit ex Fide galeato?*

faith

ſaith he, whether you make *Caſſian with Baronius, or Saturninus, Baſilides, and Valentinus the anteſignanos Docetarum, the principal Authors of that hereſie, theſe being under Adrian and Antoninus Pius, will appear to be after Ignatius:* having gone thus far, he comes off again, with a *Volens hoc argumento abſtineo, he willingly abſtains from uſing this argument*; becauſe, ſaith he, *Simon Magus was before Ignatius*, and he, *ſaith Irenæus, taught this doctrine of Chriſts appearing only, not being a true man*; and that *Caſſian*, &c. *were call'd the chief of them, muſt ſignifie, not that they were the firſt broachers, but in their times the chief maintainers and abetters of that Hereſie.* This mercy, I confeſs, was but ſeaſonable, and had much of *Juſtice* in it, and ſhews that that *Author* was able to have anſwered his other arguments, if he had ſo pleaſed, particularly that which is made uſe of ſo confidently both by him and *Salmaſius of* Σιγὴ, the *Valentinian* dialect, which is by *Iſaacus Voſſius* ſatisfied with this very anſwer which here *Blondel* gives to the uſe of the word δοκηταὶ, *viz.* that *Valentinus* was not the firſt that ſaid λόγον ἀπὸ σιγῆς *ortum*, but that 'tis agreed on by the Antients, that he was not the *founder* of a *new*, but *reviver* of an *old opinion* τὰς ἀρχαίας εἰς ἴδιον χαρακτῆρα διδασκαλίας μεθαρμόσας ἀναλαττῶν, ſaith *Irenæus*, and other Fathers to the ſame purpoſe, as *Iſaacus Voſſius* hath collected their affirmations in his *Annot.* on the place. Having gone thus far in rejecting theſe *Epiſtles*, he is at laſt at leaſure to remember and acknowledge, *Plenam illis ipſis, quas confictas putamus Epiſtolis, fidem habere Patres, that the Fathers* (indefinitely, if not univerſally, and it ſeems he had no one to produce to the contrary, if he had, he would certainly have produced it, and with reaſon have depended on it more, than all theſe other *Topicks*) *afforded a full plenary belief to theſe very Epiſtles*, which the two *Champions* of the age *Salmaſius and he think to be ſuppoſititious*, [*putamus*] is but a poor word, *Salmaſius* could ſpeak bigger on weaker or fewer arguments, [*tam certò ſcio, quam me hæc ſcribere.*] To this authority of the *Fathers* againſt his opinion, his anſwer is ſhort, but hath much weight and aſperity in it (which they that have as ſtrong an appetite to lay the *Presbyterians* flat, as the *Presbyterians* have expreſt to deſtroy the *Biſhops*, they that have the ſame exceptions againſt all *diſtinction*, or diſcrimination of *Lay* and *Clergy*, as *Blondel* and *Salmaſius* have againſt the imparity and inequality of *Biſhops* and *Presbyters*, will, when they can hope to be heard, be ready enough to make uſe of, and muſt not be deny'd to have urged an argument *ad homines* unanſwerable, whenſoever they ſhall pleaſe to make uſe of it; and 'tis but this, *Quid tum? What then?* the authority of the *Fathers* in a matter of fact (as that *Ignatius* wrote theſe *Epiſtles*) caſt off without any ceremony, or difficulty in two ſyllables. And the reaſon for ſo doing, which is added, will help the matter but little; *Quàm multa minimè ſuſpicaces ac imparatos & fefellerunt ſemper, & quotidie fallunt? How many things have always deceived, and daily do deceive men that are not ſuſpicious, nor upon their guard?* And if all the *Fathers* of the *Church*, beginning from thoſe that were neareſt *Ignatius*'s time, muſt be involved in the number of theſe incautious, cheatable men, I ſhall be afraid to mention the conſequences, that will too readily be deducible from hence. I ſhall only ſay; May not this liberty, or licence rather, be ſoon extended very inordinately to the invaſion of the ſacred *Canon* of *Scripture*? Nay, when the ſame current, and conſent of Fathers, which delivers down all the books which make up our *Canon* of Scripture, for *Canonical*, and *Theopneuſt*, ſhall be found at the ſame time to deliver down, and make uſe of theſe *Epiſtles* of *Ignatius*, only with the diſtinction of *Apocryphal*, (and mean by that, not *ſuppoſititious* books, or books which are under *ſuſpicion* that they are not their off-ſpring, whom they call Father, but only books of *inferiour* authority, as *Apocryphal* is oppoſed τοῖς τῆς θείας γραφῆς, to the books of *divine Scripture, & legi Domini, to the Law* or *Word of God*, & τοῖς κανονιζομένοις *to thoſe that are put in the Canon*, and in a word τὰ τῆς νίας Ἀποκρυφα, as you may ſee in the end of *Nicephorus*'s *Chronography*, and in others; *inter ſcripta novi Teſtamenti apocrypha, numbred among the Apocryphal books*, not of *Ignatius*, but *of the New Teſtament*, and appointed to be read by pious men, though not allowed that ſame authority and dignity, in which the books of *Sacred Scripture* have been juſtly eſtated) when, I ſay, the ſame hands of the *ancient Church* ſhall deliver *both the Epiſtles* of St. *Peter for divine Scripture*, and theſe *Epiſtles of Ignatius* for the *Epiſtles of Ignatius*, though not for *Divine Scripture*, who can ſay that * *Salmaſius* when he had thus confidently thrown off theſe *Epiſtles* from being written by *Ignatius*, did not *conſequently*, and agreeably to his προλήψεις in the throwing off one of Saint *Peters Epiſtles* alſo? And who can think it reaſonable that our warineſs and cenſoriouſneſs ſhall enable us at 1500 years diſtance to judge more truly of a matter of fact, (which none but they that are near, be they never ſo wary, and ſuſpicious, can diſcern any thing of) than they that lived in thoſe times which were neareſt to the ſcene of action? Nay, how much more rational is that of the ſame *Salmatius*? who in the controverſie about the parts of the Croſs, *i. e.* when he conceived antiquity to be favourable to that opinion which he defended, hath made this argumentative againſt his adverſaries, *An credibile eſt Gregorium qui vixit tanto tempore poſtquam crucis ſupplicio nemo amplius afficiebatur, certiorem eſſe teſtem de habitu crucis totius &c. quàm eos authores qui ſcripſere cùm adhuc paſſim in uſu eſſet communiſſimo nocentum crucifixio? Is it credible, that he that lived ſo long after the uſe of that kind of death was left off, ſhould be a ſurer witneſs of any thing that belongs to it, than thoſe Authors that wrote when it was in uſe? De cruce*, p. 255. And again, if *Blondel* may ſay without proof, that the *Fathers* were *incautious* in general, and thence conclude, that they were actually deceived in this particular; Why may not I as reaſonably affirm (having given my reaſons, when he hath not) that *Blondel* is too *cenſorious* and *partial*, and willing to bring all to the cauſe he hath eſpouſed, and thence conclude (knowing how contrary theſe *Epiſtles* are to his intereſts) that he hath actually expreſt his *paſſion*, and injuſtice in this cauſleſs cenſure of *theſe Epiſtles*? I have done with this learned mans obſervations in this matter, and when I ſhall hear of any other argument which can ſeem of force againſt theſe *Epiſtles*, I ſhall be glad to conſider it, profeſſing my ſelf to conceive that as long as that one *Author* ſtands in the *Church* in his juſt value, the cauſe of *Prelacy*, and *Hierarchy* cannot want ſupports, every page almoſt of thoſe *Epiſtles* being ſufficient (which the adverſaries acknowledge in ſaying he doth εὐκαίρως, ἀκαίρως, *in ſeaſon and out of ſeaſon*, at all turns aſſert *Epiſcopacy*) to interpret the obſcurer *veſtigia* in the *New Teſtament*, and to aſſure us what was the practice and doctrine of the *Apoſtles* and *Primitive Churches* in that point; and that is the reaſon I have inſiſted ſo long on a thing which may ſeem ſo extrinſecal to my firſt undertaking, and ſhall not think

* *Wall. Meſſal.*

think my self out of my way, if I be content to return to this controversie again (as having such an immediate influence on the cause in hand) whensoever I shall be call'd to it; In the mean, I shall content my self with this view of that matter; and for the present, as I cannot but conceive it rashness to cast away an Epistle of S. *Peter* upon a bare affirmation in a *Parenthesis* (*quæ sola plane genuina est*) so will it be in a lower degree, but in like manner, to deal with a most antient *Apostolical-spirited* volum, upon such unproved censures as these; and it is observable, that the first Writer that ever undertook to be thus severe against that whole Volume of *Epistles*, did with as much confidence, and as little pretension to argument, cast off one of the books of *Canonical Scripture*. This I thought not amiss here to insert, to vindicate the Writings of that antient Martyr, though it may be taken for a *parergon* in this place.

Supposing then this Writer to stand in the same repute in the *Church of God*, in which he did, before he was observed to be unreconcileable with the designs of the new *Reformers*, I shall proceed to make use of his testimony. He commands obedience to be paid to *Bishops*, ὡς ἀποστόλοις, as to the *Apostles*, to the *Presbyters as to the Seventy*, to the *Deacons*, as to the Deacons in the *Acts*. The passage is known, and although in another place, he makes the *Presbyters* parallel to the *Apostles* and the *Bishops* to *Christ*, yet these places are easily reconciled, it being clear, that that latter place considers the *Apostles* at the time, when *Christ* was here on earth, at which time, they were indeed but a second rank (and in that respect it is that *Origen* saith, *Tr.* in *Mat.* 24. *Proprie Episcopus Dominus Jesus est, Presbyteri Apostoli, Christ is properly the Bishop, and the Apostles Presbyters*) but the former place considering them after *Christs* departure, is that which more properly belongs to this matter; this power (though promised before) being not yet instated on them, till after his resurrection, immediately before his leaving of this World (or indeed till the coming of the *Holy Ghost*) at which time they were left the *Governours* of the Church, as *Christ* had been before, and the *Bishops*, their successors ever since. To which purpose St. *Cyprian*, Ep. 65. *Apostolos* i. e. *Episcopos & Præpositos Dominus elegit, the Lord chose Apostles*, i.e. *Bishops and Governours*. So *Judas's Apostolical* function is called ἐπισκοπὴ *Bishoprick Act.* 1. 20. so *Theodoret* thinks *Epaphroditus* was *Bishop* of the *Philippians*, because he is called Ἀπόστολ& *Apostle*, and on 1 *Tim.* 3. saith thus τὰς νῦν καλουμένας ἐπισκόπους Ἀποστόλους ὠνόμαζον, *those that are now called Bishops, they then call'd Apostles*, so *Titus*, saith he, and so *Apollos*, and so (saith *Remig.* on 1 *Cor.* 4.) *Sosthenes* also. Thus St. *Hilary* frequently calls St. *Paul Episcopum, Bishop*. And *Hilarius Sardus* in *Eph. Apostoli Episcopi sunt, the Apostles are Bishops*. So the *Scriptor qu. in vet. & nov. Test. qu.* 97. *Nemo ignorat Episcopos Servatorem Ecclesiis instituisse: ipse enim priusquam in cœlos ascenderet, imponens manum Apostolis, ordinavit eos Episcopos. No man is ignorant that our Saviour instituted Bishops over the Churches: For he himself before he ascended to heaven, laying his hand on the Apostles ordained them Bishops.* So saith *Rabanus Maur.* in 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. of the *Apostles* times, *Episcopi provincias integras regebant, Apostolorum nomine nuncupati. The Bishops were called Apostles.* So doth *Blondel* himself confess not only out of *Gildas*, that St. *Matthew Episcopatum sortitus est, was Bishop*, but acknowledges it of St. *James* the brother of the *Lord*, as the voice of all antiquity, that he was *Bishop of Jerusalem. Jacobum Hierosol. Ecclesiæ Episcopum constanter asserunt veteres omnes. Apol. pro sent. Hieron.* p. 50. And if it be said, that he meant by the word *Episcopus Bishop*, no more than a *Presbyter*, one of many; I shall only then put him or the Reader in mind, what the same *Blondel* in his *censure* of the *Pontif. Epistles* (when they say he was not so severe against *Bishops*) hath put together of that *James. Hieros. Ecclesiam rexisse statuunt veteres, & à Christo Episcopale munus accepisse, ait Hegesippus apud Hieron. in Cat. Epiphan. hær.* 78. *Hieron. in Gal. c.* 1. *Greg. Turon. l.* 1. *c.* 17. *Nic. Methon. de pane consecr.* (He might have added *Chrysost. Hom.* 3. on the *Acts.*) *A Christo & Apostolis. Eus. l.* 7. *c.* 19. *Constit. l.* 8. *c.* 35. *ab Apostolis, Constit. l.* 7. *c.* 48. *l.* 8. *c. ult. Clem. Alexand. apud* * *Euseb. l.* 2. *c.* 1. *Athanas. in Synop. Euseb. l.* 2. *c.* 2. *Hieronymus de Script. Eccl. Beda de* 6. *ætat. & Martyrol. ad Cal. Maii. & Chron. Grælanon. Scriptor.* ὃν ἀνεθρόνισεν ὁ ἅγι& Πέτρ&, acknowledging all, that as *Bishop* he *governed* that *Church*, as a single person, *sat in the sea* or *throne*; all the difference between the Antients being, whether by *Christ* or the *Apostles*, or both, or by St. *Peter* only, he was *ordained Bishop*.

* *The same author in his Chr.* p. 43. *affirms that he was by the Apostles ordained Bishop of Jerusalem, the nineteenth year of* Tiberius, *i.e. the very next year in his account after the death of Christ.*

Thus, saith St. ‖ *Chrys. did Christ invest the Apostles with this power of retaining and remitting sins,* καθάπερ τὶς βασιλεὺς ἄρχοντας ἀποστέλλων, &c. *as when a King sends Governours over Provinces, he gives them power of imprisoning, and releasing*, intimating the ἄρχοντες or *Rulers* of the *Church* to be the men that are here represented by the *Apostles*, and so in *L.* 3. περὶ ἱερωσ. speaking of the weighty office of *Bishops* (to excuse himself who had fled from it) he principally insists on the power, which is intrusted to them, and in that respect applies to them the stile of the *faithful, and wise servant, whom God makes Ruler over his houshold*. So *Theophylact.* on *Matt.* 18. ἔχουσιν ἐξουσίαν ἀφίναι καὶ δῆσαι ὅτι κατὰ Πέτρον τῆς ἐπισκοπικῆς ἀξιωθέντες χάριτ&, *They that after the manner of* St. *Peter, are vouchsafed the honour of being Bishops, have the power of binding and loosing*. So again appears by the forecited *Testimonies* of the προεδρεύοντες *Presidents* in St. *Chrys.* and the ἐκκλησίας πρόεδροι *Præfects of the Church*, in *Theophylact.* And so in the name and sence of the *Greek Church*, *Gabriel* of *Philadelphia* περὶ τῆς β. διαφ. *in his second difference betwixt the Greek and the Roman Church*; οἱ ἅγιοι Ἀπόστολοι, καὶ οἱ αὐτῶν διάδοχοι ἀρχιερεῖς, *The chief Priests*, i.e. *Bishops, are the successors of the Apostles*, and in plain words, ὥστε φανερὸν ὅτι οἱ Ἀπόστολοι ἦσαν ἐπίσκοποι, *So that 'tis manifest, that the Apostles were Bishops*, and applies to them that of the *Psalmist*, *Psal.* 45. 16. of *Gods constituting them Rulers over all the earth*, and names the several *Churches* wherein the several *Apostles* ordain'd *Bishops*, St. *John* in *Asia*, St. *Andrew* in *Achaia*, St. *Thomas* in *India*, &c.

‖ *Hom.* 86. *in Joh.*

Thus also among the *Latins* St. *Jerome*, who was not very favourable to *Bishops*, saith expresly, that they were the *Apostles successors, Episcopi omnes Apostolorum successores sunt.* Ep. 83. *ad Evagrium.* So St. *Ambrose*, *Claves illas regni cœlorum in beato Petro Apostolo cuncti suscepimus sacerdotes. All we, that are stiled Sacerdotes, in the blessed Apostle* St. *Peter received the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven.* And what *Sacerdos* signifies among the Writers of that time, and particularly in St. *Ambrose*, the observation of any diligent Reader will instruct him; *viz.* that which the [*suscepimus*] applyed to St. *Ambrose*'s person, will inforce, he being *Bishop* of *Millain* at that time, (and this is agreeable even to the Heathens acception of the phrase, who use *Sacerdos* and *Pontifex* promiscuously; witness *Servius in Æn.* 3.) So *de dignitate Sacerd. c.* 2. he shews out of *Scripture*, that the

Sect. 5.

Sect. 6.

Sect. 7.

ſheep are delivered *Sacerdotibus*, I ſhall render it, *to Biſhops*, becauſe it follows, *and ſo muſt be ſubject to thoſe Rulers.* So in S. *Chryſoſt.* in the fore-cited περὶ ἱερωσ. l. 2. The word ποιμὴν (which together with *Paſtor* in *Latin*, is ordinarily the *Biſhops* Title, in order to the *Shepherds* office of ruling, and governing, as well as *feeding* the *flock*) and ἱερεὺς, *Sacerdos*, are promiſcuouſly taken, and the latter by the *Interpreter* there rendred *Epiſcopus*, *Biſhop*.

Sect. 8. And to the ſame purpoſe moſt clearly S. *Cyprian*, *Ep.* 12. ſpeaking of the *Lapſi*, thoſe who having fallen were under the cenſures of the *Church*, and how the *Presbyters* had preſumed to reconcile, or abſolve them, he concludes that they did not (*Reſervare Epiſcopo honorem Sacerdotii ſui, & Cathedra*) *reſerve to the Biſhop the honour of his Prieſthood, and chair*, ſhewing the indifferent uſe of thoſe words, *Epiſcopus* and *Sacerdos*, at that time; and that in oppoſition to *Presbytery*, appropriating to the one the *Power* of the *Keys*, excluſively to the other. This he had ſet down more plainly before *Epiſt.* 10. ſhewing, and aggravating the greatneſs of the fault of thoſe *Presbyters*, that had taken upon them to uſe the *Keys* in that caſe, *Præpoſitum ſibi Epiſcopum non cogitantes, not thinking that there was a Biſhop ſet over them*; *quod nunquam omnino ſub anteceſſoribus factum eſt, reſolving that it was a fact without any precedent in the Church*; and again, *L.* 1. *Epiſt.* 3. having proved the *Epiſcopal power* to be immediately from God, he expreſſeth it in theſe words, *Sacerdotalis auctoritas & poteſtas divinâ dignatione firmatur, The ſacerdotal power is ſetled by divine dignation*, and adds the occaſion of all *Schiſms* in the *Church* to be, *quod Sacerdoti Dei non obtemperatur*, that *the Biſhop is not obeyed: Nec unus in Eccleſia ad tempus Sacerdos, & ad tempus Judex, vice Chriſti cogitatur*; *and that 'tis not conſidered, that the one Prieſt*, i. e. *Biſhop, and Judge, is for the time in the Church in Chriſts ſtead*; which is yet more clear by his making *Sacerdotum Collegium, the College of Prieſts*, all one with *Coepiſcoporum conſenſus*; *The conſent of Fellow-Biſhops*, and preſently adding, that he that ſets himſelf above this *unus Sacerdos, one Prieſt, ſe non Epiſcopi ſed Dei judicem facere, makes himſelf Judge not of the Biſhop, but of God.* And therefore 'tis a ſtrange proof of *Blondels*, that *Epiſcopacy*, and *Presbytery* is all one, from that ſpeech of *Pontius Diaconus* concerning this *Cyprian*, *Quod ad officium Sacerdotii & Epiſcopatus gradum novellus electus eſt*, having before ſaid, *Presbyterium & Sacerdotium ſtatim accepiſſe.* Whereas the equipollence of the words *Sacerdos* and *Epiſcopus* being obſerved, and the difference of *Presbyter* from them, doth clearly infer the contrary; and that is apparent by the very place, *Multa ſunt quæ jam Presbyter fecit*; *ad probationem bonorum operum ſatis eſt, quod ad officium Sacerdotii & Epiſcopatus gradum adhuc novellus electus eſt.* He was, it ſeems, *a Presbyter firſt, and did many things in that ſtate, and a proof that he did ſo, was his election to the office of Sacerdos or Biſhop, when he was a novice*, i. e. *preſently or ſoon after his converſion*; where the difference of his being a *Presbyter* and a *Biſhop* is moſt manifeſt. So when St. * *Hilarius Pictav.* ſaith, *Aarone Sacerdotes ſignificari non ambiguum, in Levi, miniſtros oſtendi*, the ſame *Blondel* concludes, *Sacerdotes ſive præpoſitos, & ſeniores* to be all one, not knowing or obſerving again that *Sacerdos* ſignifies *Biſhop*, who is there ſet parallel to *Aaron, in lege primus Sacerdos, the firſt Prieſt in the Law.*

Apol. pro Sent. Hieron.

* In Pſalm.

Sect. 9. Many other evidences might be produced out of thoſe and after-times, as in the Council of *Taurinum* ſpeaking of *Palladius*, *A Triferio ſacerdote fuerat multatus, he was puniſhed by Triferius*, who, that he was a *Biſhop*, (if it were doubted) would appear by the acts of that *Council*, and particularly by his excommunicating *Exuperantius*, *a Presbyter*, *Can.* 4. which ſure none but a *Summus Sacerdos*, *a High Prieſt*, or *Biſhop* could do.

Sect. 10. But there can be no need of more proofs in this matter, and if there were now any more doubt, that the *Biſhops* were the confeſt *ſucceſſors* of the *Apoſtles* in this Privilege or Prerogative, that one *Canon* of the *Apoſtles* might ſatiſhe it, Οἱ πρεσβύτεροι καὶ διάκονοι ἄνευ γνώμης τοῦ ἐπισκόπου, μηδὲν ἐπιτελείτωσαν, αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐστὶν ὁ πεπιστευμένος τὸν λαὸν τοῦ Κυρίου, &c. *Let not the Presbyters, or Deacons do any thing without the conſent of the Biſhop, for he hath the people of the Lord intruſted to him, and ſhall one day be required an account of their ſouls*, which beſides that it is evidenced to belong to this *power of the Keys*, by the uſefulneſs of that to the diſcharging the truſt about ſouls, appears further by the μηδὲν ἐπιτελείτωσαν, *the prohibiting of Presbyters to do any thing without him.*

Sect. 11. A ſaying, which whatſoever is thought of it, is the voice of the firſt *Antiquity*. *Ignatius* muſt begin the number in *Ep.* ad *Trall.* Ἀναγκαῖον ἴσθι, ὅσαπερ ποιεῖτε, ἄνευ ἐπισκόπου μηδὲν πράσσειν ὑμᾶς. *It is neceſſary that whatſoever ye do, ye do nothing without the Biſhop.* And if, becauſe it follows immediately, ἀλλ' ὑποτάσσεσθε καὶ τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ, ὡς Ἀποστόλοις, *obey the Presbyters, as the Apoſtles*, it be conceived, that that precept belongs to the *people* only, and not to the *Presbyters*, it will then be eaſily replyed, that to the whole matter the ſame *Ignatius* in *Ep. ad Mag.* hath given it in a latitude, which had prevented this ſcruple, ὥσπερ οὖν ὁ κύριος ἄνευ τοῦ πατρὸς οὐδὲν ποιεῖ, οὕτω καὶ ὑμεῖς ἄνευ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου, μήδε πρεσβύτερος, μήδε διάκονος, μήδε λαϊκός. *As the Lord Chriſt doth nothing without the Father, ſo you alſo without the Biſhop; You, whether Presbyter, or Deacon, or Laick.* Once more in *Ep. ad Smyrn.* μηδεὶς χωρὶς ἐπισκόπου τι πρασσέτω τῶν ἀνηκόντων εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, *Let no man without the Biſhop do any of thoſe things which belong unto the Church.* And the *Council* of *Laodicea* hath (almoſt in *Ignatius*'s words) commanded the ſame, *Can.* 56. τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους μηδὲν πράττειν ἄνευ γνώμης τοῦ ἐπισκόπου, *The Presbyters muſt do nothing without the conſent of the Biſhop*; and many more acts, and *Canons* might be produced to the ſame purpoſe.

Sect. 12. And if againſt all theſe, this exception be made, that by the force of ſuch *Rules* not only the *power of the Keys*, but alſo all other power belonging to the *Church* is appropriated to *Biſhops*: to this the Anſwer (as it will be eaſie, ſo it) will tend much to the clearing, and ſerve for the ſhutting up of this whole matter; That indeed there is great truth in the Objection, that all *power* in all matters *Eccleſiaſtical* did primarily belong to the *Biſhop*, and to no others, even *Presbyters* themſelves; but as it was by the *Biſhop* communicated to them, not only by that firſt act of *Ordination*, in giving them the χάρισμα, or firſt *power*, but alſo by a ſecond act neceſſary to give them that other *power* to uſe or *exerciſe* that *power*, when they have it.

Sect. 13. This is the plain ſence of the *Canon* of the *Council* of *Arles*, *Can.* 19. *Nec Presbyteris civitatis ſine Epiſcopi præcepto amplius aliquid imperare, vel ſine authoritate literarum ejus in unaquaque Parochia aliquid agere. The Presbyters of any City muſt not command any thing without the precept of the Biſhop, nor do any thing in any Pariſh, without authority of the Biſhops letters, licenſing them to do it.* Thus, I ſay,

it

it is not only for the *power of the Keys*, but even for the *Sacraments*. *Ignatius*'s ſaying laſt produced in *Ep. ad Smyrn.* is by him thus enlarged, ἐκείνη βεβαία εὐχαριστία ἡγείσθω ἡ ὑπὸ τὸν ἐπίσκοπον οὖσα, ἢ ᾧ ἂν αὐτὸς ἐπιτρέψῃ. *Let that Euchariſt be reputed firm* (or rightly celebrated) *which is done by the Biſhop, or by him to whom he ſhall give leave*; and for *Baptiſm* and that together, οὐκ ἔξον ἐστὶ χωρὶς τοῦ ἐπισκόπου οὔτε βαπτίζειν, οὔτε προσφέρειν, *It is not lawful without the Biſhop*, i.e. *without his leave, either to baptiſe, or adminiſter the Sacrament*; ἀλλ' ὅταν εἰκὸς ᾖ δοκῇ κατ' εὐαρέστησιν Θεοῦ, *but when he ſhall think fit according to Gods pleaſure*, ἵνα ἀσφαλὲς ᾖ καὶ βέβαιον πᾶν ὃ ἂν πράσσητε, *that all that you do, may be ſafe and firm*. It ſeems the *conſent* of the *Biſhop* was thought neceſſary to make it *ſafe* for any *Presbyter* to do any *Eccleſiaſtical* act, or to give validity to it, when 'twas done by him. So *Tertul. de cor. mil. Non de aliorum quàm de præſidentium manu Euchariſtiam ſumimus, We receive the Euchariſt from none but the Preſidents*, or *Governours*. They are all one with the προεστὼς in *Juſt. Mart. Apol.* 2. to whom that whole buſineſs is there remitted. So again *Tertul. de bapt. Dandi baptiſmum jus habet Summus Sacerdos qui eſt Epiſcopus, dehinc Presbyteri & Diaconi, non tamen ſine Epiſcopi authoritate, propter Eccleſiæ honorem, quo ſalvo ſalva pax eſt. The chief Prieſt who is the Biſhop, hath the power of giving baptiſm, after him the Presbyters and Deacons, yet not without the authority of the Biſhop, for the honour of the Church, which as long as it is preſerved, the peace of the Church will be preſerved alſo.* So when the *Scriptor. anon. quæſt. in V. & Nov. Teſt.* which is thought to be *Hilary*, ſaith, *In Alexandriâ & per totam Ægyptum, ſi deſit Epiſcopus, conſecrat Presbyter, that in Alexandria and Egypt, if there be no Biſhop, the Presbyter conſecrates*; 'tis clear by the mention of that liberty in the *Presbyter*, as of a thing peculiar to *Ægypt*, and that too, only when *there is no Biſhop preſent*, that regularly this power belong'd to none but the *Biſhops*, and to thoſe *Presbyters* to whom he gave it. Where by the way will appear a great miſtake of *Blondel* and (I ſuppoſe out of him, as his many other *Notes* in his *apparatus* againſt *Biſhops*) of *Salmaſius*, who in another place of *Hilary* in *Eph.* 4. cited by both of them, [*apud Ægyptum Presbyteri conſignant, ſi præſens non ſit Epiſcopus*; *In Ægypt the Presbyters conſign, if the Biſhop be not preſent*] interpret *conſigning*, either to be * *confirmation*, or *bleſſing* (I ſuppoſe *abſolving*) of *penitents*, or *ordination*. It being clear by the other place, juſt now cited, that *conſignatio* ſignifies there *conſecrating* of the *Sacrament*, which is peculiarly call'd *conſecration*, that of giving orders being *ordination*, not as he calls it *ordinandorum conſecratio* (which what it would grammatically ſignifie I know not, unleſs ſome *benediction* of them that are *after* to be *ordain'd*) and it ſeems ‖ *Blondel* himſelf, p. 61. thinks it poſſible that *conſignatio* may ſignifie the *conſecrating the Elements*, & by what follows, I conceive him to uſe it in that ſenſe, ſaying, *quod antiquis per ſolam Epiſcoporum abſentiam licuit, omnibus nunc abſolutè licet*, that *which anciently was made lawful to all* (i.e. *to Presbyters*) *only by the Biſhops abſence, is now abſolutely lawful to all*: Which I ſuppoſe he doth mean of *conſecrating* the *Sacrament*, and I am ſure could not reaſonably believe of *ordination*. But this by the way, in paſſage, to confirm that aſſertion of *Ignatius* ſufficiently, that the *Church* was by the *Apoſtles* put into the hands of *Biſhops*, that ordinarily the conſent of the *Biſhop* was required to enable a *Presbyter* for any *Eccleſiaſtical* act, *the plenitude of power* being by *Chriſt* delivered down to the *Apoſtles*, and through them to their *ſucceſſor-biſhops*, and by them diſpenſt out to others in that meaſure, and thoſe portions, which they ſhould think fit.

* *Sive baptizatorum confirmatio, ſive pœnitentium benedictio, ſive ordinandorum conſecratio.* *Blond. Apol. p.* 57. *& Salmaſ. in appar. ad l. de Prim. Papæ.*

‖ *Sive de Euchariſtiæ confectione Chriſmatione, ſive de ordinationibus ſacris interpretari placeat.*

And if it be demanded here, What it is which in our *Church* is given to *Presbyters* in their *Ordination*, as the full importance of the form then uſed [*Receive the holy Ghoſt*:] I anſwer, 1. not all that is at any time contained under that phraſe, when it is uſed in the conſecration, but only the particulars, which are after mention'd; and ſo diſtinctly not the *power of ordaining*, which is not mentioned, and which is a *particular*, that never was regular for any *Presbyter* in the antient *Church* to aſſume to himſelf, or to any number of that order, without a *Biſhop* over them (and it would not be hard to give an account of all that hath been produced of late by *Salmaſius*, or any other from the *origines Alexandrini*, or any other record of antiquity to the contrary, but that it is ἄλλης σχολῆς, and would be too large a παρεργον in this place; and if the practice of ſome few *Proteſtant Churches* in this laſt *Century* be oppoſed againſt it; then 1. I ſhall conceive thoſe very unfit to be confronted againſt the *Univerſal* for 1500 years: and therefore, ſecondly, I ſhall not doubt to affirm, that want is not only a defect, but a corruption among them. Thirdly, it will be obſervable, that even thoſe that want it among them, have formerly thought fit to excuſe it by the caſe of *neceſſity*, and to acknowledge it their *infelicity*, but not their *fault*, (their *ſuperiors* in the State not permitting them to have *Biſhops* to *ordain* them;) and to give their judgments freely, that where *Epiſcopacy* is, it is to be *preſerv'd*; and where it is not, it is to be *wiſht for*; which is a ſufficient expreſſion of their ſenſe of it: And if the *improſperouſneſs* of the cauſe of late in this Kingdom hath moved ſome of them to *change* their ſtyle, I ſuppoſe there is no greater reaſon to depend on their judgments who are mov'd or wrought on by ſuch *extrinſecal* arguments, than on his, who lately made no ſcruple to confeſs, in giving his opinion of *H. Grotius*, *Ego non probo prudentiam minùs felicem. He lik'd not the choice of that ſide which was not proſperous.* And then fourthly, that this cannot be applicable by way of excuſe to thoſe, who deſire to caſt out *Biſhops* where they are, on purpoſe that *Presbyters* may uſurp the *power* which belongs to them. Secondly, not all power of *binding*, and *looſing*, *retaining*, or *remitting*, though thoſe words are there added (*whoſe ſins you do remit*, &c.) but ſo much as the *Biſhops* or *Governours* are preſumed to have thought fit to impart to them, and what that is, will appear by other acts of our *Church*, eſpecially by the *Liturgy*: as 1. The *declaring of abſolution* in the *Church* after the *Confeſſion* of ſins: 2. The *abſolving* them by way of *prayer* before the *Sacrament* (in caſe the *Biſhop* be not preſent,) and 3. in *Baptiſmal waſhing*, and 4. upon ſpecial *Confeſſion* on the ſick-bed; or any time elſe which may by analogy or reduction come under theſe ſame heads, as in the caſe of private conference, and confeſſion at other times: In all theſe the *remitting of ſins* is allowed among us to a bare *Presbyter*, not only by way of *pronouncing*, or declaring of *abſolution*, but (as a *miniſterial* act) actually abſolving him, (by *Chriſts authority committed* to the *Presbyters*) from all his ſins.

Sect. 14.

All which yet will not extend to the *abſolving* from the band of *Excommunication*, or proportionably to ſuch power of *binding*, any further (at moſt) than to confer the firſt *power* of it, which if it be then given, doth yet remain (as the other power of *Preaching*, and adminiſtring the *Sacraments*) *bound*, and *reſtrained* from being exerciſed, till they be further looſed by the donation of a ſecond

Sect. 15.

power as *Luke* 24. 49. when Christ sent them *the Promise of his Father*, which was at the time of his *breathing* on them, *Joh.* 20.22. and gave them a χάρισμα, a *grace*, or first *power* of it, he yet *restrains* the exercise of it, till the actual descent of the *Holy Ghost*, (*but tarry you in Jerusalem, till you be indued with power from above*) and that is not done in this *Church* as it stands established by *Law*, and in this particular of the *Keys*) till he becomes a πρεσβύτερος, a *ruling Elder*, whether by being made *Bishop*, or otherwise by having *Jurisdiction* vested on him; and thus much will serve turn for the first enquiry, on whom the *power of the Keys* was bestowed.

CHAP. IV.

Sect. 1. I Come now to the second *general enquiry*, in what this power consists, and shews it self; which I shall make no stay, or scruple to define in this proposition, *That the power of binding and loosing in these places of the Gospels is* * χάρισμα πνευματικὸν, a *spiritual gift* or *grace*, and belongs to the τὰς τῶν σφαλμάτων ἢ συγχωρήσεις ἢ ἐπιτιμήσεις, in *Theoph.* in *Mat.* 16. the *pardoning or punishing of faults*, the former to the *Censures of the Church*, the *Ecclesiastical* punishments of *Excommunication*, and the later, the *power of loosing* to that of *absolving* from them.

* Διάφορα χαρίσματα τὰ πνεύματος. Δὸ ἐπάγαγεν, ὧν ἀφῆτε &c. *Chrys.* in Joh. 20.

Τὸ εἶδος τῶν πνευματικῶν χαρισμάτων αὐτοῖς δίδωσι τὸ τὰ ἁμαρτήματα ἀφίεσθαι. *Theoph.* in Joh. 20. ἐστὶ δὲ εἰπεῖν ὅτι ἐξουσίαν τινὰ καὶ χάριν πνευματικὴν δίδωσιν αὐτοῖς, ὥστε ἀφιέναι, &c. Ib.

Sect. 2. This position I must vindicate from the contrary interpretations or objections which are thought to keep these *Texts* from concluding or countenancing any such *Censures*. And of these, though they are not all to one sense, yet one interpretation I have chosen rather to insist on, because it hath not yet been considered by others, and because it seems to pretend to more antient grounds than the rest formerly have done, I mean that which proceeds by interpreting the Phrases out of the writings of the *Talmudists*, and from them concludes (I shall give it you in the learned Writers own words) that the *power of binding and loosing* is רשות להורות באימור והתר *facultas decernendi, explicandi, interpretandi, declarandi de ligato & soluto, quod planè millies in Talmudicis ex vetustissimæ Ecclesiæ illius usu denotat, quid vetitum ex lege sacrâ, quid permissum* (*quemadmodum & Græcis* * *scimus δῆσαι, quod ligare est, etiam interdicere sonare, & λύειν, quod est solvere, etiam permittere, seu obligationem sive auferre, sive nondum inductam monstrare, aut asserere*) *adeoq; ad docendi, seu interpretandi, seu Theologiæ Præceptivæ munus solum ibi attinuit*, &c. making it no more than the *faculty of explicating, or interpreting what is lawful, what not*, &c. in a word, no more, than the power of deciding *cases of conscience*, *seu sic de jure publicè respondendi illudq; dicendi*, &c. The truth of which, I shall, with all due respect, for a while take boldness to examine. First, by yielding, or for the present not denying, that there was or might be an *office* or power among the *Jews* intrusted to some select *Elders* of the people, of teaching and giving publick *responses* (by way of deciding cases of *Conscience*, though not by way of *Judicature*) what was to be accounted *lawful*, what not, both by the Law of *God*, and the *Tradition* of the *Antients*; which yet being supposed and granted, I must secondly interpose, that it is not thereby proved that this is called in the *Talmud*, or by any of those writers, the *power of binding and loosing*, (or that the *power of binding and loosing* is by them so described) but (which is quite another thing) רשות להורות *a power of teaching or instructing*, &c. *what is lawful, what forbidden.* Nor will it be a proof of any force to conclude (that which we have no reason to believe without a proof, or some kind of affinity in the phrases, *viz.*) that this *power of binding* is that *power of teaching*, and no more, only because there was such *a power of teaching* among the *Jews*. For if we will judge *à pari*, experience proves the contrary, in this *Church* of ours; where though there be a *power of binding*, and a *munus docendi*, *an office of teaching*, &c. yet no man is bound from thence to acknowledge these two to be all one, but we have long believed them to be two *faculties*, or offices, the one given the *Apostles* in the *donation of the Keys*, the other in the *mission* to *preach*; (and though it were granted that we were mistaken in affirming them to be two such distinct faculties, yet would not that hinder the truth of this assertion, that in our books they are so distinguished, the question being now of the fact, and not of the right, and it being clear that in our practice our *Preaching* is one thing, and our *Excommunicating* is another) and secondly, because 'tis clear, there were two distinct powers among the *Jews*, one of *declaring in foro*, as well as the other *extra forum*, one *judicial*, as well as the other *doctrinal*; and sure it would be but a poor *supersedeas*, or *prohibition* to keep the *Sanhedrin* among them from judging and punishing any offender brought before them, by telling them that there was among the *Jews* a רשות להורות *a licence or faculty of declaring what was lawful*, without any power of punishing; For they would be so soon able to say, that 'twas by some other *power* (and not by that of *declaring*) that they undertook thus to judge and punish, and let me add, that although the *power* among the *Jews*, were acknowledged only to be a *civil power*, yet might *Christ* in his *Church* set up an *Ecclesiastical power* proportionable to that, and imitate that in the *sacred*, which they used only in *civil* judicatures; as anon we shall have occasion to demonstrate. And thirdly, the phrase of the Gospel, from whence we pretend, is not the *facultas*, *faculty*, or *power of binding*, but the *donation* of *Keys*, and with that, *Christs promise*, that *whatsoever they shall bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven*: and therefore I conceive this will not be a convincing way of inferring this conclusion.

* *Vide* Eustath. & Did. in illud Iliad. Σ. ἐμεῖο δὲ δῆσιν Ἀρῆς ἀλκτῆρα γενέσθαι, & Inscript. Isid. apud Diodor. Sic. l. 1.

Sect. 3. We must therefore in the next place proceed to examine the reasons, or arguments produced to perswade us, that the *power* of *binding and loosing* is no more than the *power of declaring*, &c. what is *prohibited*, *what is permitted*, the *office* of the *Casuist* only. And these reasons I can find to be but two.

1. That

1. That *ligatum & ſolutum planè millies in Talmudicis ex vetuſtiſſimo Eccleſiæ illius uſu denotat quid vetitum, quid permiſſum.* 2. That in ſome places of *Greek Authors*, δῆσαι and λύσαι, to *bind*, and *looſe* are uſed alſo. Sect. 4.

For the firſt of theſe, I ſhall firſt ſay, that if it were true, that the Idiom of the *Talmudiſts* were *ex vetuſtiſſimo Eccleſiæ illius uſu, out of the moſt antient uſe of that Church*, the *Law of Moſes*, and the Scriptures of the *Old Teſtament*, being the *Records* of the *moſt antient Church*, ſome footſteps of it might be expected there; but I ſhall ſuppoſe there are no ſuch to be found, not only becauſe I have there ſought them in vain, but becauſe I preſume the Author would have conceived any *Teſtimony* from thence to be more *Authentick* than the *Talmud*, and ſo would certainly have produced them, if there had been any. 2*ly*. For the *Talmudiſts* acception of the phraſes; firſt I might ſay, that we are no way obliged to interpret *Greek words* in the *New Teſtament* by the uſe of the *Talmudiſts*, becauſe though the *traditions* concerning *Hebrew* cuſtoms mentioned in the *Talmud* may reaſonably be thought antienter than *Chriſts* time (and ſo the *Teſtimonies* brought thence be worth the *heeding* for *ſuch*, and fit ſometimes to be uſed for the explaining the like *cuſtoms* mentioned in the *New Teſtament*) yet the book it ſelf, and conſequently the words in it (which only we have now to conſider) was written, and ſet out long after the New Teſtament, the *Miſnaioth*, or firſt δευτερώσεις, which contain the *Text* of the *Talmud*, being ſet forth by the תנאים *Tannaim*, or *Doctores Miſchnici*, about the year 150 after *Chriſt*, who as they profeſs to have had their beginning *per continuam ſucceſſionem acceptionis legis oralis à Moſe*, ſaith *Buxtorf*; *by a continual ſucceſſion of tradition of the oral law from the times of Moſes*, ſo they acknowledge to end in *R. Jehudah hakkadoſch*, (ſtiled *Haunaſi* the *Chief* or *Prince*, and by way of eminence *Rabbi*, when he is cited in the *Gemara*) who lived under *Antoninus* in the midſt of the ſecond *Century*. After theſe *Tannaim*, are the אמוראים *Amoraim* whom *Scaliger* calls γνωμολόγοι, the Authors of the *Gemara*, and of that *Gemara*, i.e. thoſe *diſputations*, and deciſions of thoſe learned men at *Jeruſalem*, together with the *Miſchna* forementioned, doth the *Jeruſalem-Talmud* conſiſt, as was ſet forth * *an.* 230. as the collection of the like *diſputations* and deciſions on the *Miſchna*, which were had in *Academiis Pombedithana, Soriah*, and *Nahardeah*, make up the *Talmud Babylonicum*, which was compleated, *ann.* 500. This will be ſufficient to ſhew that the words of *Chriſt*, either as they were ſpoken by him, or repeated by the *Evangeliſts*, ought not to be conceived to have imitated the phraſes of the *Talmudiſts*, ſo long after them; and there will be as little reaſon to believe that the writers of the *Talmuds* have imitated the phraſes in the *Goſpel*, being themſelves both *Jews*, and enemies to the *Chriſtian* Religion. The only thing which can be ſuppoſed reaſonable or poſſible in this matter, is this, that our Saviours Language was ſo near kin to that which the *Jewiſh* ſchool after uſed, that we ought to have regard to it in expounding his words. But this will not extend to all Chriſts ſpeeches, or phraſes, nor be uſeful but where there appears ſuch a conſent, or agreement, much leſs be ſufficient to prove a poſition of this conſequence, where the agreement is not clear and neceſſary: and beſides, if the *Idiom* of the *Talmudiſts* were of any weight in this matter, yet ſure it is not ſufficient to weigh down the contrary Interpretation of the *Chriſtian Fathers*, (who are to us in all reaſon to be heeded, as the veryer *Talmudiſts* of the two, the *Traditors* and deliverers of our *Goſpel*, and *Creed* unto us) or the uſe of it among the *Jews*, that they have written in *Greek*, particularly of the *Author* of *Eccleſiaſticus*, who is conceived to be the famous *Ben-Sira*, and with him λύειν ἁμαρτίας, is punctually *to forgive ſins*, c. 28. 2. however no way able to extend it ſelf to that other place in St. *John*, where the phraſe is varied, and the [*power of remitting and retaining of ſins*] is given to the *Diſciples*, which will have no analogy with that which is here pretended; for whatever ſhould be granted of the words *ligatum & ſolutum*, being all one with *prohibited*, &c. the *retaining or remitting of ſins*, will be diſtant from it, for ſure that will not be, *to declare* one mans ſins *unlawful*, anothers *lawful*, which it muſt do, if this interpretation be applied to that place alſo. Sect. 5.

* *Vid. Buxtorf. Lex. Rab. p. 583.*

This being premiſed as an *Anſwer* ſufficient to take away the force, or unconvincingneſs of this interpretation, I ſhall *ex abundanti* ſuperadd, that I have uſed ſome care to examine thoſe words, and to obſerve their importance in thoſe, and other *Jewiſh* writings: I ſhall give you an account of it. Sect. 6.

The *Hebrew* word for binding is אסר, which I ſhall make no ſcruple to acknowledge, doth in the *Talmuld* many times ſignifie to *forbid* and *prohibit*; and from thence אסור and אימור ſignifies a thing *forbidden, prohibited, unlawful*; only by the way I ſhall crave leave to ſhew you by what degrees it comes to ſignifie thus. The word in the Old Teſtament ſignifies to *bind*, (and ſure that is the beſt interpreter of *Idioms* in the New) and accordingly is rendred by δέω, δεσμεύω, ζωννύω, πεδάω, &c. and is uſed commonly for binding with cords, and ſometimes for that band, or *obligation*, that proceeds from having made a *vow*, as *Num.* 30. 4. & is then rendred ὁρισμὸς *definition* or *decree*, becauſe by that *vow* I *bind*, or *define*, or *determine* my ſelf to ſuch a performance; Farther than this, 'tis true this word is rendred by our Tranſlators *Num.* 11. 28. to *forbid*] *Lord Moſes forbid them*, where yet 'tis obſervable that the *forbidding* there, which *Joſhua* deſires, is applied to the *perſons*, and not to the *thing*, and ſignifies a *checking*, repreſſing, [*Lord Moſes ſuffer them not, cohibeto eos*] as when by *chiding*, or *diſciplining*, a ſuperiour *reſtrains* another, according to which uſe of the word it is, that *Philip de Aquin.* makes it agree in ſence with מנע, and חשך *prohibuit* and *cohibuit*, *forbidding*, and *repreſſing*: and thus it will be very agreeable with our ſence of *binding*, as that ſignifie *Church-cenſure*, παίδωσις, *diſciplining*, *repreſſing* offenders by that means. In the whole Scripture I believe there will not one place be found where that word is rendred by the 72. by any word ſignifying barely to *prohibit*, or the like, unleſs you will ſay it doth *Dan.* 6. 7, 8, 9. where the word אסר is rendred δόγμα, and ὁρισμὸς, a *decree*, and yet if you examine that place, and the nature of the *decree*, you ſhall find, that it was not a bare *prohibition*, but a binding to puniſhment upon non-performance, (for the *decree* was there, *ver.* 7. that *whoſoever ſhall ask any petition from either God or man, but of thee, O King, ſhall be caſt into the den of Lions:*) and ſo the *decree* is that deſignation to the *puniſhment*, of caſting into the *den*, which is there call'd אסר *binding*, as when the Judge decrees the Offender to be *Excommunicated*, that act of *judicature* is a *decree*, yet nevertheleſs a *binding*, (this *binding* being a *judicial* act, and from thence receiving its force of *obligation*) and *è converſo* in that a *binding*, or obligation to *puniſhment*, that it is ſuch a *decree*, to wit, a decree *ſub pœnâ*, that ſuch a thing ſhall be done; ſo ſaith *Schindler*, that the *Chaldee* אסר is *obligavit ad obedientiam, aut pœnam, binding to obedience*, or *penalty*, and *Elias Levita*, that כל דבר &c. *Every thing*

from

from which either ſin or puniſhment cometh unto him that doth it נקרא אסור *is ſaid to be bound*, or is call'd *Aſſur*; and therefore *Munſter* giving an account of the uſe of the word in the *Commentaries* of the *Rabbins*, ſaith אסר or אסרא ſignifies *edictum aut ſententiam, quâ quis tenetur*, &c. *by which any man is bound to puniſhment, if he obey it not.* In like manner as he that *vows, binds*, (and the word אסר *Num.* 30.4.&c. belongs peculiarly to that) becauſe in *vowing* he doth either by words of *execration* explicitly, or elſe by *intimation* implicitely, call *puniſhment* upon himſelf, if he perform not his *vow*, and ſo *binds* himſelf to that *puniſhment*. And ſo ſtill the word [*binding*] by denoting a decree in this kind, doth not at all vary from our preſent ſenſe of *binding* by way of *cenſure*, which now we contend for, but rather confirm and concur with it; and ſo I conceive (in thoſe *excerpta* about *excommunication*, which *J. Coch* hath ſet down in *Latin* out of *Maimonides*) thoſe words of *Maimonides* do import, *Quod totus Iſrael decrevit, non obſervat Princeps*, &c. *What all Iſrael decreed, the Prince obſerves not:* he ſpeaks of inflicting *anathema*'s, and I ſhall grant that the word rendred *decrevit*, is in the original אסר the word for *binding*, (in reference to which it follows in the next words, by him ſet down, *remittitur à læſo, ſi ei ſatisfecerit*, &c. *The injur'd perſon remits, if ſatisfaction be made him:*) and from thence ſhall conclude, that even when it is to be rendred *decrevit*, it may yet note *puniſhment*, particularly that of *excommunication* or *decree ad excommunicandum*, ſentence to *puniſhment* being a kind of *Legiſlation*, and all *binding* to that, an act of *Command* or power.

Exc. Gem. Sanhed. p. 147.

Sect. 7. Having thus conſidered the verb אסר I ſhall as freely grant that the participles, or nouns deduced from thence, אסור and אימור among the *Rabbins* or *Talmudiſts*, ſignifie very often a thing *forbidden, prohibited, unlawful* (though in the Old Teſtament again the nouns there uſed אסר, and אסרה ſignifie not ſo, but are taken in a regular ſence, and ſo rendred by the 72 δεσμὸς *a band*, and ὁρισμὸς an *ordinance* or *decree*, and אסור δεσμὸς and δεσμώτης, *bound* or *impriſon'd*, and the like, and not the *thing unlawful or prohibited*) which yet being granted and added to what was before granted of the *Talmudical* uſe of the *Verb*, comes not home to prove the Objectors concluſion, which is this, that the verb אסר ſignifies among the *Talmudiſts, decernere, explicare, interpretari, declarare, de ligato, vel quid ligatum ſit*, i.e. *quid vetitum: to diſcern, explicate, interpret, declare concerning a thing bound, or what is bound*, i.e. *what is forbidden:* for to prove this ſence of the *verb*, that other ſuppoſed uſe of the *participle* is not ſufficient, any more than my confeſſing *amatum* to ſignifie a *thing loved*, will conclude me to affirm, that *amo* ſignifies to *declare a thing to be loved*, which we know ſignifies formally to *love*, & nothing elſe.

Sect. 8. That the verb ſignifies to *forbid*, or *decree, per modum legiſlationis* (which is all that could be deduced from theſe premiſes, (though ſuppoſed true of *ligatum* in the *Talmud* ſignifying nothing but *illicitum*,) 'tis acknowledged, but that will not ſerve the turn, thereby wholly to evacuate and nullifie the *power of the Keys*, which is pretended to belong to the *Church* from theſe texts; If the *Apoſtles* had this power to *forbid* or *decree*, this were 1. more than to *interpret or declare a thing to be unlawful*, the office of *making laws* is more than that of the *Caſuiſt*, or Counſellour, or Preacher: and beſide, ſecondly, it would be but reaſon to ſuppoſe thoſe *decrees* backt with ſome *power* of Cenſures againſt *reſiſters*, and ſo indeed the word imports, to *decree ſub pœna, under penalty*, and not ſimply to *decree*. But the thing for which this *Talmudical* interpretation contends, and which we oppoſe, is that this power of *binding* is *only* a power of *declaring*, and *explaining a thing to be unlawful*, and for this from all that is pretended, or offer'd to our view, I have after all my ſearch no temptation to ſuſpect, that even the *Talmudiſts* themſelves do uſe the word. The *verb* with them may ſignifie [to *prohibit*] and the *nouns*, and *participle*, a thing *prohibited*, or *unlawful*, and that is the utmoſt that *Buxtorf* could obſerve of the words among the *Talmudiſts*, or that the author of the interpretation offers any proof for [*ligatum & ſolutum*, i.e. *millies in Talmudicis vetitum lege ſacrâ aut permiſſum*;] and if theſe notions will be taken, then the meaning of [*whatſoever ye ſhall bind on earth ſhall be bound in heaven*] will be, *that whatſoever they ſhall by decree prohibit on earth ſhall be prohibited, or unlawful in heaven*; which were only to exchange the *power* of *Cenſures*, for the power of *giving Laws*, which, as it is more than that of the Caſuiſt, ſo, I conceive, is never to be found any where without power of *puniſhing* alſo.

Sect. 9. This I conceive to be anſwer ſufficient to all that is produced, or pretended, even upon ſuppoſition that the *Talmud* were the Umpire, or the uſe of words there, the beſt *Nomenclature* for the *New Teſtament*. But then over and above, we muſt again remember, that this *Talmudical* obſervation will be but little conviction to us, who find that the Writers of the *New Teſtament* have no *ſympathy* with the *Talmud* in this matter, but uſe variety of other words to expreſs [*commanding*, or *decreeing*, or *forbidding*;] ſuch are ἐπιτάττειν, ἐντέλλεσθαι, ἐπιθεῖναι, κελεύειν, κωλύειν, δογματίζειν, and the like, but never δῆσαι or any of that making; and in like manner have other phraſes to expreſs a thing *unlawful*, or *forbidden*, ἀθέμιτον, and the like, but never δεδεμένον, or any thing like it: neither is it, I conceive, pretended, that theſe words δῆσαι and δεδεμένον have any ſuch ſence in any other place of the New Teſtament; but only in theſe two, which are (parallel one to another, and ſo) in effect but one, and that the matter of the preſent Controverſie, and ſo a *petitio principii*, when 'tis made uſe of to confute him that concludes the *Cenſures* from thence.

Sect. 10. Add unto theſe yet farther, that even in the *Talmud* it ſelf the word אסר (of which this obſervation is made) ſignifies *binding* too, and that not only in the obvious vulgar ſences, but in that alſo which we here contend for, of *binding* by *cenſures*, or *binding* over to *puniſhment* (*obſtrinxit ad pœnam*, as *Schindler* renders the *Chaldee*, and as *Elias Levita* the *Rabbinical* word, *he bound over to puniſhment*) and ſo with great reaſon may be reſolved (even when it ſignifies to *prohibit*) to belong only to ſuch *penal prohibitions*, or at leaſt, (belonging at firſt to ſuch only) to have fall'n after in common uſe (which ſure hath been obſerv'd to bend words from their *primitive* ſence) to ſignifie κοινῶς all kind of *decrees* or *prohibitions*: which ſurely will not *exclude*, but contain under it that which we now contend for.

I ſhall ſhew the ſtrength of this argument by a parallel, as I conceive, exactly proportion'd to it. חרם in *Arabick* ſignifies *millies*, very ordinarily, [to * *forbid*, or reſolve *any thing to be unlawful*] from thence the noun מחרם and חראם is *vetitum*, any thing *prohibited*, or *forbidden*, and חרם and תחרים *prohibition*; Suppoſe now in ſome diſcourſe concerning the kinds or degrees of *excommunication* among the *Jews*, or of the power of the *Sanhedrin*, or indifferently in any *Jewiſh* Writing, I ſhould meet

* *Vetare, prohibere, illicitum ſtatuere.*

meet with the word חרם and render it in Latin *prohibuit, interdixit*, and a friend ingenuously admonish me, that it ought to be rendred, *anathematizavit, devovit*; would it be thought reason or ingenuity in me to reply to my admoniſher; No, but I have rendred it aright, for in *Arabick*, חרם ſignifies [*prohibuit*] and therefore 'tis but an ignorance in the *Arabick Dialect*, to render the *Hebrew*, *anathematizavit*, and but a popular errour (to be reform'd from hence) in them, that conceive there was any kind of *excommunication* among the *Jews*, meant by that word, חרם, whereas 'tis clear, that word ſignifies only *prohibition*, and therefore belongs among the *Jews* only *ad Theologiæ præceptivæ munus*, or to the Office of *teaching and interpreting*, what is *vetitum, vel interdictum lege ſacrâ*] If, I ſay, I ſhould deal thus with any piece of plain *Hebrew*, my firſt queſtion would be, whether this account of my rendring that word would be accepted; and if not, my ſecond now is, whether the proceſs of the preſent arguing hath not done the like, or ſomewhat more.

This will be yet more clear by proceeding to conſider the words which are oppoſite to it, (and to which this Author refers when he ſaith, *Solutum millies in Talmudicis licitum, aut permiſſum, a thing looſed is taken a* 1000 *times in the Talmud for lawful or permitted*) ſuch are התיר and מותר, which I alſo acknowledge to be taken amongſt the *Talmudiſts* for *licitum & permiſſum, lawful and unforbidden.* Sect. 11.

Of which yet ſomewhat muſt be further obſerved, 1. that נתר from whence they come, in *hiphil* ſignifies *ſolvere, to looſe* (as indeed that which hath no obligation laid on it, which is *looſe* from all *band* to *obedience*, or obligation to puniſhment, is properly reſolv'd to be *lawful*) but then this hinders not, but that the *verb* in *hiphil* may ſtill ſignifie, (and indeed even among the *Rabbins* ordinarily doth) *to looſe*, both *properly* and *metaphorically*; properly, as to *looſe*, or *unty* thoſe that are *bound* with cords, or ſuch like *bands*, properly ſo called, as *Pſalm* 146. 7. מתיר אסורים *ſolvite vinctos, looſe thoſe that are bound*, and *Pſal.* 105. 20. the *King ſent* ויתירהו *and looſed him*, where the *Chaldee Paraphraſe* reads ושריית *& ſolvit eum*, and the 72 ἔλυσεν αὐτὸν, and *Pſal.* 146. 7. *Dominus* מתיר *qui ſolvit vinctos, looſing men out of priſon*: or *metaphorically*, and that in a double ſence, either as it is applyed to doubts, or difficulties, and then 'tis to *diſſolve* them; or to *perſons*, and then 'tis to *let looſe*, or *unobliege*, and in this latter ſence *J. Coch* cites it *ex cap.* 1. *Nedarim*, that on whom the *anathema* or *cherem* is inflicted *coram*, or *in his preſence* אין מתיר לו אלא בפניו *it ſhall not be remitted to him, but before his face alſo*: where this word ſignifies clearly *remiſſion* or *abſolution*, and that from a ſentence of *excommunication*; ſo again in that *conſtitution* of the Law cited by *Buxtorf*, the word is twice uſed moſt clearly in our ſence, He that continues in *Niddui* 30 days ולא בקש להתיר *and deſires not to have it looſed, they ſeparate him, or put him under Niddui again, and if he continue ſo* 30 *days more,* ולא בקש לחתורו *and deſires not to have it looſed*, (or as he renders it, *relaxate*) *they excommunicate, or put him under cherem*, and therefore *Schindler* mentioning התרה, and the Rabbins uſe of it, renders it ſimply *ſolutio, looſing*; and there is a ſaying in שלחן ערוך in which it bears this ſence. *If any man ſwear in this form,* [*If this be true, let me be excommunicate in this world, and in the other*] and be *perjured, he cannot be abſolved by any.* Sect. 12. *Ep. Heb. inſtit.* p. 57.

Another word Synonymous to this, and ordinarily uſed by the *Talmudiſts* is שרה, and that primarily ſignifying (as the other did) to *looſe* or *diſſolve*, as *to looſe cords* which *tye*, or *Camels* which are *tyed* with them, is by the *Talmudiſts* taken for * *abſolving, remitting, forgiving, pardoning*; ſo ſaith *Elias Levita* in *Thisbi*, it is uſed by the Rabbins for *pardoning* and *remitting*, as, שרי רחמנא הוללי, *The merciful God pardon Hillel*, and in the prayer that begins כל נדרי *All ſhall be remitted*, or *pardon'd*. So in a place cited by *Coch* out of *Gem. Moed. Caton. c.* 3. *Quid remedii? age cum ipſo.* רלישרי לך *ut remittat tibi*, that he *may looſe you from the excommunication*: and again, *ads principem,* רלישרי לך *that he may remit it to you.* So *c.* 1. Nedarim, *Steti coram R. Huna, cum audiens quandam nomen Dei in vanum proferre, eam excommunicaret, & ſtatim eâ præſente anathema relaxaret*, there the word שרא is uſed again, for *looſing* in our ſence, *relaxating* of, or *freeing* from a cenſure of excommunication, directly all one with מתיר לו *remittatur ipſi*, following in the ſame place, which even now we produced. Sect. 13. * *Vid. Buxtorf. Rabb. Lex.*

A third word there is ordinarily uſed to this purpoſe, of the ſame importance, and that is פיר. So in * *Moed. Katon, Sapiens poteſt ſeipſum excommunicare, a wiſe man may excommunicate himſelf* ומיפר לעצמו and *free or looſe himſelf again*: and ſo in that out of 1. *Nedarim*, in *J. Coth, excommunicationem poſſe è veſtigio reſcindi*, there the word is, להתפרה in both, contrary to *excommunication.* Sect. 14. * *Vid. Buxtorf. Lex. Rabb.* p. 2465.

By the little that hath been ſaid it may ſufficiently appear, that to *bind*, and to *looſe* may be found even among the *Talmudiſts* to ſignifie ſomewhat beſide *interpreting* or *declaring, quid vetitum, quid permiſſum ſacrâ lege, what is forbidden, what permitted by the Law of God*, as that refers ſimply *ad ſolum docendi, & interpretandi, vel Theologiæ præceptivæ munus, only to the Office of teaching, and interpreting, and of preceptive divinity*, &c. and that 'tis no way contrary to the ſtyle or idiom of thoſe Writers to affirm, that *binding* and *looſing* belongs to *Cenſures*, (and not only to *ſtating of caſes of Conſcience*) even if the *Talmud* were our *judge*: for ſure there is nothing more ordinary in that, than to hear of *looſing* them, who are *excommunicate*, till they were looſed, were ſuppoſed *bound* alſo. Sect. 15.

And therefore it may be obſerved (in paſſing) that the learned *H. Grotius* having in his *Notes* on *Matt.* 16. 19. made this *Talmudical* obſervation that אסר δεῖν to bind, and התיר or פטר λύειν *to looſe*, are by the *Hebrews* attributed *to the interpreters of the Law*, (which ſeems ſomething agreeable to this obſervation) conceiving the *Keys* there ſpoken of, to *be the Keys of knowledge, Luke* 11. 52. doth yet on *Matth.* 16. 19. interpret δεῖν and λύειν *binding* and *looſing* there, by κρατεῖν and ἐρύειν *retaining* and *remitting*, *John* 20. 23. and in his notes on that third place acknowledges that thus the Apoſtles did *remit*, either when by *Baptiſm* they received into the *Church* thoſe that profeſſed the faith, or when after the *Teſtimony* of ſerious *repentance* they received into *their communion*, thoſe that had been *lapſt* or *faln*, and applyes to it that of the 2 *Cor.* 2. 10. *To whom ye forgive any thing, I forgive alſo*, (which belongs clearly to the *excommunicate*, *inceſtuous* perſon, in the former *Epiſtle*, who was it ſeems by this *Eccleſiaſtical* courſe brought to a capacity of *remiſſion* and *abſolution* by that time, and now abſolved by S. *Paul*) and for the conjunction of both theſe ſences in the interpretation of that place, he produces S. *Cyprian*'s *authority Epiſt.* 73. To which I ſhall only add, that in another part Sect. 16.

of

of his Notes upon the *Goſpels*, *Luk.* 6.22. this very *Judicious* man (whoſe education might have given him as great prejudices againſt the Prelacy, as any other) hath given us a very excellent tract concerning this ſubject of *Excommunication*, or *Cenſures*; And at laſt reſolves out of S. *Cyprian*'s Epiſtles, *Totum ferme Chriſtianæ diſciplinæ vigorem in iſtis judiciis conſtitiſſe*, &c. *that well-nigh all the vigor of Chriſtian diſcipline conſiſted in thoſe judgments of the Church. Quem morem qui ex Eccleſiâ ſublatum volunt, graviſſimum infligunt vulnus diſciplinæ, quam corruptis adeò Chriſtianorum moribus ad veterem ſeveritatem reduci maximum ſit operæ precium, tantum abeſt, ut ulla ejus pars reliqua laxari debeat*, &c. *which cuſtom they which would remove out of the Church, inflict a moſt grievous wound on diſcipline, which (now in this notable corruption of the manners of Chriſtians) it were moſt excellently worth any mans pains to have reduced to its ancient ſeverity, ſo far is it from being fit, that any remaining member or part of it ſhould be looſed, or put out of joynt*; and in another place, *Diſciplinam moxum ego non refugio, ut modò pax coeat, nulla futura ſit tam ſevera, cui non libenter me meoſque ſim ſubjecturus. For the diſcipline in order to manners, I would willingly ſubject my ſelf, and all that belong to me, to the ſevereſt that could be brought into the Church.* But this by the way.

p. 680.

Sect. 17. For the perfecting of this anſwer, and ſatisfying all the contrary appearances fully, it muſt yet farther be obſerved, that there is one thing preſumed, and not undertaken to be proved in this objection, without which all the obſervations from the *Talmud* are utterly invalid and unconcluding, and that one thing not at all to be granted by us, being indeed as I conceive, very far from *truth*. It is this; that by the particle ὅ and ὅσα [*whatſoever ye ſhall bind*, &c.] is noted the *thing*, and not the *perſon*, for ſo that *interpretation* requires [*what thing ſoever ye ſhall declare to be unlawful*, &c.] whereas it is no new thing in all *languages and dialects* to put the *neuter* for the *maſculine* gender, *things* for *perſons*, and that in the *New Teſtament*, is not without example, as *Matth.* 11. 27. πάντα μοι παρεδόθη, *All things*, i.e. *all men*, the *babes* or believers, ver. 25. (for which he *thanks* his *father*) *are given to me of my father*; and ſo. 1 *Joh.* 5. 4. πᾶν γεγεννημένον, expounded by πᾶς, &c. verſe 18. *every thing*, i.e. *every one, that is born of God.* Thus when S. *John*, *Apoc.* 21.27. ſpeaketh of *man*, and other the like inhabitants of the *new Jeruſalem*, he ſaith, *There ſhall not enter in there any thing that defileth*, or that *worketh abomination, or a lye*; πᾶν ποιῶν in the *neuter*, *which is, no doubt, no unclean abominable perſon*, &c. So 2 *Theſſ.* 2.4. the *Apoſtle* ſpeaking of *Antichriſt*, ſaith, that *he exalteth himſelf above all that is called God*; where the [πᾶν *all*] in the neuter, ſure ſignifies in the *maſculine*, every perſon that partakes of that *name*; ſo *Heb.* 7.7. τὸ ἔλαττον in the neuter, for *the leſſer*, or *inferiour perſon*, v. 9. οὐδὲν for *no man*, and *Ch.* 12. 13. τὸ χωλὸν for *him that is lame*; With which Examples the phraſe in this Text bears ſuch a proportion, that it cannot be unjuſt to reſolve, that it is at leaſt poſſible, that the *neuters* here may in ſence be *maſculine* alſo; which very *poſſibility* were enough to evacuate the *Talmudical obſervation*, the accommodation of which to this place ſuppoſes the *neutral* ſence of the ὅ and ὅσα to be certainly there meant, and is not reconcileable with the *maſculine*. *For to ſay* [*whomſoever you ſhall declare to be unlawful or prohibited*, &c.] were not ſence; whereas on the other ſide, the granting the *neutral* ſence, would not ſo neceſſarily deſtroy our pretenſions, this rendring of the words being proper enough, and home to our turn, [*whatſoever ye ſhall bind on earth*, i.e. *whatſoever ſins of any treſpaſſer* ye ſhall conclude under the *Cenſures*] or again [whatſoever *puniſhment* you ſhall *bind* on mens ſhoulders (the ſpeech being ſtill limited to this one ſort of puniſhments) it ſhall be *bound* or ratified in *heaven*:] though the truth is, the perſonal notion of the ὅσα, being ſo agreeable to other phraſes of the Scripture, I have no temptation to doubt but that it is the importance of the place [*whatſoever*, i. e. *whomſoever you ſhall bind on earth, by the power of the Keys*, ſhut out of this lower *kingdom of heaven*, conclude under the *Eccleſiaſtical bands*, or *cenſures*, &c. *ſhall be bound in heaven*, &c.] i.e. by God *ratified* there, (ſuppoſing that what they do, they do according to the rule,) this is moſt commodious and agreeable to the mention of the *Keys* (to which 'tis annext, *Matth.* 16.) which certainly denote *power* of receiving, or excluding not ſome *thing*, but ſome *perſon*, and to the *treſpaſſing brother* ſuppoſed to become *refractory* (to which 'tis annext, *Matth.* 18.) who is ſtill a *perſon* alſo; to which I will only add that in the beginning of that diſcourſe, *Matth.* 18. 11. there is another manifeſt example of a *neuter word in a maſculine ſence*, *The Son of man came to ſave* τὸ ἀπολωλὸς, *that which was loſt*, i.e. thoſe *little ones*, ver. 10. of *whom God would* not that one ſhould *periſh*, verſe 14.

Sect. 18. To this account of that firſt argument (ſufficient I conceive to prove that this interpretation hanging thus looſe from the *Talmudical* uſe of the word, is not in the rendring this text of the *New Teſtament*, neceſſary to be received) I ſhall yet farther add theſe two obſervations more, 1. That the *Talmudical* ſence cannot have place in the latter part of *Chriſts* ſpeech [ἔσται δεδεμένον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς *ſhall be bound in heaven*] and therefore will be *improbable* in the former. For ſure the *binding in heaven*] is ſomewhat more than *Gods interpretation or declaration of the lawfulneſs of any thing*; and if the *Church* ſhould be thought unfit to have any kind of *power*, yet *heaven* is acknowledged capable of it; beſides the form and compoſure of the words will enforce, that if that pretended *Talmudical* ſence were admitted into both places, God declaring any thing to be *lawful*, or *unlawful*, muſt be conſequent to the *Miniſters declaration* here, which will be very unreaſonable, for though Gods *Cenſures* may by vertue of his Promiſe follow the *Cenſures* of the Church, yet *Gods Laws* (for ſuch are his declarations of what is *law*) ſure cannot, or if they do, this will be a great aſſurance that there is ſome power in the *Church*, when it is ſo backt by *God*.

Sect. 19. A ſecond argument to this purpoſe may be taken from the *Analogy* of Scripture, or comparing the two places in *Matth.* of *binding and looſing*, with that third in *John* of *remitting and retaining*; which I conceive is proved to belong to the ſame matter, whatſoever that ſhould prove to be, but then will not be ſo capable of the *Talmudical* interpretation, for ſure that will not be ſo clear from thoſe Writers alſo, that κρατεῖν *to retain*, hath that ſence among the *Talmudiſts*, which was impoſed upon δῆσαι, *to bind*, which for the preſent I ſhall take for granted, till ſome proof be offer'd to the contrary, and in that found the *power* of the *Church*, (ſuppoſing it were not deducible from S. *Matthew*,) and then by *analogy* of thoſe places in S. *Matthew* with this in S. *John*, apply it to thoſe places alſo.

Sect. 20. Now for the ſecond proof which is offer'd by the ſame hand againſt the received interpretation, the places in *Greek* Authors, where the word δῆσαι or *binding* is vouched to ſignifie *forbidding* only, though

though I might juſtly ſay, firſt, that the producing of two places in the whole ſhole of *Greek* Authors, will not with any Logick infer the neceſſity of taking them in this ſence here; then ſecondly, that *forbidding* is much more than *declaring*, or *interpreting a thing to be forbidden*; that an act of *power*, and not only of *doctrine*, of a *Magiſtrate*, and not only of a *Caſuiſt*; and thirdly, that we are not wont to require the dictions of the New Teſtament, which have ſo much of the Old Teſtament *Hebrew idiom* in them, to be tryed by *Attical* heathen *Greek* Writers: yet ſhall I not now need to refuſe that tryal which is here offered. Two only places there are produced (or in the margent appointed to be conſulted with) to that purpoſe, *Euſtathius* and *Didymus* in Hom. Il. σ. ἐμοὶ δ' ἥσσων Ἄρης ἀλκτῆρα γενέσθαι, and *Inſcription. Iſidis ap. Diod. Sic. l.* 1. Theſe two places I have with all attention conſidered, and ſhall truly report what I have found in them.

Euſtathius brings ſeveral interpretations of theſe words in *Hom.* the firſt of which is, that δῆσαι may ſignifie κωλύσαι, ἐμοῦ δ' ἧσσων ὁ Ἀρὴς, *i. e.* ἔδησε καὶ ἐκώλυσε τὸ ἀλκτῆρα γενέσθαι, ὑγὲν ἀμύντορα τῷ Πατρόκλῳ, which that you may underſtand, you muſt know the occaſion of *Homers* ſpeech, it was this, *Patroclus* was ſlain, and *Achilles* knew not how to help him, or avenge his death, for which he hath very paſſionate ſorrow, even to wiſh he were dead himſelf, becauſe he could not avenge that death of his; this he thus expreſſes in *Homers* language; Sect. 21.

Αὐτίκα τεθναίην ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἄρ' ἔμελλον ἑταίρῳ
Κτεινομένῳ ἐπαμύναι, ὁ μὲν μάλα τήλοθι πάτρης
Ἔφθιτ', ἐμοῦ δ' ἥσσων Ἄρης ἀλκτῆρα γενέσθαι.

I would, or, *O that I might preſently die, in that I was not able to avenge the death of my Companion; He died far from his Countrey*, and *Mars, or the Fate of War hath bound*, or *hindred*, or *reſtrained me from being avenger of his blood*: where it muſt be obſerved, that *Mars* did not give any *precept* or *interdict* to *Achilles* not to avenge *Patroclus*, or declare that it was unlawful, but only that the fate of the War had not ſo far favour'd him, as that he could find any means to do it, which he calls *binding* or *hindring* him, and therefore *Didymus*, to whom we are referred, renders it ἐνεπόδισεν, *hindred*, and explains the whole matter by this *paraphraſe*: ὁ πόλεμος τὴν ἐμὴν ἀφελόμενός παντοπλίαν, ἔδησεν ἐμοὶ τὴν ἔξοδον, ὥστε ἀλκτῆρα μὴ γενέσθαι πατρόκλ. τ. ἐ. βοηθόν, *The fight having deprived me of my Arms, would not ſuffer me to go out, and help Patroclus*; and ſo it ſeems *the forbidding*, by which they render δῆσεν, is only that of *hindring*, or *ſtopping*, (which is a natural effect of the vulgar notion of the word, as it ſignifies *binding*, he that is *bound* being *hindred* or *ſtopt* from his *courſe* or *action*) *not of prohibiting or interdicting*. But then moreover you muſt conſider, that the ſame *Euſtathius* and *Didymus* obſerve in that laſt verſe many different lections, as for example, one eſpecially, inſtead of Ἄρης *Mars* in the *Nominative caſe*, ἀρῆς *hurt*, or miſchief in the *Genitive*, which reading they reject not, but accordingly explain the place, and render ἀρῆς ἀλκτῆρα, βλαβῆς καὶ κακώσεως ἀποτρεπτικὸν, *damni averruncatorem*, and ἐμοῦ δ' ἧσσων, ὅ ἐστιν ἐνεδέησε τῷ πατρόκλῳ, εἰς τὸ ἀρᾶς ἐκείνῳ ἀλκτῆρα γενέσθαι, *Patroclus had need of me, to avert that miſchief from him*; and this, ſaith *Euſtathius*, the antients thus paraphraſe, ἐμοῦ τὴν πρᾶξιν ἔδησεν Ἄρης, ἢ τὸ ἐξ ἐμοῦ βοηθείας ἐνεδέησεν, *Mars wanted my action, or the help which might have come by me*; and *Ariſtarchus* ſomewhat to the ſame purpoſe, ἐμοῦ ἐδέησεν εἰς τὸ ἀλεξιτῆρα γενέσθαι τῷ Ἄρει, *he wanted me to avert the danger of the War*; and agreeably *Didymus* ἀρῆς ἀλκτῆρα. τ. ἐ. ἀποτρεπτικὸν πολέμου, which different lection thus explained by them, takes off all colour, or pretence of affirming that *binding* ſignifies *prohibiting*, or *interdicting* in that place, but only *ſtanding in need* of, which is another ſence of the word δέω, and ſo ſtill 'tis apparent, that δῆσεν may ſignifie ſomewhat elſe in that place, and if it do ſignifie *binding*, and that be rendred κωλύσαι *to forbid*, that yet it muſt not be taken in that ſence, that *forbidding* ſignifies *preceptive interdiction*, eſpecially not the bare *pronouncing* a thing *unlawful*, the ſence which 'tis brought to prove, and which alone is againſt our pretenſions,) but only *forbidding*, as when the *matter forbids*, *hindring*, or *reſtraining*, or *binding* from a poſſibility of doing it, and juſt ſo the Hebr. מנע by which *Philip de Aquin.* renders אסר *binding*, ordinarily ſignifies to *hinder*.

As for the other place referr'd to, the *Inſcription* of *Iſis*, thus it lies in *Diodor. Siculus*, l. 1. p. 16. of *Stephanus's Edition*, ἐγώ εἰμι Ἶσις ἡ βασιλίσσα πάσης χώρας, ἡ παιδευθεῖσα ὑπὸ Ἑρμοῦ, καὶ ὅσα ἐγὼ δήσω, ἄδηλός ἐστι λῦσαι, *I am Iſis the Queen of the whole Region, educated by, or under Mercury, and what ſoever I ſhall bind, no body can looſe*. What advantage can be taken of theſe words thus lying (and not reſtrained, by either antecedents, or conſequents) toward the juſtifying or approving of the forementioned interpretation, or acception of the phraſe, for *declaring*, or *pronouncing* of the *unlawfulneſs* of a thing, I do not fully diſcern; for why may not the latter words paſs for an interpretation of the former, and ſo the ſence be, that ſhe being *Queen of the whole region* had all *power* in her hands, to do, or *conſtitute* (not only what *laws*, but) what *puniſhments* ſhe would, and then, that no body had *power* to undo, whatſoever ſhe thus did, to *reſcind*, or *looſe*, or *abſolve*, what ſhe ſo *bound*? In as wide a ſence as this, I could produce many places in *Greek* Authors, particularly a paſſage of *Proclus* out of *Plato* in his ſixth *Diſcourſe about the eternity of the World*; where to prove the World cannot be diſſolv'd by the Creator of it, and yet by none but the Creator, he expreſſes it often in theſe two words, δῆσαι and λῦσαι [ἄλυτον δ' ἐστὶ παντὶ πλὴν τῷ συνδήσαντι] meaning by *binding*, the compoſing the whole *compages* of the World, and by *looſing* the deſtroying, or, as we ſay, the *diſſolution* of it; this, I confeſs, is nothing to our ſence of the words (and as little to that other) and yet very near as much as the place now cited. Being left to gueſs what was the occaſion of producing this place to that other purpoſe, I ſhall think it poſſible, that it was occaſion'd by this, that in the margent *Stephanus* hath ſet ἐγὼ μοδίτησα, inſtead of ἐγὼ δήσω, which if it were conceived to be a *Scholion*, might be taken to be a teſtimony, that *binding* ſignifies making of Laws, as far as that *Scholiaſts* authority would reach. For the preſent, I ſhall ſuppoſe, that this is it, becauſe I cannot think of any other way to help this *medium* to infer the deſired *concluſion* in any degree, and yet make no queſtion but there was ſome; But then, if that be it, I muſt interpoſe, 1. that that in the margent, is not a *Scholion*, but an *emendation*, or *various lection*, as the mark prefixed ſignifies, and then ſeeing 'tis aſſured, that *Diod. Sic.* or the inſcription it ſelf, which he ſets down, had not both theſe *readings*, it will thence follow, that Sect. 22.

either it was truly ἐνομοθέτησα (and then there is no authority from thence for any ſignification of δήσω) or elſe that it was δήσω, and then there is no appearance of proof, that δήσω ſignifies there νομοθετῆν, and this is ſufficient to the matter in hand, which part ſoever of the *dilemma* be accepted.

Sect. 23. But having ſaid this, I ſhall ſuperadd *ex abundanti* my opinion of the importance of that inſcription, *viz.* that *Iſis* the *Queen of that region, was taught or inſtructed by Mercury* in the ἀποκεκρυμμένη φιλοσοφία, *hidden Philoſophy*, ἀμυδραὶ ἐμφάσεις καὶ διαφάσεις τῆς ἀληθείας, *dark repreſentations of truth*, αἰνιγματώδης σοφία, *the enigmatical wiſdom which their theology was full of*, mention'd by * *Plut. de Iſ. & Oſir. and that no body was able to reveal, or expound her riddles or myſteries.* The ground of this my interpretation is, an *inſcription* of *Iſis*'s Temple mention'd by *Plutarch*, immediately upon his diſcourſe of that enigmatical theology in the place forementioned. Τὸ δ' ἐν Σάει τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς (ἣν καὶ Ἶσιν νομίζουσιν) ἔδος, ἐπιγραφὴν ἔχε τοιαύτην· ἐγώ εἰμι πᾶν τὸ γεγονὸς, καὶ ὂν, καὶ ἐσόμενον, καὶ τὸν ἐμὸν πέπλον οὐδεὶς πω θνητὸς ἀπεκάλυψεν. *The Temple of Minerva (which they take for Iſis) in Saos had ſuch an inſcription* (not literally this, but *ſuch* an one, or to this purpoſe) *I am every thing that hath been, and that is, and that ſhall be, and my vail (or what I ſhall think fit to conceal) no mortal hath ever been able to diſcover.* This ſeems to be a paraphraſe of that other *inſcription* in *Diodorus*, and then though the words differ (which the τοιαύτην [not the *very ſame*, but *ſuch an one*] intimates) yet the ſence of the one ſeems to be fully expreſt by the other, and then the concluſion will be this, that as λύειν in *Diodorus*, ſignifying no more than ἀποκαλύπτειν to *reveal* in *Plutarch* (as to looſe a riddle, a ſecret, is to reveal it, to which the *Key of Knowledge* in the Scripture may alſo refer,) belongs not at all to the matter in hand, of *declaring* a thing *to be lawful*, ſo the contrary δήσω is not applyable to that purpoſe of *forbidding*, or *declaring a thing to be forbidden*; and ſo much for that teſtimony alſo.

* *Edit. Pariſ.* p. 354. B.

Sect. 24. To all this which hath been ſaid the Reader may farther add, that *Suidas*, *Heſychius*, and *Phavorinus* have no other notion of δῆσαι than that of *binding in bands*, and therefore render it by δεσμεύω, and δεσμάω. Only in *Heſychius* in one place I find theſe words δεδεμένος, νόμος, δεσμός: which words ſtand in need of ſome *emendation* (as a very great part of that book doth) and may be thus ſet right, δεδεμένος νόμῳ, δέσμιος, *a man bound by law*, i.e. *a priſoner*; or δεδεμένος νόμῳ δέσμιος, *bound*, i. e. *a priſoner of the law*; or elſe this ſeems to be the deſign of them, that the word δεδεμένος is uſed in a ſence proportionable to that, wherein νόμος *law*, is δεσμὸς *a band*, as indeed every law is a *band* to all thoſe that are under it: but then you may obſerve, that this is a very diſtant ſence of the word from that which was cited from the *Talmudiſts*, (where the thing *bound* is ſaid to be *forbidden*,) for here δεδεμένος ſignifies *bound*, or commanded, and ſo this (beſide that it gives the *Church* a power from *Chriſt*, of *commanding* and making *laws*, to which in any probability the power of *puniſhing* would be conſequent) is little to our preſent diſquiſition.

Sect. 25. I cannot ſatisfie my ſelf, that I have vindicated my *poſition* ſufficiently, unleſs unto the conſideration of the former *objections*, I add alſo ſome few words in taking notice of what the *Socinians* have reſolved to this matter; which I ſhall tranſcribe out of *Volkelius*, *de ver. cel. l.* 6. *c.* 4. Where having expreſt the power of *binding and looſing* to be the *power*, *Alios quidem reatu peccatorum quodammodo conſtringendi, alios verò ab illo abſolvendi, of binding ſome in ſome manner under the guilt of ſins, but of abſolving others*, he reſolves this to conſiſt in this only, *ut pro authoritate muneris, quod tanquam Chriſti legatus ſuſtinebat, aliis quidem nempe omnibus in Chriſtum credentibus, atque ex animo ei obtemperantibus, remiſſionem peccatorum, ipſius nomine offerret, aliis verò pœnas ſempiternas denunciaret. That by authority of that office which he ſuſtains as an Embaſſadour of Chriſt, he ſhould offer in his Name remiſſion of ſins to ſome, to wit, to all that believe in Chriſt, and cordially obey him, but denounce unto others eternal puniſhments.* So that in effect the *Power of binding and looſing* ſhould be only the *power of offering remiſſion of ſins to penitents*, that is, preaching the *Goſpel*, and no more.

Sect. 26. This magiſterial affirmation having no tender or offer of proof annext to it, will need no long ſtay to conſider it; whatever is in it of *poyſon*, or danger, will eaſily be diſpell'd by an *antidote*, which the very ſame ſhop in another box will yield us, and that is another very diſtant interpretation of that *power of binding and looſing*, c. 15. of that book (how faln from the ſame pen of him that had before ſaid *in eo tantum fuiſſe conſtitutam, ut remiſſionem offerret*, &c. *that it conſiſted only in the offering of remiſſion*, &c. or by what means reconcileable with that ſence, I will not go about to conjecture) where affirming the *power* of *exterminating impious Chriſtians*, to be *intruſted to the Church*, he proves it, 1. from the words of St. *Paul* about the *excommunicating* the *inceſtuous Corinthian*; then from this, that Chriſt ſpeaking of the contumacious treſpaſſer *refuſing to obey the Church*, and thereupon commanding him to be *accounted as an heathen*, and a *publican*, *in cœlo ratum eſſe dicit, quicquid Eccleſia in terris ligat, aut ſolvit, affirms that to be ratified in heaven, whatſoever it is the Church on earth binds or looſes*, i.e. *quoſcunque vel à fidelium commercio ſegregat, vel in eorum numerum reponit, whomſoever the Church ſeparates from the commerce of the faithful, or reſtores to the number of them:* where I conceive it apparent, (unleſs ſome very cloſe *ſophiſm* lye hid under plain words) that binding ſignifies *diſterminating, excommunicating, ſegregating from the commerce of the faithful*, which I willingly imbrace, as the conceſſion of that man, and the ſence of his fellows, very fit to be confronted to his former negation, eſpecially being backt, as it is, with a conjecture of his (which I have long thought to be moſt probable) that St. *Paul* forbidding *Timothy, to lay hands ſuddenly on any man*, 1 *Tim.* 5. 22. *leſt he partake of other mens ſins, refers to the reception of penitents that had been formerly excommunicate.* For ſuch, he truly ſaith, were wont to be received into the Church again by *impoſition of hands.*

Sect. 27. Evidences of that cuſtom he brings from the narrations of *Victor*, about the *Vandalick perſecution*, l. 2. *Qui nobis pœnitentiæ manus collaturi ſunt, & reconciliationis indulgentiam, obſtrictos peccato peccatorum vinculis ſoluturi, who confer on us the hands of penitence, and favour of reconciliation, looſing from the bands of ſins, thoſe which are bound by ſin.* Where the *pœnitentiæ manus the hands of penitence, and looſing from bands of ſin*, belong to thoſe which were *bound*, but now are *reconciled:* and the like from the 5*th Canon of the Council of Carthage*, *diſt.* 50. *Presbyteris ac Diaconis, ſi quando de gravi aliquâ culpâ convicti à miniſterio remoti fuiſſent, manus non imponerentur, ut pœnitentibus, vel aliis ex fidelium laicis. That Presbyters and Deacons when upon conviction of*

any

any grievous fault, they are removed from the Ministry, should not have imposition of hands as penitents, &c. and out of *Fulgentius* Ep. 1. de conjug. *Illa egrota acceptâ manus impositione pœnitentiam secundum morem, quem habet Christiana religio, peregit, she performed her penance by receiving imposition of hands according to the manner observed in the Christian Religion*; To these you may add that of *Alcimus* Ep. 24. *Manus impositionem adhibete converso ab hæresi, They that were recover'd from heresie were to have imposition of hands*, a sign of absolution; (as together with unction or *Chrisme* it is now used in the *Romish* Church, when any is reconciled to them.) *Interdictâ nominis ejus in posterum, si ex corde convertitur, mentione, and his name no longer to be mention'd in the bed-role of the heretick's*: and the *author contra Prædestin.* l. 3. *Non ausi sunt Ecclesiarum Pontifices manum imponere* p. 148, *pœnitenti, nisi confessionem voluntariam ostendenti. The Bishops durst not impose hands on the penitent, unless he exprest a voluntary confession*; and many the like. And in the Chron. of *Jo. Gerundens.* speaking of the Arrians Synod of Toledo, congregated by *Leovigilaus*, one of the Canons is, *De Romanâ religione ad nostram Catholicam fidem venientes non debere baptizari, sed tantummodo per manus impositionem & communionis perceptionem ablui. They which came over to them from that which they counted heresie, should only have imposition of hands*, &c. *and not baptism a new*, and many other passages there are of that kind. This is a very probable interpretation, made use of by Saint *Cyprian* and *Pacianus* among the antients, *Paran. ad Pœnit.* and by *Mat. Galenus* among later Writers; and may, by the way, farther be attested not only by the analogy between absolution, and healing diseases, of which imposition of hands was the Ceremony, but also by the context it self, where ver. 19. is set down the proceeding, by *way of Censure*, against a *Presbyter*, and the publick checking of *sinners*, ver. 20. a charge to do all χωρὶς προκρίματος ver. 21. without *prejudging*, and μηδὲν κατὰ πρόσκλισιν, *nothing by favour or inclination*, and then immediately follows, *lay hands on no man suddenly, absolution* very properly annext to *censures*, (and I conceive a caution, that by knowing mens sins, *be be not brought to partake with them, but that he keep himself unpolluted*, in the remainder of that verse, upon which the 23. verse may follow pertinently, though as in a *parenthesis*, that *Timothy may drink a little wine for his health*, and not *incur that danger of partaking of other mens sins*) and then ver. 24 a rule of direction for that whole matter, that as some mens *sins are conspicuous before-hand, and so bring them per modum meriti præcedentis, by way of precedent merit, to censure, and in some* the *sins follow after that censure also*, as when there is no *reformation* upon *censure*, (in which case there must be no *absolution*) *so in like manner* also *mens good works* (in case they do *reform* upon *censure*) *are*, or must be, *manifest before absolution*, (and therefore the antient Canons require the ἀναθοεργίας, *good works or alms-deeds* in the penitent to prepare for *absolution*) and those that are not so, (*i. e. their not bringing forth such worthy fruits of repentance*) cannot be *concealed*, and so by that means *Timothy* may discern who are fit to be *absolved*, who not, and so all the context clearly belongs to this matter. But this by the way.

Only having so pregnant an opportunity, I shall add what I conceive concerning the *imposition of* Sect. 28. *hands*, *Heb.* 6. 2. *joyned there with the doctrine of Baptisms*. The Apostle there had mention'd λόγον τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ, *the discourse of the beginning of Christ*, *i. e.* the first things that we read of in the *Gospel*, and he refers them, as I conceive, to four heads, 1. *Repentance*, or *change from dead works*; 2. *Faith on God*: These two he calls the *Doctrine of Baptisms*, and of the *Imposition of hands*, either by way of ἐπάνοδος, (of which I gave you * examples in the sacred style) and then the *Doctrine of Baptisms* will * *Cap.* 1. be appropriated to *Faith on God*, unto which men are *baptized*, and the doctrine of *imposition of* Sect. 10. *hands* to *repentance*, which is the preparatory to *absolution*, or else both of these together, *Faith and Repentance*, must be affirmed to be the *doctrine* both of *Baptisms* in the *plural*, and of *imposition of hands* too, and that both as it denotes *confirmation Act.* 15. 41. parallel to *Christs blessing* (of those which had been baptized before) *with laying his hands on them*, and *absolution* too, parallel to his *laying hands on the sick*, *Luke* 4. when he *healed them*, which is called *loosing* ἀπὸ δεσμῶν, *from a band*, *Luke* 13. 16. and all this will be proper, for both the *Baptism of John*, and of *Christ* required of them, that came to it, *Repentance and Faith*; and *Confirmation* being but a kind of sealing, and repetition of the covenant, and the promises made in *baptism* (without water, only by *laying on of hands*) was so too; and *Absolution*, though it peculiarly required *Repentance*, yet it included also *Faith on God*, and peculiarly that branch of it, the believing *remission of sins* upon *repentance*. Besides these, there follow two doctrines more, the *Resurrection* and *Eternal judgment*, which may be also reduced to these two heads, *The Resurrection* to that of *Faith* in *Baptism*, of which it was a *peculiar* part, (the *trina immersio*, the *three dippings*, so antient in the *Church*, referring distinctly to his *rising* the third day, and so perhaps the βαπτίζεσθαι ὑπὲρ νεκρῶν, 1 *Cor.* 15. *i. e.* in Saint *Chrysostomes* opinion, being *baptized* into the *Faith*, or belief, of that Article, intimated, or briefly exprest by νεκρὰ the Dead) and *Everlasting judgement* to that of *Repentance from dead works*, which if not *repented from*, i. e. *forsaken*, would bring that *judgement* upon men. But this by the way, and as a conjecture incident, and agreeable to the former.

I have thus far proceeded in this matter for the removing of prejudices, and vindicating our Sect. 29. position from two sorts of objectors, and might now think it reasonable to proceed to a third view, *viz.* of *Erastus*'s structure, and all that he hath said of this matter; But this would require so intolerable a length, that if I should apply my self to it, I should both tire the most patient Reader, and leave the rest which I have to say on the other points at first proposed, to be overwhelmed or lost under the shade of so vast a πάρεργον. Some prudence therefore there will be need of for the *compounding* of this business, that I may neither too much *despise*, nor too largely *prosecute* this objector: And the most convenient middle betwixt these two *extremities*, I suppose, will be, 1. *To bring you acquainted with the person.* 2. *To give you an account how he fell out*, or on what occasion his quarrel to *Excommunication* began. 3. *To view the place and the weapons, at which we are likely to meet*, i. e. to follow him κατὰ πόδα so far, till we see directly what the *state* of the *question* is, wherein the point of the difference between us consists; and then to put off the *combat*, till the *spectators* are ready to call for it, and shall profess themselves armed with patience to sit it out.

Sect. 30. For the first of these, the view of the person, I shall say no more than that he was a Dr. of *Physick* who having fallen on an age when *novelties* were in fashion, (the *Bishop* of *Geneva* turn'd out, and a Government brought in, which within few years before was acknowledg'd so *new*, that *Calvin* was fain to write to the *Protestants* in *Helvetia*, that they would but signifie their approbation of it, and could not obtain that neither, though soon after, it undertook to be the *only divine Model* in the world since *Christs* time) thought it not unreasonable to step out of his profession, and offer to the world his *novelty* too; and having in his own profession expresst in some particulars, a *zeal*, which others of his faculty will affirm to have been *without knowledge*, (as when he speaks of the preparation of *Stibium*, or *Crocus Metallorum*, and the *Antimonian receipts*, he resolves that no man can *salvâ conscientiâ*, *with a safe Conscience* administer them, which yet every *Physician* knows now by dayly experience to be very useful and safe) it will not be matter of wonder, if he committed the like mistake in the business of *Excommunication* (a medicine more out of the proper rode of his studies) and conceived that a poysonous noxious *recipe* in the Church, (judging, it seems, at a first view, that they which were most wicked needed rather to be invited to the Church than driven from it) which the experience of all Christian Churches, and the advice of *Christ* himself, as a *Physician* of *Souls*, have concluded to be very *harmless* and *medicinal*. I shall say no more of his person, but that he doth not seem by his book to have considered much of *Divinity*, save only of this one head, and in order to that present Controversie. And then though I should not make it an Objection against an Author, that his book, and he were of divers *Professions*, and faculties, because he that is not a *Divine* by profession, may yet, if he have no calling, have spent his whole time on *Divinity*, and if he have undertaken another profession, may yet neglect that, that he may spend his time in this nobler faculty, or may have those excellent abilities, that he may attain to as great an height in two faculties, as others of meaner parts may do in one, yet, if it appear by any sure πρόληψις, that that *Physician* which writes in Divinity, hath studied little more *Divinity* than at that time a few months could help him to, and thinks this provision sufficient to furnish him, to write contrary to the whole judgment of the *Church* before him, I may as safely commend a *Divine*, that when he is sick first of a *disease*, then, through impatience of his *Physician*, shall by looking over some *Physick-books* take confidence to controll his *Physician*, and that he may do so the more authoritatively, cast off all the antient *Masters* of that *faculty* before him, or affirm that in them he finds nothing contrary to his opinion, when they that have read them all, know there is nothing more contrary. This I have said, because this *Doctor* makes his complaint of the *opposition*, and *contempt*, and *affronts* put upon him by those friends, to whom before the setting out he had communicated his book, objecting, saith he, nothing against him, but that he was besides his calling, which therefore with him, I confess, to be an unsufficient argument against his book, if it have no other to joyn with it, and I rather conceive, that it was a civility in his friends, which used it, than an entire, and sole objection, designed by them as a means to take him off from a confidence that he had done well, (by telling him, he was no competent judge whether he had or no, and advising him, that being a stranger in that faculty, he should not depend too much upon his own judgment) rather than an acknowledgment, that he had nothing else to *object* to him. And if *civilities* be apt to be thus mistaken, the truth is, a little plain dealing were a more friendly office. I shall therefore have no necessity of replying to his answers to those friends, that [*Scrutamini Scripturas*] and [*Probate Spiritualia*] [*Search the Scriptures*] and [*Try the things that are Spiritual*] were a sufficient commission to him for that attempt, especially if 'twere true which he adds, * *that if he had had a stipend to read Divinity, this fact of his would then have nothing in it, in their opinion, alien from his office or duty.* Where yet, I suppose, the *office* might be distinguish'd from the *stipend*, and though the *money* be not apt to inspire, as a χάρις or *grace*, yet sure the *munus*, or *calling* to the office may go for a χάρισμα, to which we may hope for the annexion of *Gods* blessing, more than to the ἀλλοτριεπισκοπία, (*the medling in faculties, or studies that belong not to us*) we have any promise to authorize us to expect.

In Praef.

* *Si stipendio conductus theologica doceretur, nihil sec. ipsos ab officio, & munere in hac parte alieni facerem. Praef.*

Sect. 31. 2. For the *occasion of his quarrel against excommunication*, I shall give you no other account, than what from himself I have received, (who, I suppose, was able to speak the bottom of the truth, and nothing else) and while I do so, shall desire the Reader to observe, how certain it is that the *fabrick* of the *Church of England*, I mean the antient structure, as it stands by Law, and the doctrines thereof, would never have provoked him to this enmity, if he had lived here under the best, or perhaps worst days of our *Episcopacy*, and then, as his *Hippocrates* in his excellent Tract περὶ ὕδατος, ἀέρων, καὶ τόπων, will tell us of a mighty influence, that *the place*, the air, or some such accidental circumstance may have upon the bodies first, and, through them, the minds of men, so will the Reader find, that his having *chang'd the air*, had been excellent effectual *Physick* for him, and, in all probability, might have made a shift to have changed his opinions also.

Sect. 32. The first thing, which, saith he, cast him on those considerations against *Excommunication*, was the unseasonableness of the time for the administring of such *purging Physick*. *There was then*, saith he, *a great paucity of Protestant Professors, and the number of Papists extreamly over-topt them in those parts, and of the Protestants scarce the thirtieth part understood, and approved the doctrine*; and therefore it must be in his opinion, a strange improper season for the setting up this course of severe rugged discipline, which would *exclude from the Sacrament so many of the few Protestants*, that it would both unpeople their assemblies, and necessarily cause a *dangerous scissure in the multitude.*

Sect. 33. The second thing was his having observ'd *the unfitness of the persons, that were employ'd and presided in this matter*, (their Ministers and Lay-Elders) *fit*, saith he, *neither for age, nor experience, nor wit, nor judgment, nor manners, nor authority*, to be esteem'd *able to sustain so great an office with dignity.*

Sect. 34. The third thing, (and that which advanced him in his conceit that he had faln upon the right sence of Scriptures produced, and pleaded for this discipline) was, the consideration of the *state of the Common-wealth and Church among the Jews, God having said, Deut. 4. that that people had Laws and Statutes, so just and wise, that the institutions of no Nations, the sanctions of no Common-wealth, no Ordinances, though never so wisely thought on, could compare with them*, and therefore that that *Church*

must

must needs be best, and most wisely disposed, which came neareſt to the *Jewish* form. A consideration indeed, that, it seems, was of great weight with him; not observing that that comparison in *Deut.* was made only betwixt the *Jewish*, and other Heathen Nations of the World at that time; and only in relation to their present state, and not to the prejudice of *Christs* institutions after, when that Nation and Religion was destroyed; and that if that argument were of weight, (besides that he must be bound to prove his Model out of the *Mosaical* Law) he must be obliged also to bring back all the *Sacrifices*, *Passeover*, *Circumcision*, *Ceremonies* of the *Jews* into the *Christian Church*, and turn both the *Lords Day*, the *Sacraments*, and the very *Religion of Christ*, the νόμῳ πίστεως, the *Law of Faith*, out of it.

The fourth thing, saith he, and that which set him on writing was, an accident that he then observed, *An English man which at that time had quitted this Kingdom on the distike of Ceremonies, and came to* Geneva, *and proposed his Theses there* de adiaphoris & vestibus, *of things indifferent, and of vestments*; particularly, *the Surplice*, &c. *he was*, saith he, *not permitted to maintain them publickly*, ne Anglos offenderent, *that they might not offend the English*; *This man therefore changing his purpose, chose a new Thesis*, *In quavis rectè institutâ Ecclesiâ hanc servari procurationem, in quâ ministri cum suo delecto ad eam rem Presbyterio jus teneant quosvis peccantes etiam Principes excommunicandi*: *That in every well-order'd Church, this government was to be observed, in which the Ministers with their Elderships chosen to that purpose should have power of Excommunicating all offenders, even Princes themselves:* and this *Thesis*, saith he, *he was permitted to maintain*; I hope, he did not believe, that the *English* would be better pleased, or less offended with it, than with that other about *Surplices*, but only that 'twas a doctrine, wherein that Common-wealth of *Geneva* was more concern'd, and so did not so much consider, how the *English* might take it from them, as in the other, where they were less *interested*, they had leisure to do. That the doctrine of the *Anglican* Church, and constant practice of it, is utterly abhorrent from this dangerous, *sacrilegious exces*, I shall not be so wary or humble, as to think it necessary to demonstrate, but confess that he which saw that doctrine so confidently, and so early avow'd by the *Disciplinarians*, had a great temptation to write against their *Excommunication*, though no ground of assurance, that all which he should say against that subject, would therefore prove true, because that one doctrine of those which asserted it, was so far from being such. Master *Hooker* hath given a very good judgment of his enterprize; that *Beza*, and he, divided the truth betwixt them, neither of them saying all truth, nor all falshood, each of them παῦρα μὲν ἐσθλὰ μεμιγμένα, πολλὰ δὲ λυγρὰ, disguising, and allaying, and drowning a little of wholsome doctrine, with a great deal of the contrary. And let me say, to conclude this point, that both in the taking up his opinion, and in maintaining it, *Erastus* hath more to impute to *Beza*'s and the *Genevan*'s errours, and innovations, and excesses, and extravagancies, (which upon inquiry into the ancient *Church* records, he truly saith, he could not find avowed, or authorized) than to his own *grounds*, or arguments against *Excommunication*. *Sect.* 35.

The last motive, which, he confesses, perfected the work, and put him upon the press, was the contempts, and affronts of his friends, *i. e.* in effect, the opinions, and good advices of all men, that saw his *Theses*, and could by no means like them; but this hath been occasionly mentioned already, and only gives the Reader occasion to admire, and bewail the infelicity of *passionate* men, who cannot receive any benefit by their friends, are in the unluckiest condition of all men living, (beyond which no enemy can wish them a greater curse) sure to be the worse for that, which God meant us for the most inestimable blessing, I mean the ἀληθεύειν, καὶ ἀνυγιαίνειν, their *telling us truth*, and (out of desire of *doing us good*) admonishing us of our miscarriages, which he that cannot make any other use of, than to interpret those hugest *obligations* for *affronts*, those *friendships* for *rudenesses*, and therefore resolves to *publish* his conceits, because all his friends to whom he communicates them, advise him by all means to suppress them, may well be allowed to write a Volume against all kind of *Excommunication*, being already, it appears, so far from being able to bear such strong *Physick*, that the most private prudent, *first, or second admonition* of single persons, or ὑπὸ τῶν πλειόνων, the joynt act of a *College of friends and Physicians* do but make him more incurable. *Sect.* 36.

I come now to my third undertaking, *i. e.* to view his *Theses of Excommunication*, and follow him step by step, till we have sprang the point of the difficulty between us, and, I think, that part of the progress will sufficiently discover the weakness of his fabrick; at least how little appearance of advantage he hath against *us*, that are not for the *Geneva-Presbytery*, how well soever *ad homines* he may be thought to have disputed. *Sect.* 36.

His * first *Thesis* lays the ground of his discourse, and of his mistake. The word [*Excommunication*] he will have taken from 1 *Cor.* 10. which is false, and not endeavoured to be proved, and upon the back of that errour, another falsity, *viz.* that *Communion* is there call'd *Corpus Christi*, *The body of Christ*; all that is there said toward that matter, is, that the Wine is κοινωνία αἵματος, *The Communication* (not *Communion*) *of the blood of Christ*, the bestowing his blood upon us, a means or a pledge of making us *partakers* of that rich mercy, *that blood* that was shed for us. That that is the right rendring of κοινωνία, is undertaken in another discourse upon the *Sacrament*, and needs no further to be repeated here, the notion of the word *Excommunication* being most clear and uncontroverted, that it is the *sequestring* of an offender from the || *Communion*, i. e. the visible *Society* of *Christians*, without ever thinking to cut him off, but on the contrary desiring to engraff him the more firmly into the *invisible*, and then also again into the *Church* the *visible* (but mystical) *body of Christ*. And therefore, *Sect.* 37.

* Th. 1. *Excommunicationis nomen videtur ex* 1 Cor. 10. *desumptum esse, atque emotionem significare à communione illâ, quâ ibidem corpus Christi nominatur.*

|| *Sanè nunc excommunicatio ab omnibus definitur exclusione à societate & communione fidelium.* Ib.

For the distinction of that *Communion* in the * second *Thesis*, into *internal* and *external*, *visible* and *invisible*, we say that one only member of the distinction belongs to the point in hand according to our stating of it. (And if the adversary of *Geneva* did press the other, we do not defend him in it) *viz.* the external and visible *Society of Believers*, or *Christian Professors*, from which only we affirm any man to be cut off by the act of *Excommunication*, and if he that is so cut off from that, be also finally cut off from the other, this is but *accidental*, and very extrinsecal to that act, and distant from the *Sect.* 38.

* Th. 2. *Est autem duplex fidelium Societas, interna sc. ac spiritualis, externa seu visibilis ac politica,*

the design and end of it, being the effect only of his sin, which, before he was *excommunicated* for it, is supposed to have concluded him under the wrath of God, and of his *Contumacy*, which will not permit this most fatherly punishment of the *Church* to work any good upon him; to which though it be consequent indeed, that this censure obtaining not the desired effect, shall tend to his greater condemnation; yet will this consequent no more be chargable on that *censure*, than on any other the methods of mercy or chastisement, by God used on purpose for his *Reformation*.

Sect. 39. In ‖ the third *Thesis* it is by us acknowledged true, *that internal and external Society* go not *always together*, and the consequents which *Erastus* builds on that, are true, and acknowledged *in an unjust Excommunication*, but these belong nothing at all to a just, nor consequently infer any thing against the *institution*, which giving rules that it may, and commands that it should be always exercised *justly*, may be permitted to suppose it is so; or if by errour or miscarriage it be not; it doth not *exclude* him from that inward *Communion* that was not before excluded, (supposing that he behave himself meekly and Christianly under that unjust censure) and if there be (as indeed there is) great difficulty to judge, whether the person thus to be *excommunicated*, be first excluded from the inward communion or no, yet will not this conclude the *censures* unlawful, because if he be not quite out before, this puts him not out (nor is occasion of doing so any more than chastisement from God, which may possibly work impatience and blasphemy in the person, but is not of *necessity*, or in any propriety of causation to do so) but rather is a means of keeping him in, of setting him upon his guard, of awaking or rescuing him from the danger of falling out of it, (and then *abundans cautela non nocet*, he that is awake already will be never the worse for calling) and withal of exercising some *Christian* vertues in him, which might possibly lye useless by him, if they were not thus employ'd, and call'd out to practice,

‖ Th. 3. *Tantum verò inter utramque discrimen est, ut qui in alterutrâ continetur, non etiam comprehendatur in altera necessariò. Nam ut membrum Christi esse possit qui injustè ex visibili aliqua Ecclesia ejectus est, aut inter infidelcs latere habitaréve cogitur, ita qui in visibili cœtu numerantur non dicos etiam membra viva sancti Christi: ex quo sequitur discrepare res illas posse, qua uni nos conjungunt non alteri, & ab unâ nos abjungunt & non ab alterâ.*

Sect. 40. To the * fourth *Thesis* we say that no man thinks, or according to our principles, hath any need to think, that any but God can joyn any to that *internal* Communion of Christ and the faithful, *i. e.* beget faith in any (nor consequently cut off any from it) unless ministerially, as ὑπηρέται and συνεργοὶ Χριστοῦ, *workers under*, and *with Christ*, and so only by power derived from him, we pretend to do what in the *censures* is done toward it.

* Th. 4. *Membra quidem Christi efficimur, i. e. internæ spirituali Christi societati conjungimur per solam fidem quæ per charitatem est efficax, & eâdem hâc per solam infidelitatem excidimus, proinde non potest nos huic inferere, aut eâdem excludere, nisi qui fidem donare, eandemque nobis iterum auferre potest.*

Sect. 41. To ‖ the fifth *Thesis*, we answer that there is a mistake, for we are made *consortes externæ & visibilis Ecclesiæ, Partakers of the external and visible Church*, not only by those three as they are the *acts* of the *man* who is so partaker, but to those three must be added a second notion of the third of these, which seems not here to be taken notice of, (though also the words are so set, that 'tis not excluded) and that is the act of the *Church*, first according to Christ's commission to the *Apostles*, in receiving them into the *Church* by *Baptism*, and, when for lapses, and returns into sin they are excommunicate, restoring them by *absolution*, and at all fit times allowing them the Sacrament of the *Lords Supper*, in charity supposing them (as long as they are in the *Church*) such members as ought not to be denyed that privilege, and if they be not unworthy, effectually sealing to them the benefits of *Christianity*. From whence 'tis clear that such the *usurpatio Sacramentorum* may be, (*viz.* if he receive the *Sacrament of the Lords Supper* that is * not *baptized*, or that is justly *excommunicate*) that 'twill be perfectly an *usurpation*, and not sufficient to give him right to be reckon'd *inter membra externi fidelium cœtus*, *among the members of a visible Church*.

‖ Th. 5 *Externæ verò visibilisque Ecclesiæ consortes reddimur ejusdem fidei professione, ejusdemque doctrinæ approbatione, denique eorundem sacramentorum usurpatione; in quo tria hæc insunt, is tanisper dum ei insunt, inter membra externi fidelium cœtus computatur, etiamsi ad internum spiritus & mentis communionem non pertingat.*

* Though *sacramentorum usurpatio in proper speaking suppose Baptism, which is one of those Sacraments, yet* Sacramentorum participatio, *Thes.* 6, *signifying only receiving the Lords Supper, I have reason to suppose it may do so here, and therefore I put in this.*

Sect. 42. *Th.* 6. ‖ in the first part their is need of a distinction: for the *Confession of Faith, and approbation of Christian Doctrine* may be, 1. either *Cordial* or *Hypocritical*. 2. Either *Private* or *Publick*. If it be Cordial, then 1. it makes me partaker of the *inward Communion* with Christ and his members, and supposes a man to be in that state, in which he that is, ought not to be *Excommunicate*, and so 'tis not ταύτης σκέψεως, it *belongs not to this matter*. If it be Hypocritical (as it will appear, if he that acknowledges Christ, and approves his Doctrine with his *mouth*, denyes it in his actions) then is it fit to bring the *censure* upon him, which he most hates and fears, to cast him out of the *Church*, which is only his disguise and vizard, or turn him out of that hypocritical confession of *Christ*, to display and lay open his *hypocrisie*, that he may be asham'd, and think good to reform, and to that end, to deny him the publick hearing of the Word, which it seems hath wrought so little good upon him, and to assure him that he shall not be accounted a Christian, unless his actions accord with his profession; All which you may mark is so far from deterring him from the cordial Profession, that 'tis the most probable means to invite him to it. So again for private *confession and approbation* (which belongs more to the *internal communion* again, than to the *external*) we drive no man from that by *Excommunication*, but onely from the publick performance of it in the Congregation (under which, and which only, *the publick hearing* of the Word read or preach'd is contained.) And by so doing we separate him from that *visible* Church on that charitable one purpose, that he may see how he hath abused that benefit, and timely learn to make better use of it, though again we do not invite him to that bare empty oral publick or private confession, or that oral *approbation*, which his hands, *i. e.* his *actions* confute, or that *unprofitable hearing*, which will only heap judgment on him; yet on the other side we are far from deterring him from the real publick *confession*, &c. but by thus dealing with him we shew him the necessity of it, and so by beating him out of his false holds, which will do him no

‖ Th. 6. *Ergo qui ex Ecclesiæ communione externâ ejicitur, (i. e. qui excommunicatur) vel ab omnibus hisce tribus, vel à duobus, vel ab uno tantùm removetur, sed à duobus primis, nempe à confessione fidei, & à Christianæ doctrinæ approbatione (sub qua volo verbi & doctrinæ auditionem comprehendi) repelli nullus debet, quin potiùs hùc invitandi & quavis ratione adducendi sunt omnes. Quocirca relinquitur, ut qui excommunicatur, à solâ (ex tribus commemoratis) sacramentorum participatione prohibeatur. Huic, utrùm inseparabiliter cohæreat privati commercii negatio, an separari possit, postea considerabitur. Alias pœnas non pertinere ad substantiam excommunicationis hujus certum est. Etenim possit eadem etiam non excommunicatis infligi, & excommunicatis non infligi.*

good

good, *drive* (which is more than *inviting*,) him to the refuge or Sanctuary, *the real confession*, the effectual *approbation*, and profitable *hearing*. To which head I must add, that I much wonder why all this while in the number of the constitutives of *external Communion*, publick *prayer* is not mentioned (not so much as reductively, as here *hearing of the Word* is:) This ought to have been added, and then I shall add of it, that though that be a duty that men would be invited to, as vehemently as to any, yet 'tis lawful to exclude any from this *benefit* in *publick*, when that exclusion may be a means most probable to awake a lethargick sinner.

By this it appears how groundless the last part of the sixth *Th.* is, *That excommunication is only excluding from the Sacrament*; for 'tis also from *prayer*, and *hearing*, (*viz.* in publick) as well as from the *Sacrament*: when that is thought expedient to reform any. Thus *Tertul.* mentions *exclusion à communicatione orationis, & conventus, & omnis sancti commercii*, apol. c. 39. *from partaking of Prayer and all sacred commerce*, and generally the *καθαίρεσις* antiently was from all: though (the manner of receiving in *penitents* being first by admitting them to *hearing*, and then to partaking in the *prayers*, which were before those that are joyn'd with the *Communion*; and after, to those *prayers* also, and in time to the *Communion* it self) it was after thought fit, that some of the *censures* should not be total to the excluding from all, but only setting them *inter audientes*, or *Catechumenos*, which were not yet admitted to the *Sacrament*, of which only the practice which he sets himself against seems to be an imitation. What follows therefore in the conclusion of that *Thesis*, that, [*quod aliæ pœnæ non pertinent ad substantiam excommunicationis certum est.* *'Tis certain that other penalties belong not to the substance of excommunication*] is very false, and proceeds from an ignorance, or willingness to deceive, as if the word *Excommunication* denoted only the keeping from the Sacrament of the Lords Supper (to which end, it now seems, it was, that the first *Thesis* was designed, and against whatsoever it is argumentative, 'twill not be against us) whereas it denotes the *excision* from all, or any degree of *Communion* in *sacris*, and is a *generical* word, of which there be different *species* according to the several kinds of holy things (the *Word*, the *Prayers*, the *Sacrament*) from which one may be *excommunicate*; And that of exclusion from the *Sacrament* is one degree of exclusion, and the exclusion from either or both of the other also, is an addition to that, never inflicted upon any but those to whom the *Sacrament* was denied. So far from truth is that which is added, that those other punishments *possunt non excommunicatis infligi*, may be inflicted upon those that are not *excommunicate* in his sence of *excommunicatus*, for one *excluded from the Sacrament*: for no man was denyed *prayers* and *hearing* that was admitted to the Sacrament, (nor is it rational that one should, for sure he that is thought worthy of the highest dignity and benefit in a *Church*, must be wronged, if he be denyed, and thought uncapable of the lowest) though the other part upon this reason be confest to be true, that these punishments of exclusion, from *prayers* and *hearing*, may sometimes *excommunicatis non infligi*, *be not inflicted upon them that are excommunicate*, as he that is thought unworthy the Priests office, may yet be allowed to be one of the *Nethinim* or door-keepers, as in the antient *Church*, he that was suspended from the *sacerdotal function* was yet suffer'd to *communicate*, *ut Laicus*, as a *Laick*. *Sect.* 43.

By which the answer is clear to the * next *Thesis* as far as concerns the *interdictio templorum*, *exclusion out of the Church* (and for the other two, that of the private commerce, & *actus cujusvis liciti of doing any lawful act*, we interpose not) *i. e.* from all the parts of the publick *service*, which that it was brought into the *Church* by the *Pontificians*, or that it is *contra apertam Scripturam*, *against manifest Scripture*, is certainly so very far from truth, that no man that hath read any part of *antiquity*, can doubt of this practice and usage, before thy tyranny of *Popery* is affirmed by any to have come into the world; and for the second, what that *aperta Scriptura* is, I shall not divine, but resolve that if it be that which is named in the end of the *Thesis*, 1 *Cor.* 14, there is nothing at all concluding from thence. The *ver.* that seems to be referred to (for we are left to divine) is *v.* 23. or 24. *where the speaking in the Church*, *praying or prophesying*, &c. *in an unknown tongue*, is by S. *Paul* proved to be improper, and not to tend to *edification*, because *prophesying*, *i. e. explaining of Scripture*, *praying*, *singing of Psalms*, &c. being designed for the use of the believers, and no others, are in any reason to be in a known tongue, that they may *understand*, and joyn in them. *v.* 16. the unknown tongues being designed, either only as a *sign*, *v.* 22. *i. e.* a miracle to convert unbelievers to the faith, when they see illiterate men all *Jews* speak all kinds of *languages*, or as a means of preaching to men of every countrey in their own *language*, from whence, saith the *Apostle*, 'tis consequent that if *unknown tongues* were used in a Congregation of believers, *unlearned men* that understand not those tongues, or *unbelievers* that have no reverence to the Congregation, and do not at all discern any *miracle* in their speaking with divers *tongues*, but look only upon the ridiculousness of the action, as of a gabbling of that which no man understands, will resolve that this is a direct *madness* thus to do. Whereas on the other side that of *Prophesying*, interpreting of the doctrine of Christ intelligibly, and the other parts of the *Church Service* in a known language, will be apt to *convince*, or instruct those *unbelievers* or *ignorants*; This, and no more but this, is the direct rational importance of those verses; wherein though there be mention of *unbelievers coming in*, yet that being only by way of supposition [*If they come in*, &c.] I might justly say, that that is no plain affirmation of Scripture, that *heathens*, & *alii quilibet*, *any others that will*, are not prohibited the hearing of Gods word, &c. For, 1. 'tis an old rule *that suppositio non ponit*, the *supposing* (*If they do*) *doth not suppose they do*, much less that lawfully they may: and 2. that text names *ethnicks* and *ignorants*, and belongs not at all to the *alii quivis*, *any other that will*, as that contains the impenitent *Christians*, which are the only persons, to which our *Excommunication* belongs; and of them the Apostle is far from affirming or supposing, that they might not be so excluded, and if they should by way of reduction be forced into that verse, the *Apostles* reasons would be spoiled, for they being supposeable to understand that *unknown tongue* (as they may do for all their impenitence) at least to know what belongs to the gift of tongues, and to what use they were designed, would not think them *mad* presently, that used it; which being said, I may further add, that those heathens coming into the *Church*, or the not prohibiting them to enter

* Th. 7. *Malè Pontificii propter hinc excommunicationem (quam ipsi minorem appellárunt, ac solâ sacramentorum negatione rectè definierunt) aliam insuper addiderunt, quam majorem & anathema vocárunt atque contra apertam Scripturam, interdictione templorum, privati commercii, & actus cujusvis liciti definierunt, quoniam Apostolus* 1 Cor. 14. *palàm ostendit neque ethnicos, neque alios quoslibet, à divini verbi auditione, lectione gratiarum actionibus, ac precibus Christianorum prohibitos fuisse.*

is a very distinct thing from *the admission of impenitent Christians*, when they are by *Church censures* prohibited, because the *Apostle* himself which prohibits *Communion* with the *brother* (that is, the *Christian*) which is a *fornicator*, doth yet not prohibit it with an *heathen*, or *fornicator of this world*; and the end of Excommunication being only on design of charity, to make the *Christian* offender by that means ashamed, and reformable, would be utterly cast away upon an *heathen*, who would rather be made obdurate by that means; and indeed 'twere ridiculous to turn out them who are not so forward to come in, and are not by St. *Paul* here supposed so, unless *tanquam exploratores*, to see, how *Christians* behave themselves there, and if they can find any such *madness* amongst them, as he there mentions, would be likely to charge it home upon them, though on the other side if they find such a regular frame, and beauty of all things there, they may possibly be convinced, and wrought on by that admirable order, and doctrine, as S. *Aust.* was by S. *Amb.* Sermon, though he came thither on a quite distant arrant. And so sure all this while this is a feeble text to be relyed on, as the only argument to conclude *Apostolical* Practice to be contrary to the excluding of any *à Verbi Divini auditione*, &c. *from prayer*, or *from hearing the Word in publick*, the place being quite extrinsecal to this matter, and saying nothing at all to it.

Sect. 45.

* Th 8. *Ex dictis liquet excommunicationem nihil aliud esse, quàm publicam & solennem sacramentorum, præsertim cœnæ dominicæ (quam privatim Apostolus communionem (κοινωνίαν) appellat, ut de principio dictum fuit) interdictionem, præcunte seniorum cognitione: quo peccantes resipiscant rursusque ad sacramentorum perceptionem admittantur.*

That which hath been said, sufficiently arms us against the concludency of that which * *Th.* 8. is inferr'd from the premises, and therefore there is no need of saying more to it; save only this, that in this *Thesis* there are some little mistakes committed, which I shall only name, 1. (that which is to the matter in hand, and on which his *conclusion* stands or falls, and had been *mentioned*, and is by us answered before in the 1 *Th.*) that κοινωνία 1 *Cor.* 10. signifies *Communion*, whereas, I say, it signifies indeed (from κοινωνέω *communico*) *communicatio*, and so belongs there (quite to another matter than that, to which it is here applied) only to the affirming the *wine*, &c. in the *Sacrament* to be the *communication*, or the making us partakers of the blood of Christ, not to our *Communion* one with another in *sacris*, which is the thing from which *Excommunication* cuts us off, as is noted by that definition of it, which *Th.* 1. is by the author produced, that 'tis *exclusio à societate & communione fidelium*, *an exclusion from the society of believers*. A second mistake (besides that which is consequent to the former, a new definition of it by only *Sacramentorum interdictio*, *Interdiction* of, or exclusion from the *Sacraments*, which should more unlimitedly have been *Sacrorum*, *from holy things*) that *Sacramentorum* is put in the *plural* number, which must needs be either not like a *Divine*, or not like a *Protestant*, for if it note *Baptism* as well as the *Lords Supper*, then 'tis not like a *Divine*, for no Divine would say that *Excommunication* is an *Interdiction* of *Baptism*, for till they are once baptized, they are out of the *Church*, are not capable of *Excommunication*, and when they are once baptized, though they were not *excommunicate*, they should be *baptized* no more. But if by that *plural*, he mean any other *Sacraments* besides these two, that is not like a *Protestant*, for such acknowledge no more. Having mention'd these two mistakes, I shall not add a third, that in this interdiction, the persons to whom this cognizance belongs, are not rightly named; because though it be true, that they are not, yet the men, against whom he wrote, were of that opinion, and I am a little perswaded, that if it had been an *Episcopal* audience, that should have had this *cognizance*, he had never written this book, nor been put upon those arts to evacuate the *Church-censures*. One thing only I may have leisure to commend in that *Thesis*, that he defines *excommunication* by *publica & solennis interdictio*, *a publick solemn interdiction*, *& præeunte cognitione* (I suppose he means *legitimâ*) with a *legal cognizance preceding it*; and shall add, that they quite deform the Primitive Institution, who deny the *Sacrament* to whole Congregations at once without any charge laid to all or any part of them, (save only that they are a mixt *Congregation*, wherein there are some evil men, which yet is not *legally* proved neither) and they also who deny it to particular men sufficiently catechised without any publick *cognizance* of their crime, or process *of admonition 1st and 2d*, or that design that *exclusion* to any other end, than *ut peccantes resipiscant*, the *reducing sinners to repentance*: and therefore no small petty trifle is a sufficient matter for this, but contumacious continuing in some scandalous sin after admonitions, from which when they return again by a sincere approved repentance, they are to be absolved.

Sect. 46.

‖ Th. 9. *Hic jam oritur quæstio, utrum aliquis propter commissum peccatum aut vitam impurè actam, siquidem usurpare Sacramenta cum cæteris Christianis cupiat, ab eorundem usu, & perceptione sit removendus? quæstio de eo proponitur, qui eandem fidem nobiscum profitetur, Ecclesiæ per baptismum insertus est, atque in doctrinâ ab eadem non dissentit (ut in* Th. 5. *posuimus) sed in solâ vitâ & moribus errat. Hoc ergo quæritur utrum in S. literis vel mandatum vel exemplum aliquod extet, quo tales jubeantur aut doceantur à Sacramentis submoveri.*

‖ *Th.* 9. Is the proposing of the *question* in the terms, wherein it is to be handled, wherein I shall only interpose for perspicuity sake, that the phrase [*an removendus sit?*] may have a little ambiguity in it, for perhaps it may (though less properly) be set to signifie this, *Whether it be lawful to remove such an one?* (for if it be but so, then he that pretends to write against *excommunication*, and to pretend it *unlawful* will be sufficiently concluded) and then I answer, that for any but for the *Governour* of the *Church*, to whom the cognizance of his ill life belongs, and who hath had a legal cognizance of it, and proceeded legally by the several degrees of *Ecclesiastical* process against him, it is not lawful; but for the *Bishop*, or *Prefect*, or lawful *Governour* succeeding to that power which *Christ* gave his *Apostles with the Keys of the Kingdom of heaven*, it is lawful, and by the Commission of [*Ego dabo*] and afterwards [*Ego mitto*] they are sufficiently authorized to do this, and upon this issue, if this be it, we will joyn most willingly. But then secondly, the (*An sit removendus*) may perhaps (and to that the words more incline) denote a necessity of doing it, and then the question will be, whether he *must be removed*? To which I then answer, that there lies not any such *necessity* on this, as arises from any *pollution* that will accrue to others, that *communicate* with him, if he be not prohibited any further, than the *example* of his sin, and the impunity may extend, and this the Fathers maintained against the *Novatians*. Nor thirdly, any necessity lying on the *Minister* that administers, for he having admonished (according to our *Church Orders* in our Liturgy) every such sinner to go home, and repent, and not to approach to that Table, is in *charity* to believe (being not able to *search the heart*) that he, that after that so comes, is a true *penitent*. Only if *in prudence* he think it unlikely, and therefore out of care to a poor mans soul, and for the preventing of the sin of *unworthy* receiving, he think fit to admonish him more privately, or particularly to that end, or to do any thing else, which in prudence may contribute to it, this is but his duty to an *erring* brother, and when that is done, any farther emergent guilt lies upon the receiver, and he is not (in case of the mans *unworthy receiving*) partaker of that sin.

All

All the necessity then that is in this matter, lies first upon the receiver himself, that he be wary, *Sect.* 47.
that he come not till he be prepared (and that belongs not to our present consideration) and upon the *Bishops*, or *Governours of the Church*, that, when *charity* to souls requires it of them, they fail not thus to proceed, that when *mercy* and friendly admonitions prevail not, they then take in severity, the *Apostles rod*, in the season for a *rod*, instead of *his Spirit of mercy, and meekness*, and to that end be watchful over the flock, that they fall not into such dangers and infections, by their neglect or mercifulness.

As for the qualifying of the persons, of whom this question is ask'd, I shall not differ with the Pro- *Sect.* 48.
poser, but resolve, as anon we shall shew, that he that is thus, may (and ought in the sence that I mention) be thus dealt with, and we shall joyn issue with him for the precept, and examples of Scripture commanding and teaching us to do so.

And having now, as I conceive, so easie a task before me, and such an army of seconds on my side *Sect.* 49.
(the consent and practice of the whole Christian World for 1500. years) against one single Combatant, walking in a melancholy posture by himself, (till after so many years, the concurrence of some accidental conceived *conveniences* have at last helpt him to some company,) and him again not very much used to the *weapon*, (I mean *Divinity*) which he hath undertaken to trust to, and beside having an advantage against him, which he did not foresee, we of this Church being not the men against whom his reasons were framed, and so not so likely to be prest by them, (the arguments designed against *Beza*, and his *Presbyterians* being utterly unconcludent against us) I must confess my self to be under a temptation to make use of the present advantage, and to prosecute this tryal to the uttermost; but I must in justice consider, what a chasme and rent it would make in this discourse, what an unwieldy bulk it would swell it to, and therefore must recover so much constancy of mind, as not to be thus passionately hurried out of my resolution, but leave it, till I have a louder call to it, being ready to give any man an account of what I now say in this matter.

It will be a more moderate excursion, and more reconcileable with my designed brevity, to mention *Sect.* 50.
one opinion, or pretension more in this matter, that of another *Gentleman*, who though he strive not to take *Excommunication* out of the Church any more than *Baptism*, but moreover acknowledges also, p. 369.
that it belongs to the future *Pastors*, as well as to the then *present Apostles*; yet having first resolved, p. 363.
that *Ecclesia & civitas Christianorum* are all one, he then concludes that the cognizance, and judg- p. 357.
ment of any fault, whether it be such or no, belongs to the *Church* in that notion of his, *i. e.* to p. 367.
the City or Common-wealth, (which with him also signifies the *civil Magistrate*, or, as he saith, *judicem summum*, the *supreme Judge*;) and that the *power of binding and loosing* (as that also of *bapti-* p. 369.
zing, which, saith he, is all one with it) is no farther in the *Pastor* than that he eject those out of the *Church*, whom the *Church* in his notion hath *condemned*; and receive into it, whom the *Church* judges worthy of *absolution*. I shall not labour to multiply differences, but at this time make my exceptions only to one part of this Scheme, *viz.* that the *Church* in his notion, *i.e.* the *judex summus*, the *civil Magistrate* hath the power of *judging* who are to be *excommunicated*, who *absolved*. The proofs that I can collect from him of that assertion, are only two: First, that *Matth.* 18. *Christ* bids, in case *the trespasser hear not the two or three*, (*i.e.* saith he, either *deny the fact, or confessing it deny it to be a trespass*) then *dic Ecclesiæ*, that it should *be told the Church*, [*Quare autem Ecclesiæ, nisi ut ipsa* p. 367.
judicet, an peccatum sit, necne? Why should the Church be told it, but that that may judge, whether that be a sin or no?] *and if he obeyed not, then let him be to thee a publican*, &c. *Non dicit, Dic Apostolis, It is not*, saith he, *Tell the Apostles, to note that the sentence or judgment, whether it be a sin or no, belongs not to them, but to the* Church; and consequently *that this power was no more, than to bind those whom the Church had before judged* impenitent. His second argument is from the practice and words of Saint *Paul*, who asks the *Corinthians*, [*Do you not judge them that are within?*] *yet himself pronounces the* p. 368.
fornicator excommunicate. To the former of these, I shall answer only this one thing, that there are other reasons very prompt and pertinent, why the matter should be told the *Church*, though the *Church* be taken in a notion wherein it is not supposed to judge of it: as either, 1. the [*densare inculcationibus*] in *Tertullians phrase*, the fortifying the former succesless reprehensions with this addition of authority from the number, that as the *two or three* might be more likely to work upon the offender, than the injur'd person alone, so now the πλείονες or the ἐκκλησία, *the many*, or the *Church* in the looset notion of it, for any assembly or meeting of many *Christians* together, (supposing that it do not signifie *the Governours of the Church*, as the Antients yet say it doth, and is far more probable, and asserted on stronger grounds, than that it should signifie the *Civitas* or *summus judex*) might probably be more effectual; or 2. the [*pudefacere coram multis*] formerly cited out of the *Rabbins*, the making the offender *ashamed*, when his fact is thus publish'd, and to do that is by us acknowledged the end of the admonitions, and *censures*; or 3. if there be need, the using the *multitude*, as a cloud of witnesses to convince him of the fact, or sinfulness of it, which the Text refers to before, (that *in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established*) and in all reason may be a commodious sence here also, this *third* being but the ascending to an higher, and more probable convincing course, when the former had miscarried. Either of these three, much more all together, will be sufficient ground of *Telling it to the Church*, and so from thence there is no necessity to conclude that the *judgment* is the act of the *Church*, or *Civil Magistrate* in that place. And indeed it will be hard to suppose that *possible* at that *time*, when 'tis clear the *Civil Magistrate* was not *Christian*, and therefore unfit not only for the title of the *Church*, but much more to be appealed to as the Judge by *Christians*, who 'tis certain, are bound by *Christ* to use all other means possible (and *telling* it to the *Church* in our notion is one of those possibles) to get satisfaction for *trespasses*, before they proceed to any Heathen tribunal, to implead their *fellow-Christian* there. Nor will it, I conceive, be reasonable to reply, that *Christ*'s speech belongs to after-times, when the *Magistrate* should be *Christian*; For then 1. he must acknowledge that till then, it was to be in the *Church* in our notion, and consequently that the *Ecclesiastical Governours* were the *Judge* at that time, and then by his own doctrine (that *data est potestas ligandi*, &c. *futuris pastoribus eodem modo quo præsentibus Apostolis*) it will still belong to the *Ecclesiastical Superiour*. And 2. though it may very justly be *extended* to that future state, (as what p. 363.

was ſaid to the *Apoſtles* was not *perſonal*, but belonged to their *ſucceſſors* alſo) yet there will be no probable argument that the *Apoſtles* then preſent ſhould be themſelves excluded. For, beſides that this muſt lie on him to prove, if he will aſſert it againſt all Antiquity, it will alſo be a little unreaſonable to affirm; for that were for our Saviour, to give all the power, and direct all the ſpeech to the *Succeſſors*, not to the *Apoſtles*, as a *Prophecy* only, or a prediction, no *Evangelical* inſtating on theſe to whom he ſpake. This I ſuppoſe a ſufficient anſwer to this proof, without proceeding to any deeper ſearch or examination of that which in the argument is taken for granted, *viz.* that the *Church* ſignifies the *Summus judex*, which yet is as far from being formerly convincingly inferred, as it is from the ſound of the words, or the notion wherein all the *antient Church* have uniformly taken it, (which will, I hope, be conſiderable in this matter) for that *Chriſt* did not take upon him to be a *Judge*, or introduce any change *in civil Government*, as it is by us acknowledged moſt true, ſo will it not belong to this of *binding*, &c. which is but a *ſpiritual*, not *civil* puniſhment, only a denying them that, which *Chriſt* brought into the World, and gave thoſe *Meſſengers* of his the ſole *power* of *diſpoſing* it, and indow'd them with *power from on high*, particularly for the exerciſe of it. As for the *ſecond* argument 'tis certainly a miſtake, if it be thought to conclude that the *Apoſtle* did but *pronounce* the judgment of the *Church* in that matter of the *inceſtuous*, or that the *judgment* of the *civil* ſtate was preparative to *his*. For ſure the *Apoſtle* had, (before the uſing of thoſe words of [*Do not you judge them that are within?*] in the end of that Chapt.) paſt his ſentence definitive on that *inceſtuous* in the beginning of it, *ver.* 3. For I have *already* (not *ego autem*, but ἐγὼ μὲν γὰρ) *as abſent in body, but preſent in ſpirit, judg'd him that hath thus done this thing* ἤδη κέκρικα τὸν οὕτω κατεργασάμενον, *I have judg'd this evil doer: Judg'd*, I ſay, and what is the ſentence? Why, *In the Name of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, you and my ſpirit being met together* (the *Apoſtle* and his *Presbytery*; or he in the face of the *Church*) *with the power of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, to deliver ſuch an one to Satan*, &c. And this at a time, when 'tis clear, the *Church* had not paſs'd *ſentence* on him, for Verſe 2. *They were puffed up*, as he complains, and through an opinion of their own deeper wiſdom (a *leaven*, verſe 6. *i. e.* a doctrine either of the Heathen *Philoſophers*, or of the *Gnoſticks* among them) took it for an *indifferent thing*, and *did not mourn* for him that had done it. The ceremony uſed by the *Church*, when any was to be excommunicate, and notes that they ſhould have ſo joyn'd together in *mourning*, in complaining to the *Apoſtle*, and prayer to *Chriſt*, that this *cenſure* might paſs on ſuch an one, but that they did not do it, nay, it ſeems, proceeded not ſo far as to *fraternal correption*, which was infallibly their duty toward him. As for the words cited, [*Nonne vos judicatis?*] they come in on another incidental occaſion (not directly to this firſt matter) to make the diſtinction betwixt the dealing with the *Chriſtian* and *heathen fornicators*; the *Apoſtle* reſtraining his preſcription of not converſing with *fornicators*, verſe 9. to the *Chriſtian fornicator*, whom, ſaith he, being *within the Church*, 'tis reaſonable to conclude within the *Churches cenſures*, ἐχὶ τοὺς ἔσω ὑμεῖς κρίνετε; *Do you not judge them that are within?* not *you emphatically*, or in oppoſition to the *Apoſtle*, but *you* κοινῶς as a general title of *Chriſtians*, who uſe not to judge any but *Chriſtians*, all other being left to *God's judgment*, the *Church* having nothing to do with them. It is clear enough, that the context looketh wholly that way, and conſequently there will be little reaſon to extend theſe words any farther than this, that the *Church* judgeth *Chriſtians*, not Heathens; and the *Church* in the notion only wherein 'tis oppoſed to *God*, not in which 'tis oppoſed to Saint *Paul*, but in which in any reaſon it includes the *Apoſtle* or Governour of it; For ſure he may judge them that are ἔσω, *within the Church*, (for ſo he doth, ver. 3. and no part of the context of that Chapt. ſeems to ſay any thing to the contrary) though *them that are without he cannot*; which is the only thing the *Apoſtle* had in hand to ſay at that time.

1 Cor. 5. 12.

Having briefly anſwered the reaſons, I ſhall by way of compounding the *Controverſie* with this *Gentleman*, moſt willingly acknowledge, that ſomewhat the *Church* in his notion, or more clearly the *ſupreme Magiſtrate*, being ſuppoſed *Chriſtian*, may have to do in this buſineſs of *Cenſures*, *precedaneous* to the judgment of the *Apoſtle*, or *before* the *Paſtor* or *Eccleſiaſtical Governour* proceed to them. As 1. in the chooſing or nominating him to that office: 2. in the ſetting of rules, or Laws by which he ought to proceed in hearing or judging: No queſtion, this may, and in *Chriſtian* Common-wealths very reaſonably ought to belong to the *civil Magiſtrate*; and truly this diſcourſe doth not pretend to, or deſire any unlimited, or *arbitrary power* in the *Biſhop*, but only that, the rules being prudently ſet by thoſe to whom the power of making Laws belongs in every Common-wealth, he ſhould have the cognizance in ſuch cauſes, as regularly belong to his audience, and according to that rule, and not otherwiſe, give *ſentence* on the offender; and that only thus far, that he ſhall be *turn'd* out of *Chriſtian* ſociety, or *received* into it again: (which, beſide that this is, and hath always been taken for an *inſtitution* of *Chriſts*, which 'tis reaſonable we ſhould *obey*, and not *diſpute*, is alſo in it ſelf ſimply conſidered, far from any degree of unreaſonable, no man in ordinary reaſon being more fit to *judge* who is fit to enjoy the privileges of the *Church*, who likely to be *reformed* by being deprived of them, than he that hath ſtudied that great skill of winning ſouls, and is intruſted by *Chriſt* with the charge of them.) Again 3. it will be granted that the *Church* in the ordinary notion, as it ſignifies the whole diffuſive *Chriſtian* Society in any place, may ſo far be intereſſed in this matter, as that theſe only ſhall be liable to theſe *Cenſures*, who have *offended* others by their notorious ſins, and are by the *Proxyes*, as it were of thoſe others, I mean, by their choſen *officers*, or by the like publick *fame*, the voice again and interpreter of their ſence, delated, or complain'd of to the *Governours* of the *Church*, as thoſe that have wrong'd the *Church*, and defamed that *Chriſtian* Profeſſion, to which they had given up their names; and this is a kind of *judging* (in large or looſe ſpeaking, as to be *infamous* offenders ſignifies to be conceiv'd and *judg'd* ſuch by the community among whom they live, for otherwiſe they are not *infamous*) but yet in ſtrict propriety, is only a *preparative* to the *ſentence* of the *Judge*, and an accuſing or *impleading* rather, and is not, I ſuppoſe, the thing for which this Author doth pretend, or if it were, would not to us be matter of contention with him.

The truth is, the *power* of *binding*, &c. which we contend for, as the office more than privilege of *Biſhops*, (in the careful exerciſe of which they miniſter moſt *charitably* to the good of the ſouls intruſted to them) is another manner of thing, than what this Gentleman ſeems to have conceived it (both here,

here, and eſpecially, when of it he concludes, *Unuſquiſque ſi mentis compos ſit obediet in omnibus ſimpliciter ei, cujus arbitrio credit ſe ſalvandum aut damnandum eſſe.*) God knows they pretend to no ſuch *arbitrium* in the *ſaving* or *damning* of any man; It is only an engine of *Chriſts* invention to make a battery and an impreſſion on the obdurate ſinner, to win him to himſelf to * *bleſs*, not to triumph over him; (which very thing he hath in one place excellently expreſt, ‖ *The end of this diſcipline*, ſaith he, *is by depriving men for a time of the favour and ſpiritual priviledges of the Church, to humble them to ſalvation,*) much leſs to invade any part of civil Judicature, or looſen the bands thereof by theſe ſpiritual pretences, but to leave the Government of the World juſt in the poſture, that it was before Chriſts coming, or as it would be ſuppoſed to be, if he had never left any *Keys* in his *Church*. And therefore when in an *Annotation* affixt to his laſt Edition he was pleaſed to extend his obſervation of the * *Doctrines* that might diſturb *Government*, not only to that *power which many attribute to the Pope of Rome in other mens dominions*, and to the *liberty uſurpt by the* cives infimi, *under pretence of Religion*, but alſo to that which *alicubi extra Eccleſiam Romanam Epiſcopi in civitate ſuâ ſibi poſtulant*, I muſt hope that it was a miſtake, or which I rather think (being perſwaded of the uprightneſs of his affections to our eſtabliſh'd *Government*) that his [*alicubi*] did not in any wiſe refer (as I was apt to fear it did) to the conſtitution of *Epiſcopacy* in this native Kingdom of his and mine. For that this, ſince it departed from the *Roman Church*, hath been perfectly free from any degree of that guilt, is that of which we are ſo far perſwaded that we neither fear, nor deprecate any *Hiſtorians inſtance*, nor can imagine what one particle of the Doctrine, or conſtitution of our *Church* there is, on which a rational man can by any conſequence build ſuch a ‖ *charge*; Of which nothing can make *Us* capable, but the leaving the [*non*] out of it; and that makes me a little confident, that either [*Epiſcopi*] in that place ſignifies not in the known vulgar *Chriſtian* ſence, or that the (*alicubi*) lookt not on this Kingdom, or *Church* of ours, (as it hath long ſtood eſtabliſht by Law) which moſt chearfully acknowledges the truth of his many other obſervations (particularly that of *Obedience due to the Moſes's, not Aarons chair*, of *Abiathar the High-Prieſt being no way exempt from the commands of Solomon*, of his three axioms alſo concerning *Excommunication*, that neither the *Common-wealth*, nor the *ſupreme Magiſtrate*, nor *all the perſons in any Common-wealth can be excommunicate*) and reſolves that no man ſhall ever *deprive* her of *this glorying*, that ſhe is *pure* from the *bloud of all men*, hath entertain'd no one principle, or doctrine in any degree incompetible with the *civil power*, or *peace* in the utmoſt extent, in which the moſt *loyal* Author hath deſign'd to eſtabliſh it. And if it muſt be *Arminianiſm* (as one hath lately confuted it under that title) to teach * that *the Eccleſiaſtical power is ſubjected to the Civil Magiſtrate*, who in *all cauſes over all perſons* is acknowledged by us *ſupreme under Chriſt*, we muſt be content to lie down under that envy, and not excuſe or renounce that piece of *Loyal Arminianiſm*.

p. 407.

* Acts 5. 26.

‖ *Finis hujuſmodi diſciplinæ erat ut deſtitueret ad tempus gratiâ & priviligiis Eccleſiæ ſpiritualibus, humiliarentur ad ſalutem.* p. 407.

* *Doctrinæ quædam quibus imbuti cives obedientiam civitati negare, & contrà Principes ſummos, ſummaque poteſtates pugnare, idque jure poſſe, imo oportere arbitrantur.* p. 101.

Nam quod bellum civile in Orbe Chriſtiano unquam extitit, quod ab hâc radice ortum atq; alitum non fuerit? p. 202.

p. 190.

p. 192.

p. 371, 372.

* *Errant primo Arminian. qui Magiſtratui Politico Eccleſiaſticum regimen ſubjectum eſſe docebant.* Steph. J. Tit. ſi Virga *Moſis*. p. 48. *Sect.* 51.

I have thus far proceeded in this matter for the removing of prejudices, and vindicating our propoſition from three ſorts of Objecters: 'tis now time to advance a little toward the poſitive aſſertive part, and to that end (the knowledge of *looſing* depending wholly from the conſideration of *binding*) I ſhall in the firſt place examine what images of *binding* we have in the *Scripture*, and thoſe we ſhall refer to two heads: firſt, thoſe that belong to the *power*, and practice *Apoſtolical*, (in the time and perſons of the *Apoſtles*;) ſecondly, thoſe that after the *Apoſtles* perſons (and ever ſince) were to continue in the Church, which we ſhall call *Eccleſiaſtical Diſcipline* (as diſtant from Apoſtolical) exerciſed (the one, as the other) upon offenders either *publick and ſcandalous*, or whoſe crimes otherwiſe came unto their cognizance, and conſiſting either in *ſeparating* and *removing* to ſome diſtance, or in caſting them totally *out of the Church*, or *Congregation* of viſible Profeſſors here on earth; anſwerable unto which [*looſing*] muſt conſequently be a delivering from thoſe *cenſures*, the abſolving of him, who was formerly *ſeparated*, or *excommunicated*, reſtoring him to the viſible Church, or any part thereof (to the privileges of a *Chriſtian*, and the comforts of the *Word*, and *Services*, and *Sacraments*) who was before legally caſt out of it, and deprived of them.

For the underſtanding of which, and ſpecially of the former, the *Apoſtolical* power and practice (or as it was diſcernible among the *Apoſtles*) it will not be amiſs to do theſe three things: 1. To give you a view of the ſeveral ſorts of *Excommunication* among the *Jews*, to which ſome phraſes in the New Teſtament refer: (becauſe I ſee there is ſome controverſie raiſed concerning them.) 2. To mention ſome of thoſe places in the New Teſtament, which ſeem to refer to theſe; And then 3. to obſerve the phraſes in the New Teſtament, which are more *purely Chriſtian*, i. e. which more diſtinctly and peculiarly reſpect the uſe of theſe *Cenſures* among Chriſtians.

For the firſt, I am ſure, 'twill be no news to ſay that there were three degrees of Excommunication among the *Jews*; the firſt called נדוי ἀφόρισμὸς remotion or *ſeparation*; the ſecond, חרם ἀνάθημα *Execration*, a more ſolemn *Excommunication* (with curſes out of *Moſes* Law and execrations added to it, a δέησις of which we have *Acts* 8. 20.) inflicted on him who after the נדוי firſt for 30. days, and then being allowed 30. days more (which is doubling of the נדוי) ſtill continued in that contumacy, for then, ſay the *Jews* מחר ימין אותו, they anathematize him without defining any limited time, as before in *Niddui* they did. The third is שמתא a kind of *Proſcription* and delivering to deſolation and deſtruction; or to the *coming of the Lord* in judgment againſt him, noted by μαρὰν ἀθὰ (added to the *anathema*) μαρὰν in the *Oriental* tongues ſignifying *Dominus*, (whence in *Etruria* the *Kings* are called *Murani*, ſaith *Servius* in *Æn.* 12. and the Syrians now *Maranita*, becauſe they call Chriſt מראנו our *Lord*, Agreeable to which it is that in *Epiphanius*, GOD is by the *Gazari* call'd *Marnas*, and by the *Cretians* their *Virgins* Μαρναὶ, i.e. κυρίαι *Ladies*) And ſo among the *Spaniards* the form hath been uſed, *Sit anathema Marano*, & *excommunicatus*, or מחרמא מן רחא אלרב *Let him be excommunicate from the hope of the Lord:* (and he that *loves not the Lord Jeſus Chriſt*, ſignifying him that was tainted with the *leaven* of the *Gnoſticks*, and ſo would not *confeſs Chriſt* in the time of *perſecution*, and ſo had not that *love of Chriſt* that *caſts out fear*, it is very reaſonable that this cenſure ſhould be inflicted on him.) Of theſe three *ſpecies* thus ſet down ἐν τύπῳ, I ſhould not add much more, but that again I ſee two things reſolved on by a fore-mentioned learned *Author*, contrary to what hath been generally received in this matter, and the latter of them apt, if believed, to diveſt the Church of all kind of

Sect. 52.

diſcipline, even of ſuch as was inſtituted on no other deſign, but to *bring ſinners to heaven*, and which we deſire ſhould be uſed only to that end. They are theſe, 1. That there are but two *ſpecies* of *Excommunication* among the *Jews*, *Niddui*, and *Cherem*, and that *Schammatha* is all one with *Niddui*; 2. That theſe puniſhments among the *Jews* belonged not to *Excluſion* from *ſacred*, but only from *civil ſociety*.

Sect. 53. For the firſt of theſe, that which I find produced to diſprove thoſe three *ſpecies*, is, 1. The promiſcuous uſe of *Niddui* and *Schammatha* among the *Talmudical* writings; ſecondly, the derivation of *Schammatha* from שמת, which among them ſignifies no more than to *ſeparate* and to *abdicate*; and thirdly, that *Elias Levita*, and *David de Pomis*, which are for theſe three *ſpecies*, were not *Lawyers* but *Grammarians*, and ſo did *oſcitanter negligently* and *drowſily* make three *ſpecies* of *Excommunication*, when they ſhould have made but two. To all which I anſwer, that thoſe learned men which maintain the three *ſpecies* may very well do it, for ought theſe objections enforce to the contrary. For it will not be neceſſary for us to affirm that the Talmudiſts ſhould uſe theſe ſeveral words conſtantly according to their diſtinct, proper, peculiar, *critical* importance; there is nothing more ordinary than for words that are uſed *in foro* to loſe their native proper ſignifications, and to be uſed κοινῶς for ſomewhat elſe of affinity, and near ſignification with them, and therefore it will be worth obſerving, that as *Schammatha* in the Talmud is ſometimes taken only for *ſeparation* (which is the reaſon that they which are againſt the three *ſpecies* make *Schammatha* to be all one with *Niddui*, and ſo ſet down *Niddui* and *Cherem* for the *two*:) So in other places *Niddui* is ſet to denote *Schammatha* as a higher degree than *Cherem*, as will appear (to any that cannot otherwiſe paſs judgment on it) by the *p.* 2467. places which *Buxtorf* hath produced in his *Rabbinical Lexicon*, which ſhew clearly that *Schammatha* is a heavier degree of *Excommunication*, and yet that *Niddui* is by them put for *Schammatha*, which indeed will be a proof that *Niddui* and *Schammatha* are uſed promiſcuouſly, *& ſine diſcrimine*, among thoſe Writers, but not at all, that there are but two *degrees* or *ſpecies*, *Niddui* and *Cherem*, but clearly the contrary, that *Cherem* is a middle *ſpecies*, beyond which there is *Schammatha* (which they ſometimes improperly call *Niddui*) as well as below it *Niddui*, which they ſometimes call *Schammatha*; and therefore *Jo. Coch* which is cited to prove that *Niddui* and *Schammatha* are all one, ſaith withal, that נרת and שמת, *non tantùm de leviori ſed & de graviori indifferenter uſurpantur*, *Exc. Gem. San. p.* 146. *both uſed for the greater, as well as both for the lighter Excommunication.* To which I ſhall add, that the *Hebrew* writers are ſo far from ſpeaking conſtantly, and exactly, and critically in this matter, that they ſometimes put *Cherem*, or *anathema* loweſt, and add *Schammatha* to that, and then ſet *Niddui* as the laſt of the three, as in *Jelammedenu ſect.* וישב ſpeaking of the *Samaritans*, the *ſpecies* of Excommunication are thus enumerated, ומחרימין ומשמתין ומנדין, and *they anathematized, and ſchammatized and excommunicated him*, by which it will appear, how promiſcuouſly thoſe words have been uſed among *Hebrew* Writers, (to which purpoſe may be again remembred, what was even now produced of the phraſe in *Spain*, *Sit anathema Murano, & excommunicatus, Excommunicatus* after the higheſt *anathema*) but it will not be a proof of any validity, againſt the *three ſpecies* of *Excommunication*, or the order or difference of them, when they do ſpeak exactly.

Sect. 54. For the ſecond proof taken from the derivation of *Schammatha* from שמת, which, ſaith he, ſignifies no more than to *ſeparate* or *abdicate*, I deſire this may be noted, that there is no ſuch antient *Hebrew* word as שמת but only of later uſe among the *Rabbins*, and *Talmudiſts*, which to me is an argument convincing that that *verb* may come from *Schammatha*, and not *Schammatha* from that *verb*; and therefore *Buxtorf*, when he meets with it, renders it *Schammathizare*, as a *verbal* from that noun, not willing to affix any other Interpretation to it, but this, that ſo he might leave it to ſignifie in the ſame latitude (as a *verb*) that belongs to *Schammatha*, as a *ſubſtantive*, i. e. ſometimes to be taken properly and ſtrictly to denote the third *ſpecies*, ſometimes improperly, to be all one with *Niddui*, or the firſt *ſpecies*.

Sect. 55. For the confirming of what I now ſay, I ſhall premiſe what I ſuppoſe will be eaſily granted me, that every *compound* or *derivative Hebrew word*, is to be reduced to ſome original *Hebrew root* or *roots*, from which it is derived, or of which compounded; conſequently, that the ſame muſt be reſolved of שמתא which that it is not a derivative from שמת I conceive is ſufficiently evinc'd, becauſe שמת is no primitive Hebrew word to be found in the Bible, or other *authentick Hebrew* writing (which he that will not truſt his own obſervation, but ſurvey *Schindler* and *Buxtorf*, will acknowledge with me) but only among the *Rabbins* and *Talmudiſts*, and may rather be thought to come from שמתא than *Schammatha* from that; this is not my conjecture, but the direct words of the learned *Buxtorf* in *his inſtitution of Hebrew Epiſtles*, p. 58. in theſe words, *Talmudici ex nomine* שמתא *verbum faciunt* שמת *proſcribere, proſcriptionis pœnam in aliquem ferre, the Talmudiſts from the noun Schammatha make the verb Schammeth to proſcribe*, &c. and though *Buxtorf* in his *Rabbinical Lexicon* place the verb before the *noun*, yet is that no argument of diſagreement between theſe two Writings, but is only cauſed by a care of obſerving his wonted *literal* method of ſetting the verb of three letters before the *noun* of one letter more.

Sect. 56. If it be now demanded of me from whence then the *noun* comes (ſeeing I make the *verb* come from that,) I anſwer that learned *Jews* have given it ſeveral *originations*, ſome bringing it from שם אתא *Dominus venit*, the *Lord comes*, making it all one with μαραν ἀθα, 1 *Cor.* 16. 22. (but the *dageſh* in מ makes me that I cannot conſent to that Etymology;) others from שם מיתא *ibi mors*, *there is death*; others from שממה תהא *deſolatio erit*, *there ſhall be deſolation*. Of theſe two latter I know not which to chuſe, 1. having little objection againſt either of them, and 2. finding them both *avowed* in the *Gemara Moed Katon*, in theſe words, what is *Schammatha*? *Rab* anſwered שם מיתה *there is death*, and *Samuel* ſaid, שממה תהא *there ſhall be deſolation*, &c. and 3. finding the ſence of both thoſe originations to come to the ſame purpoſe of *death*, or *deſolation*, or *deſtruction*, noting that kind of offender to be by that *cenſure* given up to divine *vengeance*, which is generally the notion of that third degree of Excommunication, which makes it to be taken for the ſame with *Maranatha* in the *Apoſtle*, that *God comes* as a judge or avenger to ſuch an one. For let me add to this matter this one thing, that this third degree of cenſure among the *Jews* at Chriſts time was proper to him, that under

Moſes

Moses Law had deserved *death*, but by reason that the power of *capital punishments* was taken from the *Jews*, could not by them be so punished, and therefore was by this way thus delivered up to *Gods* hands, to inflict vengeance upon him, which they say did very frequently befall them in a remarkable manner; and S. *Augustins* observation is to this purpose, *quæst. super* Deut. l. 5. c. 38. *Hoc nunc agit in Ecclesiâ excommunicatio, quod agebat tunc interfectio, Excommunication doth the same among Christians, that killing did among the Jews.* As for the third proof of the objection, taken from the lessening of the authority of *Elias Levita*, and *David de Pomis*, it will be sufficient to say, 1. That to make that argumentative, it ought to have been (but is not) proved, that others which have call'd the three *species* in question, are of greater authority than these; 2. That *Grammarians* (if they be such indeed, as those have been allowed that *reputation* (are * *Criticks* also, and so as fit to be hearkned unto in such a matter *of antient custom* among the *Jews*, as if they had been *Lawyers*, they would have been; more, I am sure, than any other *Lawyers*, which had not been so good *Grammarians*; and yet that any *Jewish Lawyer* hath avowed the contrary opinion is not, that I know of, as yet pretended. And 3. For the *negligence* or oscitancie of these *Grammarians*, that hath not with any proof or confirmation been laid to their charge, and if it were, 'tis as possible that Jewish Lawyers might have been guilty of it as they, nay it were more reasonable to accuse them of oscitancy, that make but *two*, and them of *double diligence* that have discerned one *species* more than they. To this *Topick ab authoritate*, I shall add only, that *Aloysius* (whom the Reader is by this Gentleman advised to turn to *Sched. sacro-prof. l. 7. c. 10.*) doth affirm in these direct words, *Sunt apud Hebræos plures excommunicationis gradus, Niddui, Cherem, Sematha, there are several degrees of excommunication among the Hebrews, those three by name*, though he enlarge not to explain the third, as he doth these two former: and so much for the first particular.

* Γραμματικῆς τέχνης μέλη· Τεχνικὴ, Ἐξηγητικὴ, Κριτικὴ. Mosc.

Now for the second thing, that these *species of excommunication among the Jews* were only to exclude from *civil society*, and had nothing to do with *sacred*, I shall venture it to the judgment of intelligent indifferent men, who shall but examine what they meet with on this subject, if it be but at second hand in * *Buxtorf*, &c. out of the *Hebrew* Writers. It is his observation of *Niddui* the lowest *species*, that it is *remotio ab aliorum congressu tàm sacro, quam politico, & domestico, ad 4 passus, separation not only from civil commerce, but from sacred also.* Now that which I conceive hath caused this mistake in this first kind (and from thence perhaps without any new cause extended it to the rest) is that such an one that was separated by *Niddui*, was allowed to come to the *sacred* meetings, to be present at *Common prayers*, to teach others, and to be taught with others, as the same *author* affirms; but then this concludeth not against us, for the same *Buxtorf* still adds, *sed semper sub dictâ lege remotionis, always under the fore-mentioned law of remotion, and distance.* And so these two ἐναντιοφανῆ, it seems are reconcileable, thus, *Niddui is not a total remotion or separation* neither from *sacred*, nor from *civil society*, (being you know but the first degree or *species*) but only add 4 *passus, that none come within the distance of 4 paces of him*, that is under the censure, and this degree of separation being extended to *sacred* as well as *civil assemblies*, yet excluded him not either from praying with the Congregation, or learning, or (if he were a *Doctor*) teaching in it. Only a mark was set upon him, to *discriminate* him from others, which were under no *censure*; this is described in R. *Eliezer*, c. 17. *King Solomon*, saith he, when he *built the house of the Sanctuary made two gates, one for Bridegrooms, another for Mourners and excommunicate persons, by which they went into the Temple.* Sect. 57.

* *Instit. ep. Heb.* p. 55.

And to these two gates and sorts of men the Apostle may seem to allude *Rom.* 12. 15. and 1 *Cor.* 7. 30. when he speaks of *weeping with them that weep, and rejoycing with them that rejoyce*; and no question the πενθεῖν which we render *bewailing*, 1 *Cor.* 5. 2. refers to that stile of mourners, and denotes the solemnity usual among the Jews of putting on mourning habit, and wailing over them that were *excommunicate*, according to that of the author of the Constitutions under *Clements* name, μετὰ λύπης καὶ πένθους ἀνιάτους ἔχοντας τὸ ἐκκλησίας ἀποπέμπετε, l. 2. *Let the incurable be put out of the Church with sorrow and wailing.* These mourners, or excommunicate in that *Rabbi* were those under *Niddui*, who it seems were admitted to the Temple, but appointed to come in at a door peculiar to them, and with some such *mark* of *discrimination*, that they that saw them might pray for them in this form, *Qui inhabitat domum hanc, consoletur te, indatque animo tuo ut obtemperes, &c. He that dwells in this house, comfort thee, and give thee a heart to obey*; by which I am forced to confess, that *Niddui* did not separate from all society *in sacris*, but only *remove* to such a *distance*; and yet the Reader will be forced to confess also, that this *separation* or rather remotion belonged *ad sacra*, as well as *ad politica*, and in the same degree that it restrain'd the one kind of *society*, it restrain'd the other also; and so saith *Jo. Mich. Dilherr. Elector.* l. 2. c. 10. having premised that *Niddui est hominis ab aliorum conventu tam sacro, quàm politico, & domestico, ad 4. usque cubitus sive passus per dies* 30 *remotio &c. A remotion from sacred, civil, domestick commerce, to the distance of four paces for* 30 *days, a deprivation of the marriage bed, of shaving, and washing, and such other commodities*, he adds that מנורה he that is under this *censure*, may be present at *sacred* meetings, but so many paces off from the rest of the company. Sect. 58.

And therefore whereas this Author affirmeth that by *Niddui* is not meant an ejection out of the *Church*, but only a deprivation of that liberty of civil society within *four paces*, and applies to it that sence, wherein the Poet calls the *Britains toto divisos orbe*, divided from the *whole world*, not that they are totally divided from the rest of the World, but to denote a *peculiar situation* of those *Islands in the Ocean*, I shall acknowledge the observation so far as it denies a *total separation*, but not as it intimates a greater separation in *civilibus* than in *sacris*, as the words [*peculiari illâ civilis inter suos consortii libertatis deprivatione*] would seem to import, and as the intention of the Writer is by himself demonstrated to be. The matter is sufficiently clear that *Niddui* is but a lighter *censure*, *remotion* or *restraint* for such a degree, but not a total separation either from *sacred*, or *civil society*, yet still as much from *sacred* as from *civil*, in both limitedly for 30 *days*, and for the distance of *four Cubits.* Sect. 59.

But then for *Cherem* the second degree, that is defin'd by * *Buxtorf*, *exclusion from the sacred Assemblies, casting out of the Synagogue with all the curses of Deut.* 28. (to which, say || others, was added the *Ceremony* of putting out the *Candles*, to signifie him *deprived* of the *light* of *Heaven*) and he hath proof for it out of *Maimonides in Madda*, c. 7. *Muchram non docet neque discit cum aliis. He* Sect. 60.

* *Lexicon Rabb.* p. 827.

|| *Dilherr. Elect.* l. 2.

that

* *Ep. Hebr. inſtit. p.56.* *that is under the ſecond cenſure, is excluded from hearing the Law in publick*; And as * *Buxtorf* elſewhere adds, *E Synagogâ, conventibus, negotiis publicis, ſacris & politicis omnibus excluſus, donec reſipiſcat*; which may further appear by the form of this *anathema*, which he brings out of an ancient *Hebrew manuſcript. Sit in anathemate ſanctorum excelſorum, in anathemate Seraphim, & Ophunnim, in anathemate totius Eccleſiæ, &c.* Now from this, the third *ſpecies* differs only in this, that as that was a *total ſeparation, donec reſipiſcat, till he repent*, but reverſible upon repentance, total for the preſent, but not *irremiſſible*; ſo this was both *total* and *final* too, and ſo undoubtedly (not remitting of the ſeverity of the ſecond, but adding to it) extended to the *ſeparation in ſacris* alſo; and therefore whatſoever may be ſaid of *Schammatha* in the wide *Rabbinical* acception of it, as it goes indifferently for *Niddui*, there will be little doubt, but the *Schammatha* peculiarly ſo call'd, or that which is call'd שמתא דייי and ראלהו ישראל *the Schammatha of the Lord*, or of the God of Iſrael, is, as the learned define it, *Ea quâ quis totaliter & finaliter ab Eccleſiâ* (as that notes *cœtum ſacrum*, as well as *civilem*) *ſegregatus, divino judicio ſit devotus, & cum eâ mors & exitium*; ſaith *Dilherr.* l. 2. of *Maranatha* (which he ſuppoſes to be all one with it.) *Eſt proſcriptio extrema, & abſque ſpe venie irrogata, quâ reus omnibus humanæ ſocietatis juribus, legibus & officiis excluſus, judicio divino committitur, & ad extremam deſolationem condemnatur. A perfect proſcription, without hope of pardon, by which the offender is excluded from all priviledges, and offices of humane ſociety, and committed to the judgment of God, and condemned to extreme deſolation.* I ſhall abſtain from adding more to the proof of this *truth* in the ſeveral *ſpecies*, conceiving that I have ſufficiently proved or vindicated it in the *loweſt*, and ſhewed the ἄτιον τῆς ψεύδους, *the cauſe or the occaſion of their miſtake*, who deny it; and then there will be little need to confirm it any further in the other *two degrees*, which do add to that loweſt, but cannot be thought to come ſhort of it.

Sect. 61. And having thus clear'd the firſt thing which we propoſed, view'd the ſeveral ſorts of *Excommunication* among the Jews, I proceed now to the ſecond, to thoſe places of the New Teſtament which ſeem to refer to them: In which matter I ſhall not be confident or dogmatical, but deliver my thoughts as for the preſent it ſeems to me, and ſhew you the grounds of my ſo ſeeming. And 1. that place *Luke* 6. 22. doth appear to belong to *Excommunication* among the *Jews*, but whether to one only or more *ſpecies* of it, I am uncertain; ἀφορίζειν ſurely belongs to the firſt kind, that of *Niddui*, which cannot be more literally rendred in *Greek* than by ἀφορισμὸς, *ſeparation*, or *remotion* four paces off, and perhaps that with ὀνειδίζειν added to it, ſignifies to do it *contumeliouſly*; But yet becauſe 'tis poſſible, that ὀνειδίζειν may have a greater force in it, and be a notation of *curſing* and *execration*, not only in this but other places of the *Goſpel*, therefore I conceive that word (ſet immediately after ἀφορίζειν) may denote the *ſecond degree*, that of *Cherem*, and then to the ſame will belong that third phraſe alſo of ἐκβάλλειν ὄνομα ὑμῶν ὡς πονηρὸν *to caſt out your name as evil*, for an *Hebraiſm* there is in theſe words, which though a very learned man conceive to conſiſt in this, 1. that ἐκβάλλειν ſhall be all one with ἐκφέρειν, (as indeed ſometimes it is) 2. that as ἐκφέρειν ὄνομα πονηρὸν *is to bring up an evil report*, ſo ἐκβάλλειν ὄνομα πονηρὸν ſhall ſignifie the ſame thing; yet I ſhall take leave to interpoſe, 1. that the phraſe uſed *for bringing up an evil report*, *Numb.* 15. 36. is ἐξενέγκαι ῥήματα πονηρὰ περὶ τῆς γῆς, not ὄνομα, but ῥήματα, nor ῥήματα γῆς, but περὶ τῆς γῆς, and in brief that I cannot find any where ἐκφέρειν or ἐκβάλλειν ὄνομα πονηρὸν in the tranſlators of the *Old*, or Writers of the *New Teſtament*, *for bringing up an evil report*. 2*ly*. that ἐκβάλλειν ὄνομα ὑμῶν ὡς πονηρὸν, *to caſt out your name as evil*: 1. [ὑμῶν *yours*] then [ὡς *as*] added, will be ſomewhat another kind of phraſe, than ἐκβάλλειν or ἐκφέρειν ὄνομα πονηρὸν· as [*to bring up an evil name or report*] is in our language a very intelligible phraſe for *defaming*, but [*to bring up your name or report as evil*] is not ſo; and therefore I ſhall venture to propoſe my conjecture, that the *Hebraiſm* is not in the word [ἐκβάλλειν] but in the [ὄνομα] and [πονηρὸν:] ſo that 1. ὄνομα ὑμῶν ſhall ſignifie no more than your *perſons*, or you (as ὀνόματα, *Acts* 1. 15. ſignifies *perſons of men*) and then ὡς πονηρὸν ſhall ſignifie [*as ſcandalous*] or *offenſive*, or abominable, as באש is by the 72 ſometimes rendred αἰσχύνομαι being *aſhamed* (whence perhaps our Engliſh *baſhful* and *abaſh*,) ſometimes βδελύσσω, to *abominate*, ſometime πονηρὸς εἰμι *to be evil* or *wicked*, *Gen.*34.30. *Eſd.*4.12. and ſo [*to caſt out your names as evil*] will clearly ſignifie to *caſt you out as wicked, ſhameful, abominable perſons*, a denotation of the חרם, which was not only *ſeparating* or *removing* to a diſtance, but *total caſting* out, and that with *reproaches*, *curſes*, and *execrations*, ſuch as in *Moſes* are denounced againſt greater malefactors. Whether theſe circumſtances of this text do thus denote, I am not confident, and therefore have only propoſed a *conjecture*, but that the ἀφορίζειν doth refer to the *Niddui*, and ἐκβάλλειν to the *Cherem* at leaſt, if not to the *Schammatha*, I doubt not, nor if you mark it, doth *H. Grotius* who hath enlarged on that ſubject of Excommunication in his *annotations* on that verſe.

Sect. 62. No more do I find my ſelf moved by the arguments of that Learned Gentleman to doubt, but that ἀποσυνάγωγον γενέσθαι *to be turned out of the Synagogue*, *Joh.* 9. 22. 12. 42. 16. 2. refers to the ſecond of theſe *ſpecies* among the *Jews*, for the קהל, and συναγωγὴ do ſometime ſignifie a *civil Congregation* or Aſſembly, and not always a *ſacred* (as when the *hypocrite* is ſaid to *pray ſtanding*, ἐν συναγωγαῖς *in places of publick concourſe, and corners of the ſtreets*, as the moſt viſible places, *Matth.* 6.) I ſhall eaſily grant, and yet not think my ſelf thereby concluded, or obliged to yield, but that it may alſo, at other times, note the *holy* Aſſembly, or meeting for the performance of *ſacred duties*, out of which it was ſure no news for the *Jews* (after that *capital judgments* were taken away from them) to *eject* notorious *malefactors*, particularly *Hereticks*, falſe *Prophets*, or their *ſectators* and *diſciples*, as theſe here for preaching of *Chriſt*, whom the Jews acknowledg'd not; in like manner as in the time of the *Captivity*, *Eſd.* 10. 8. the order is given, that whoſoever appears not upon ſummons ἀναθεματισθήσεται πᾶσα ἡ ὕπαρξις αὐτῶ, *all his eſtate ſhall be* (*forfeited* we render, the word is יחרם noting the *Cherem* which we now ſpeak of) *devoted, anathematiz'd*, as an evidence of that kind of *Excommunication* which follows in the next words, καὶ αὐτὸς διασαλήσεται ἀπὸ ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἀποικίας, *he ſhall be ſeparated from the Church or Congregation of the Captivity*, not only from *Civil*, but *Eccleſiaſtical* ſociety with them, for ſo *Cherem* was formerly demonſtrated to ſignifie; nay, it may with ſome reaſon be conceived in that place, from *Eccleſiaſtical only*, in caſe of *Cherem or total ejection*; for 'tis more probable, that the *King* under whom they were *captive*, allowing them ſome *liberty* for the exerciſe of their *religion*,

ligion, but in *civil* matters keeping them as *captives and servants*, should permit them to *punish* one another by that way of casting out of their *Ecclesiastical Assemblies*, than by that other of *civil* interdict, especially if it be conceiv'd to extend to *banishment*, &c. which would intrench upon his *Prerogative*, and be a kind of turning the *Captive* out of his *captivity*.

That ἀποσυναγωγία belongs to this *second species*, and so to casting out of the *society in sacris*, is the distinct affirmation of the learned * *Buxtorf* in these words, *Hæc est illa excommunicatio* (speaking of *Cherem*) *de qua in Evangelio Johannis*, cap. 9. 22. 12. 42. *etsi ab eo tempore Rabbini quadam ipsi adjecerint*, and the intimation of ‖ *John Coch* also in these words, *Qui simpliciter excommunicatus est*, מנורה *est ille quidem separatus à cœtu, ita ut pro vero membro Ecclesiæ non habeatur, non tamen videtur esse* ἀποσυνάγωγος *quia doctrinæ particeps est*. From which words of that very learned man, I observe these two things contrary to what I see lately affirm'd. 1. That ἀποσυναγωγία doth not belong to *Niddui*, but to *Cherem*. 2. That it is an ejection not only *ab Ecclesiâ*, *Synagogâ*, as that notes *rempublicam Judaicam*, but from *sacred Assemblies*, noted by *doctrinæ particeps*, according to that rule in *Maimonides*, *Devotus nec docet, nec docetur*, such an one is excluded from both, it seems, and so from those *holy Assemblies*, where that was wont to be done. *Sect.* 63. * *Instit. Ep. Heb.* p. 56. ‖ *Exc. Gem. Sanhedr.* c. 1. p. 149.

To this phrase of [ἀποσυναγώγους ποιήσουσιν] is subjoyned *John* 16. 2. ἀλλ' ἔρχεται ὥρα, &c. *but* (*or yea*) *the hour cometh that every man that killeth you shall seem, to be thought to do God service*, or to offer a *sacrifice* to him; whereon I shall interpose a conjecture, that those words may possibly denote the *third degree*, that of *Schammatha*, at least a consequent of it, for so saith * *Buxtorf* of that *species*, *Mortem dicit, quia cujusvis manibus ejus vita exposita est, & cuilibet eum interficiendi libera potestas: It is so call'd, because such a mans life is exposed to any ones hands, every one having a free power of killing him*, and so to that he applyes the *Maranatha* which is added to *Anathema*, 1 *Cor.* 16. 22. a form of extreme *proscription*, delivering up the sinner to *divine revenge*, in which case *whosoever kill'd him*, conceived himself to *perform* an act of *execution* of justice, and *service to God*. *Sect.* 64. * *Ep. Heb. inst.* p. 58.

Some other places there are in the *New Testament* belonging to these *Judaical censures*, fit to be explained, but I have chosen to insist only on these, because I lately find them otherwise rendred, but yet discern no reason to recede from what I have now delivered, that they do belong to those *species* of *Excommunication* not only from *civil* but from *sacred* Assemblies, though one in an higher degree than another. To which I shall only add, that they which have applied these places to *Christian Excommunication*, any otherwise than only by way of *accommodation*, shall not be pleaded for by me, who acknowledge that they belong to the *Jews*, and to their usage of *Christians*, and not to some *Christians* dealing with others; but then sure there is as little reason on their side who will not allow that way of *accommodation*, which would not be at all unreasonable, though those phrases among the *Jews* were supposed to belong only to *civil commerce*; It being ordinary for *Christ* to ordain some things in his *Church*, which were answerable to *civil* not *sacred* customs among the *Jews* (as the *Lords Supper* sure an *Ecclesiastical* rite among us, was to their *post-cœnium*, which was not so, and many the like) to transplant from their *forum* to our *Church*, and therefore no way unfit for the *Apostles*, and following *Church* to appropriate those words to *Ecclesiastical* sences, though they were supposed to be among the *Jews* of a greater latitude; Of which sort, because I formerly promised it, I shall now specifie in some instances. *Sect.* 65.

This may be discern'd in the word ἐκκλησία, which if any man should prove to have no other sence among *Christians*, than that of a meeting together in a *Town-hall*, upon no other way of probation, but that the *Hebrew* words answerable to that, are by the *Talmudists*, yea even in the Scripture of the *Old Testament* taken in this sence, this would be a little strange; the matter of fact being most evident to the contrary, and it being most prompt and proper, that words used either among the *Greeks* or *Hebrews* in *forinsecal* sences, may be bent by *Christian* Writers to a *sacred*. *Sect.* 66.

So in like manner, the word Ἀπόστολος, it is acknowledged, is answerable to the שליח among the *Jews*, and that word denoted among them some *officers*, which if they may in any respect be counted *Ecclesiastical*, are yet very distant from the *Christian* use of it: such was that of the *Messengers* sent out to demand and bring in the dues to the *Synagogues*, which cannot without the help of *accommodation* be applyed to the *Christian* acception of the word, and such again was the *proxy* in contracting or marrying two persons, for he was called שליח i. e. *Apostolus* also, an *intercessor* or *internunce* betwixt them, which as a *sponsor* undertook for one to the other, the νυμφαγωγὸς, i. e. in *Varinus* his definition ὁ μετερχόμενος ἑτέρῳ νύμφην, ἐξ ἄγων ἐκ τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς οἰκίας, of whom he saith that when the *Bridegroom himself must not go into the fathers house*, (*viz.* in a * second marriage, such as that was of God with the *Gentiles*, who had before espoused the *Jews*) ἀποστέλλει τῶν φίλων τινὰς, *he sends one of his friends*: To which notion of the word (according to one punctation of the place) the *Apostle* may seem to refer, 2 *Cor.* 11. 2. when he expresses his *Apostleship* by ἡρμοσάμην ὑμᾶς ἑνὶ ἀνδρὶ, *I have espoused you to one husband*, according to that sence of ἁρμόζω acknowledged by * *Julius Pollux*, ὁ πάνθαρος ἐγγυᾷ ἁρμόζει, ὅθεν τίνες τῶν πολλῶν ἁρμοστὴν ἢ μνηστῆρα ἐκάλεσαν, making the μνηστὴς, or *sponsor* all one with ἁρμοστὴς, and ἐγγυᾶν to signifie the *interceding or mediating a marriage*, all one with that word ἁρμόζειν there used by St. *Paul*, agreeably to which the word ἁρμοστὴς is by ‖ *Pollux* farther extended to the *mediatours of any kind of league*, εἰρηνοποιοὶ, and then according to that notion also, is the *Apostles pacifick* office, *praying and beseeching us in Christs stead to be reconciled to God*, all which are very convenient *accommodations*, but far from requiring the *Christian* word to the very kind of sence that the *Hebrew* שליח did import. *Sect.* 67. * Μάλιστα δὲ ἐπὶ δευτέρου γάμου, καθ' ὃν ὁ δίμοιρος νυμφίον μιμεῖται, ἀλλ' ἀποστέλλει φίλους, Phavor. ‖ Ὄνομ. 3. c. περὶ μνηστείας. ‖ Ὄνομ. 1. c. περὶ συμμαχων.

So again, ἐπίσκοποι, *Bishops* in the Christian *Church*, do in respect of their *office*, particularly that of *imposition of hands* (peculiar to them above the *Presbyters* even in St. *Jeroms* confession) refer to the נשיא the *Princeps Synedrii*, who imposed hands upon those that were elected into the *Sanhedrim*, but in respect of the *name* they refer to the use of the word מפקד among the *Jews*, and accordingly the very word ἐπίσκοποι is both 1 *Mac.* 1. 51, and in *Josephus*, set to signifie them that are set over any *publick* business, the ἐργοδιώκτας that *set men a work*, and require an account of the performance, and yet are by way of *accommodation* brought both in the *New Testament*, and in all *Sacred* Writers since, to signifie an office parallel to this, but purely *Ecclesiastick*. *Sect.* 68.

So

Sect. 69. So the word πρεσβύτερος, though in the *Old Teſtament* it belong properly to the *Elders of the people* either in a common notion, or as members of their *Sanhedrim*, not any *body* (or ſingle perſons) peculiarly *Eccleſiaſtick* (though by the way 'tis moſt clear, that the *high Prieſts* were, not only of that number, part of their *Sanhedrim*, or γερουσία or πρεσβυτήριον, but alſo the chief of them, and therefore in the *New Teſtament* the mention of the *high Prieſts and Elders* comes oft together in point of *judicature*, and the buſineſs of that Court being all kind of affairs, *Civil* as well as *Eccleſiaſtick*, it was moſt reaſonable that ſome perſons of both conditions ſhould be intruſted with them, and there being ſo, no wonder that there was no other Court, or *Tribunal* meerly *Eccleſiaſtical*) yet doth it unqueſtionably belong, both in many places of the *New Teſtament*, and in the conſtant acception of primitive and after-Writers, to an *order* of *Eccleſiaſticks*, as is moſt apparent both by *Clemens* and *Ignatius*, and is confeſt by them, which aſſert the ἰσοτιμία of *Biſhops*, and *Presbyters*: which makes it not very reaſonable to conſent to the way of arguing, twice uſed by that *learned Writer*, who from the *Talmudical* writings of the *Creation* of the *Jewiſh Elders*, would conclude how little, or how nothing there is in the *Creation* of a *Presbyter* among *Chriſtians*, more than of a *Doctor of Law*, &c. But this by the way.

Sect. 70. Laſtly, ſo the διάκονοι *Deacons* in the Chriſtian Church are directly parallel to the חוני"ם under the *Synagogue*, called by *Epiphanius* (by a light inflexion or change of the *Hebrew*) Ἀζανῖται, the γαζοφύλακες or *Treaſurers*, τὰς διακονικὰς χρείας ἐπιτελοῦντες in *Philo*, χειροτονηθεὶ ἐπιμεληταὶ in *Joſephus*) which I wonder a * learned man ſhould carp at, only upon this exception, becauſe it was not proved they were *in ſynagogis præfecti, ut miniſtrarent menſis*, when 'tis clear that the διακονεῖν τραπέζαις in the *Acts*, noting firſt the miniſtring to them in the ἀγάπαις, that common table for the poor and rich, doth *in univerſum* ſignifie [*providing* for the *poor*] and that is as clearly parallel to the office of thoſe *treaſurers* among the Jews, as if they had literally in the *ſynagogue ſerved tables*.

* *Rivet. Grot. diſc. Hal. p.* 475.

Sect. 71. I ſhould now proceed to my *third propoſal*, the phraſes which are purely Chriſtian, but that I conceive it not unfit to take notice of one difficulty (which we have not yet mentioned, nor ſhall have occaſion to mention among the phraſes purely *Chriſtian*) and to give ſome account of that in this place. And it is, to examine what was the condition 1. of *Heathens*, 2. of *Samaritans*, 3. of thoſe that are called *ſinners*, 4. of *Publicans* among the *Jews*; being tempted to that (if it be an extravagance) by another *parentheſis* in a learned Author before mentioned.

Sect. 72. For *Gentiles* they were of three ſorts: either 1. *proſelytes of juſtice*, who were *circumciſed*, and undertook their *whole law*, and theſe were allowed to live among them, to enjoy all *liberty* and *priviledges*, that any *Jew* did, differing from them in nothing but their *Gentile-birth*. Secondly, *proſelytes of the Gates*, which were converted ſo far by them, as to receive the *Precepts of the ſons of Adam and Noah*, but not to be circumciſed, &c. and theſe were alſo permitted to live freely among them in *civil* ſociety, and to come to the *Temple* (*Gods houſe being a houſe of prayer to all people*, i.e. to all ſuch *Gentile worſhippers*, or *godly men of the Nations*) but that with a mark of difference from the *Jews*, and *perfect proſelytes*, there being a *court* provided on purpoſe for them, called the *court of the Gentiles*, divided from the *court* of the *Jews* by a little partition called by the Apoſtle μεσότοιχον τῦ φραγμῦ, by *Joſephus* γῆιον & or δρύγδε, on which was written μὴ δεῖν ἀλλόφυλον ἔντ& ἴέναι, *that no ſuch Gentile proſelyte might go in*, *i.e.* beyond their own, into the *Jews* Court, and ſo theſe though admitted to ſociety in *ſacris*, yet were ſo removed or *ſeparated* by Law, the whole body of them, that they were in a manner under the ſame cenſure of *Niddui*, or ἀφορισμὸς, ſeparated from them for ſome ſmall ſpace, proportionable to that of *four paces*, but this not by any act of *excommunication*, but by a general Law or tradition, thus diſcriminating them from *Jews* in this particular.

Sect. 73. Thirdly, there were the *Gentiles* continuing ſtill utterly unconverted in their Gentiliſm, and with thoſe they were not to have *ſociety* at all (not only *in ſacris*, for there was no need of interdicting that, they would not joyn with them, and for them to joyn in the *Gentile* ſacrifices were down-right *Idolatry*) but to *ſeparate* from them, for fear their *company* and converſation ſhould infuſe their *Gentile ſins* into them, wherein they were ſo ſtrict, that they would not go into the *prætorium*, where the band of *Roman* (i.e. ſuch *Gentile*) ſouldiers were, *John* 8. *ver.* 28. counting it a *Pollution*, if they had ſo done. So you ſee what was the condition of the *Gentiles* among the *Jews*, and all this by Law or ſtanding *cuſtom* among them, without any interpoſition of any degree of *excommunication*, as having nothing to do *to judge them, which are without*, i. e. the laſt kind of *Gentiles*, and having ſet rules for the other two.

Sect. 74. Then for the *Samaritans* they are almoſt, if not quite, in the ſame caſe with the laſt ſort of *Gentiles*, no *converſation* allowed between the *Jews* and them, as you ſee *John* 4. *verſe* 9. οὐ συγχρῶνται Ἰουδαῖοι Σαμαρείταις, *the Jews have not common commerce with the Samaritans*, no not ſo far, as that one ſhould give the other meat, or drink in his want, or help him to it, as appears by the former part of that verſe, *Doſt thou being a Jew ask to drink of me being a Samaritan?* they might not συνεσθίειν, *eat together*, which was proportionable to the *Niddui*, (that being a *ſeparation*, to the diſtance of four paces, *à congreſſu domeſtico*, as well as *ſacro & civili*, and a prohibition of eating, and drinking together promiſcuouſly) and not only ſo but an interdicting of acts of *common humanity*, as helping to neceſſaries of life, like the *proſcription* among the *Romans*, but this is not by way of *excommunication* again, (but by *ſtanding law or cuſtom*) for the *Samaritans* uſed not the ſame place of *worſhip* with the *Jews*, came not to *Jeruſalem*, *John* 4. *ver.* 20. and ſo could not be *excommunicated* by them. Nay, *Matthew* 10. *ver.* 5. you ſhall ſee the *Samaritans* and the *Gentiles* joyned together in oppoſition to the *Jews*, when the *Apoſtles* are commanded to *go neither to the way of the Gentiles, nor to the City of Samaria, but only to the loſt ſheep of the houſe of Iſrael*, that is, firſt to them, before either *Samaritans* or *Gentiles* were preach'd to, which were all one in effect, the *Samaritan* being called ἀλλογενὴς an *alien*, *Luke* 17. 18.

Buxt. Ep. Heb. inſtit. p. 55.

Sect. 75. In the next place, the word *ſinners* is in the *New Teſtament* an equivocal word, for it may ſignifie either *Gentiles*, as *Gal.* 2. 15. *ſinners of the Gentiles*, or elſe *ſcandalous offenders*, infamous perſons, *harlots*, &c. theſe (it ſeems) it was unlawful to *eat with*, *Matth.* 9. 11. If taken under the firſt notion, the caſe will be clear upon the ſame account, as before we gave you of the *Heathens*; but under the

ſecond

ſecond notion, if ſinners ſignifie notorious offenders, then are they conſidered either as men under the puniſhment of *excommunication*, or at leaſt *worthy* to be under it, and that either under *Niddui* or *Cherem*, the loweſt of which would make them uncapable of *familiar converſation*, and eating together with other *Jews*; and upon that ground, the *Jews* might quarrel with *Chriſt* for eating with them, and Saint *Paul* ſpeaking of the *inceſtuous perſon* might refer to the *Jewiſh* cuſtom, and thereupon command τῷ τοιούτῳ μηδὲ συνεσθίειν, not to eat with him, (that *remotion* in *Niddui* for the diſtance of four cubits, being unreconcileable with familiar eating together) and ſo the *Phariſee*, when the γυνὴ ἁμαρτωλὸς. *Luke* 7.37. came with her *cruſe of ointment, and anointed and kiſt Chriſts feet*, reſolves that if Chriſt knew what ſhe were, he would not admit of ſo near a commerce with her, and concludes him no *Prophet*, that he did not know it.

Laſtly, for the *Publicans*, who were alſo thought unfit for men to *eat and drink* with, I conceive *Sect.* 76. that is not again from any of the *Jewiſh cenſures* paſt upon them, but only becauſe either they were *Gentiles*, and ſo uncapable of that commerce, or elſe being *Jews*, yet being officers of the *Romans*, they were ſuppoſed to *commerce* ordinarily with *Gentiles*, and ſo to be *polluted* by that means, and by the law of *legal pollution* interdicted that familiar reception among the *Jews*; notwithſtanding which, it appears the *Publican*, *Luke* 18.10. *went up to the Temple to pray*, as well as the *Phariſee*; and, if the Parable be argumentative, it ſeems the *Phariſee* and the *Publican* were in the ſame *Court* of the *Temple*, (as may be gueſt by the *Phariſees* pointing him out, *This Publican*) and ſo that the *Publican* enjoyed all the ſame privileges of acceſs that the other did, (though ſtill he continued afar off, and that in a moſt *humble poſture*, as if he were under *Niddui*, that loweſt degree of *excommunication*) but becauſe it may be ſubject to miſtake, to *argue* from *Parables*, I ſhall not do ſo, but leave the *Publican* joyned with the *ſinners*, as one *Heathen* with another, both by the *Jewiſh* laws, forbidden to *converſe* with, and not expelled by any *cenſure* of *excommunication*.

Theſe conjectures being thus *obiter* and in paſſage premiſed, only on purpoſe to diſcard ſome leſs pertinent places, which ſome others perhaps have taken liberty to make uſe of, and not out of *deſign* to make any ſpecial *advantage* of this *explication* of them, in order to my preſent purpoſe, or in oppoſition to any; I come now to the laſt thing propoſed even now, to ſhew you the phraſes more purely *Chriſtian*: Such are, 1. *To deliver unto Satan*, παραδῦναι τῷ Σατανᾷ. 1 *Cor.*5.5. 1 *Tim.*1.20. anſwerable to *Cherem* among the *Jews*, ſo far as belonged to the *ſociety in ſacris*, a turning the blaſphemer out of the *Church* of *Chriſt*. This was the frequent ſtile of *excommunication*, becauſe it was the *depriving* the man of thoſe every-day *means* which are in *Chriſtianity* afforded, as ordinarily uſeful to eject *Satan* and the power of his Kingdom out of the heart: Such are, 1. The *Prayers of the Church*: 2. The publick uſe of the *Word* or *Doctrine* of *Chriſtianity*: (for ſo he that is under *Cherem*, *nec docet nec docetur*, *neither teacheth nor is taught*, and in the antient *Chriſtian* Church it appears they were excluded from that, and upon repentance received for the firſt three years among the ἀκροώμενοι, or *hearers* in the *porch*, στῶν ἀκόων γραφῶν, ſaith *Zonaras*, which being the firſt degree of their *return* to *Communion*, argues that before they were *excluded* from it:) and thirdly, the *Sacrament* of the *Lords Supper*, in which reſpect *ſcandalous* ſinners are by Saint *Jude* call'd *ſpots in their feaſts*, or *agapæ* (which being annext to the *Lords Supper* denoted the whole action) *i.e.* unfit, as *blemiſhed Sacrifices* to be received there. The uſe of which means being in the *Oeconomy* of the *Goſpel* deſigned to ſo much advantage to the Soul, or the caſting *Satan* out of it, conſequently the *baniſhing* from, or depriving of the uſe of thoſe means is properly ſtiled the *delivering to Satan*, though in Gods gracious diſpoſal of all things, that be deſigned by him alſo to the ſame gracious end, to *caſt Satan* out of him, on whom nothing elſe can be able to work.

And then ſecondly, it was ſo call'd, becauſe in the *Apoſtles times* a ſad conſequent there was of this *Sect.* 77. *tradition* or *excommunication*, proportionable to the *diræ* or *execrations*, in the *Jewiſh Cherem*, which, ſay they, *raro effectu carebant*, *ſeldom wanted the effect*, to wit, corporal power and poſſeſſion, and inflictions of *Satan* on thoſe, who were delivered up to him, as to a *lictor* or *carnifex* (in like manner as we read befell *Saul* after his defection from God, when the *evil Spirit came upon him*, 1 Sam. 16.14.)

For it muſt be remembred, that about *Chriſts* time, and a little after, the *devil* was permitted to *Sect.* 78. have ſuch a ranging unlimited power, that he did ordinarily obtain leave to *tyrannize over* the *bodies* of mortal men, laying all kinds of *diſeaſes* upon them, (as indeed there is ſcarce any kind of *diſeaſe*, but ſome reſemblance of it you may find in ſome or other of thoſe deſcribed in the *Goſpel*) which is ſometimes called κολαφίζειν, *Satans buffetting*, 2 *Cor.*12.7. ſometimes βασανίζειν, *racking*, or *tormenting*, as of the *Centurions ſervant*, *Matth.* 8.6. *grievouſly tormented*, and ſo *Matth.* 4.24. that condition of men is deſcribed by ποικίλαις νόσοις καὶ βασάνοις συνεχόμενοι καὶ δαιμονιζόμενοι: we render it, *taken with divers diſeaſes and torments*, the word συνεχόμενοι (as κατεχόμενοι) is uſed ordinarily for thoſe that are *poſſeſt with Devils*, and ſo here of thoſe conſequents of ſuch poſſeſſions, and therefore follows, καὶ δαιμονιζόμενοι, *and poſſeſt with Devils*. And ſometimes δῆσαι, *to bind*, as *Luke* 13. in the ſtory of the *woman which had the ſpirit of infirmity*, verſe 11. (*i.e.* a *devil* or *evil ſpirit* that inflicted a ſtrange *infirmity* or *diſeaſe* upon her) 18. years, *bowing her together*, *that ſhe was not able to look up*. 'Tis ſaid of her, ἣν ἔδησεν ὁ Σατανᾶς, *that Satan had bound her*, *verſe* 16. and the curing her is called *looſing her from her infirmity*, *ver.*12. ἀπὸ δεσμῆς, *from her bond*, *ver.*16. agreeable to the phraſe of *binding* and *looſing* in this buſineſs, *Matth.*16.19. & 18.18. Hence it is that the *Apoſtles delivering to Satan*, is ſaid to be εἰς ὄλεθρον τῆς σαρκός, 1 *Cor.* 5.5. *to the deſtruction of the fleſh*, *i.e.* by way of *pain* or *diſeaſe*, a ſpecial part of *Apoſtolical diſcipline*. Thus in *Ignatius Epiſtle* to the *Romans*, we have κόλασις διαβόλου, *the puniſhment of the Devil*, which I conceive in that place muſt belong only to *temporal inflictions*, becauſe he wiſhes it were upon himſelf, μόνον ἵνα Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐπιτύχω, *that he may by that means obtain or come to Chriſt*, of which eternal would deprive him; and, perhaps Saint *Pauls* wiſh extended no farther, *Rom.*9. than to be thus *excommunicate* from the *Church* of *Chriſt*, and to be under thoſe temporal evils that attended it, which was an exuberance of love alſo to his brethren.

The ſumm of what hath been ſpoken on this point, is, That as among the antient Heathen *Romans* *Sect.* 79. there was *baniſhment*, and *interdictio ignis & aquæ*, offenders were interdicted the neceſſaries of

life, and as in *Josephus* the *Esseni* [τὰς ἐπ' ἀξιοχρέοις ἁμαρτήμασιν ἁλόντα, ἐκβάλλουσιν ἐκ τῆ τάγματ☉ ὅδε ἐκκριθεὶς δικλίσῳ πολλάκις μόρῳ διαφθείρεται, πονηρῶν δὲ καὶ λιμῷ τὸ σῶμα τυκόμεν☉,&c. *cast out from their Congregation such as are taken in notorious offences, and they that are thus cast out, come many times to miserable deaths, consumed with hunger,&c.*] or as *Heliodorus*, 2 *Mac.* 3. in his sacrilegious enterprise was *scourged* by two *Angels* in the shape of *young men*, *verse* 26. and hardly come off with life; so the *Apostolical Excommunication*, or *Anathema*, was attended with these adversaries of life, *diseases*, *pains*, and grievous *torments*, to lay a necessity on them of *returning*, or being reformed by that means. And this I conceive is the *rod* which the *Apostle* mentions, 1 *Cor.*4.21. the power of inflicting death, as on *Ananias*; or diseases, blindness on *Elymas*, and the like, the Heb. מטה there rendred ῥαβδὸς, *rod*, being *Isa.*10.24. πληγὴ, a *plague*, all one with μάστιξ, *Mar.*3.10. and so very capable in that place of this interpretation, and by the matter of the choice there proposed to the *Corinthians* most fitly applyed to it.

Sect. 80. This have I said, (and might add a great deal more) to illustrate this one phrase of *delivering to Satan*, and in it that *Apostolical* censure of *excommunication*, and its attendant, corporal inflictions of *diseases* and pains.

Sect. 81. To all which, methinks *Cains* condition described, *Gen.* 4. is very applyable, (by way of *accommodation* at least) *verse* 14. *Behold, thou hast driven me out from the face of the earth*, answerable to *verse* 11. *Thou art cursed from the earth*, the חרם or *Anathema* to which the *cursing* there is answerable, being a *species* of *excommunication* higher than *Niddui* or ἀφορισμὸς, even a *driving* or casting out, (the English of ἐκβάλλειν, before-mentioned, *Luke* 6.22.) *i. e.* either from the *Church* (as anon you shall see γῆ signifie)or, which is all one, from that part of the *earth*, where *Adam* and his other children dwelt as the sole *Church* then *existent*, and thereupon immediately it follows, and *from thy face shall I be hid*: Gods face typically noting the *Church*, where God had always a *peculiar presence*, to which refers the לחם פנים the *bread of faces* or *shewbread* in the *Temple*, shewing or signifying the *presence* of God there, *and I shall be a fugitive and a vagabond*, and then finally it *shall come to pass*, *saith he, that every one that findeth me, shall slay me*; there is the שמתא or ὄλεθρ☉ *death*, ἀποκοπὴ, *excision*, from which though God freed him, *verse* 15. yet the other he lay under, as appears by *verse* 16. *Cain went out from the presence of the Lord, went out*, *i.e.* was turned out (as ἀπολέσουται, *Matth.*25.46. is all one with ἐκβληθήσουται, *chap.*8.12.) *of the presence of the Lord*, *i.e.* out of the *Church*, or visible congregation of Gods Servants, the place where God is pleased peculiarly to *exhibite* himself, *i. e.* out of *Adams family* or the place where he dwelt, for it follows, *Cain* dwelt in the land of *Nod* on the *East* of *Eden*; but this only as an *image* or *accommodation*.

Sect. 82. One thing I desire here to interpose as in a parenthesis, which hath been touched on in other * Papers, but will be here seasonably set down more at large, as peculiarly pertinent to the matter now in hand of *delivering to Satan*, and 'tis this, that this act of the Church in *delivering up to Satan*, is but an *Image* of *Gods* real dealing, who is wont upon occasion *tradere Satanæ*, *to deliver men unto Satan*. The ground of this affirmation you may discern by compounding these Scripture Truths together. 1. That *Satan is our adversary before God*, and therefore call'd *Satan* שטן which signifies so, and also ἔχθρ☉ *enemy*, and ἀντικάμεν☉ *set against us*,&c. Secondly, that one main act of his *Satanship* is expresst in *accusing* us *before God*, *Rev.*12.11. and thence he is call'd peculiarly ἀντίδικ☉, *i.e.* an *opposite*, ἐν δικῇ, *in court of judicature*, 1 *Pet.*5.8. and that either 1. upon some *false* suggestion, no real crime, as particularly that of *unsincerity* (or serving God only as long as God used him well, allowed him the εὐτυχία φιλόθε☉) in the case of *Job*, *Chap.*1. *ver.*9.11. in which respect he is peculiarly call'd διάβολ☉ a *calumniator*; and 'tis observable that the 72. do most-what render שטן by that word, noting this act of *calumniating* Gods servants to their Master, to be a special piece of his being our *adversary*; Or else, secondly, upon the real commission of some sin, which advantage he will be sure not to omit, when he can take it, for sure he that will *accuse* falsly, will not spare to *accuse* when he hath true matter of *accusation* allowed him. To which purpose he is stiled *observator calcanei*, *an observer of the heel* in the vulgar *Latine*, *Gen.* 3. 15. (agreeable to the *Septuagints* τηρήσεις πτέρναν, unless (which I easily believe) that be a false print for τειρήσεις) *an observer of the heel of Christ*, *i.e.* of *Christians*, or one that *goeth up and down*, *to and fro in the earth*, Job 1.7. to find out matter of accusation, and in this sence he is called κατήγορ☉ τῶν ἀδελφῶν, *i.e.* an *accuser* (as that differs *critically* from a διάβολ☉ or *calumniator*) *of the brethren*, i.e. *Christians*, or *believers*, when they fall into any fault. An example of this, I conceive, we have in the case of Saint *Peter*, *Luke* 22.31. where *Satans desiring to have Peter*, seems to be founded upon some previous or precedent accusation of him for some criminal commission, perhaps that of *striving* with the other Disciples for *superiority*, immediately preceding *ver.* 24. (as his *successor* at *Rome* hath done ever since) or for some other sin, which *Satan* saw, though we do not at this distance.

Sect. 83. And upon this putting in of accusations against any, follows in the *third* place, his *expetivit ut cribraret*, *Luke* 22.31. *his desiring to winnow*, his solemn petition to *God* that he that hath so *offended*, may be *delivered* unto him; parallel to which our *English Bibles* make that other place ζητῶν τίνα καταπίῃ, *seeking whom he may devour*, 1 *Pet.* 5.8. which is there plainly attributed to him, as he is ἀντίδικ☉, a *plaintiff* or *adversary* in a Court, impleading, or accusing, or *delivering to the Judge*, *Matth.*5.25. that so he *may deliver him back again as to a tormentor*, and then if this *Satanical course* or μεθοδεία prevail, if this *accusation* be received, this *petition* be granted, as it was (though with limitation) *Job* 1.12. the result is, *a man delivered up to Satan*, to have as *Job* had, so many assays of his *malice* practised upon him. To which purpose you may please to observe what *Psellus* hath given us in his *Scholia* on the *Chaldean Oracles* on that text [πόιναι μεδόπων ἀγκτῖῆαι, *the devils have the power of binding men*] "Αι πόιναι

Page 93. ὕτοι αἱ πωρητικαὶ, καὶ βάσκανοι τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων ψυχῶν ἐνδεσμῶσι πύτας, καὶ οἷον ἀπάγχουσι, καὶ ὁ μόνον τὰς τῶν παθῶν πλήρεις δικίζοντας, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰς εἰς ἓ ἄῦλον ὁσίαν ἐπεσφαμένας. *These punitive envious devils do bind, and even strangle the souls of good and* (as we say) *regenerate men*: and from thence it follows, saith he, that we oft see πολλὰς τῆ ὁσίως καὶ καθαρῶς πολιτευομένων ἀπροσδοκήτοις συμφοραῖς περιπίπτοντας, *Many of pure and holy conversations falling into unexpected calamities*: according to that of the *Apostle*, *For this cause are many sick and weak among you*, *&c.* And perhaps it may on this ground be farther observable, that when men are thus by *God delivered up into Satans hand*, and he by that permission designs them any mischief, he

he is able to *foretel* it to his instruments, and so sometimes doth foretel such future events, to get a reputation in the World of fore-knowing all things.

Now this being the condition of the *Apostolical censure* or *delivering to Satan*, that who were thus *delivered*, *Satan* corporally *tormented* them, brought them to *deaths* door, and sometimes killed them; it must follow on the other side, 1. That the *Apostles* by the *power of the Keys* must be enabled together, both to *cast out devils*, and *to heal diseases*, and so they were, *Mar.* 16. 17. *In my Name they shall cast out devils*, and 18. *They shall lay their hands upon the sick, and they shall recover.* 2. That whom the *Apostles absolve* from the *Censure of excommunication*, they might and should also *cure of diseases*, the consequents of that Censure then, (though not always now, and therefore perhaps only the first power belongs to the *Governours* of the *Church* now, to wit, that of absolving not of *curing*) and so every where in the Gospel we read *forgiveneß of sins, and healing of diseases, or casting out devils*, joyned together, as *Matth.* 9. 2. *Christ saith to the sick of the palsie, Son be of good chear, thy sins are forgiven thee*, and then *verse* 6. *arise, take up thy bed and walk*, (the stile and *ceremony* of *Christs cure*) and the *curing* of that disease, an argument in *Christs* own *Logick* convincing and demonstrative, that *he had power to forgive sins on earth*, for though in *Matth.* and *Luke* it be υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπὶ γῆς ἀφιέναι, and so the ἐπὶ γῆς *on earth* either applyable *to son of man*, or to the *power of the son of man upon earth*, as probably, as to ἀφιέναι *to forgive sins*, yet in the parallel place in *Mar.* 2. 10. 'tis distinctly ἀφιέναι ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἁμαρτίας, *to forgive sins on earth*, which is not subject to that *ambiguity*, *i.e.* to absolve *in the Church*, because those diseases being consequent to *Gods delivering up to Satan* which is the *Idea* of the *Churches binding*, the sinner must be first *loosed* (*i.e.* his sin forgiven) before he could be *cured*, and therefore the phrase was very critically exact and proper of the *woman with the spirit of infirmity*, λυθῆναι ἀπὸ δεσμοῦ, *to be loosed from her bond*, to express the cure of that disease. So *James* 5. 15. (which if it strictly belong not, may yet commodiously be applied to this matter) you find together the (σώσει κάμνοντα) *saving or recovering the sick*, and [κἂν ἁμαρτίας ᾖ πεποιηκὼς, ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ] *remission of his sins* also; yea and it is observable what St. *Cyprian* saith so many years after, that baptism *the seal of pardon of sin, freed those from evil spirits, that were before troubled with them.* (Whence sure it was, that the *Catechists* that prepared Converts for *baptism*, are in the *Canons* of the *Councils* called ἐξορκισταὶ, *Exorcists*) and if after *baptism* they *relapst* to sinning, the *evil spirit returned* again, by which 'tis manifest, saith he, that the *devil in baptism* is turn'd out by the *faith* of the Believer, and, his *faith failing*, returns again. *Sect.* 84.

I shall only add two things to this matter, 1. That this may possibly be the original and occasion, if not the prime importance of that phrase, 1 *John* 5. 16. [ἁμαρτία πρὸς θάνατον] *a sin unto death*, (in which the faithful are not *bound* to *pray for him* that is guilty of it, or in which case there is no *promise* that their prayers shall be heard) *i.e.* a sin of such a nature, as to which the *delivering up to Satan* the שמתא the ὀλεθρος σαρκὸς belongs, the committer of which (though he might in general be *pray'd* for, yet) as long as he continued *impenitent* and *obdurate* he was *deprived of the prayers of the Church*, at least was fit to be excluded *out of the Church*, where men prayed in common one for another, as many as were present; nay perhaps the *Apostles*, having the power of *discerning* of Spirits, might possibly discern some man *impenetrably obstinate*, and so *irrecoverably gone*, and so give over all *praying* or *interceding* for him, (as on the other side [ἐάν τις ἴδῃ] if *any man without that Spirit of discerning, see his brother sin a sin which is not unto death, he shall ask or pray, &c.* nay on the contrary *pray* for his *excision* in some cases, as the *after-Church* judging, though with an humane (and so possibly fallible) judgment, of *Julian* the *Apostate*, banish'd him out of their *prayers*, (and rather prayed for his *cutting* off) to which yet I make no doubt they would have given him a *return*, if they should have discerned any probability of his *return* unto the Faith. *Sect.* 85.

The second thing which I shall add here by way of appendage, is, that from hence will appear, the meaning of *anathema maranatha*, 1 *Cor.* 16. 22. which is as if it were חרם and שמתא (ἀνάθεμα, the *second*, and μαραναθὰ *(the Lord comes)* the *third* sort of the *Jewish censures)* compacted or put together into one, perhaps not to signifie in that place any peculiar kind of *censure* among Christians instituted (as some would think) in these words against those that have committed the *sin against the Holy Ghost*. For the [εἴ τις φιλεῖ, *loveth not*] there, will not properly signifie that *sin*, nor indeed any other, of which the *Church* can have *cognizance*, (*loving*, or not loving being a secret of the heart, till it break out into some actual vertue or sin, and then it puts off that title of the affection, and is call'd by the name of the action) but by way of *accommodation*, to apply to the state of such a man the two last degrees of *excommunication* among the *Jews*, the one noting *total*, the other *final*, irreversible excision; and by that terrible representation, as by a clap and a flash of thunder and lightning together, to give a through sense of the danger of *that state*, to set an amazing formidable mark upon those *that love not the Lord Jesus:* whether they be *hypocrites*, who whatsoever else they are, are certainly no *lovers of Christ*, at least not lovers ἐν ἀφθαρσίᾳ, *in sincerity*, *Ephes.* 6. 24. or whether *haters* of him, as all vicious persons are, and then the [ἤτω, *let him be*] is not always a legal *form* of *censure*, but either a *Prophetick* or *Apostolical* denunciation, importing but this, that the *hypocrite* or *hater of Jesus Christ* shall undoubtedly be *damned*. *Sect.* 86.

By that which hath been said on occasion of this first *phrase (of delivering to Satan)* will appear distinctly, wherein this power of *binding* in the first branch of it, as peculiar to the *Apostles* from after ages, consists, peculiarly in the *power* of *delivering up to corporal inflictions, diseases*, &c. The other *phrases* will express the *matter* as it is common to the *Apostles* times with all after-ages, the *Ecclesiastical* discipline, not as it differs from, but as 'tis all one with the Apostolical, devested only of that one consequent among them, the corporal inflictions. *Sect.* 87.

In this rank is the μὴ φείσομαι *I will not spare*, 2 *Cor.* 13. 2. explained *verse* 10. by ἀποτόμως χρήσασθαι, *abscision*, and καθαίρεσις, *sublation*, taking away, or turning out of the Church; for I conceive the verse is thus to be paraphrased. *These things I, now being absent, write to you, that when I come, I may not be forc'd to use acts of severity, according to the power which is given to me for edification*, (which I rather desire to make use of) *and not according to the power, which was given to me for destruction or excision.*) So again, the ἔγραψα μὴ συναναμίγνυσθαι, 1 *Cor.* 5. 9. the *Apostles* command of *not communica-* *Sect.* 88.

ting or associating with such. It hath much troubled some scrupulous enquirers, where or when it was that Saint *Paul* had thus *written unto them*, phansying it necessary to resolve that he had written some other Epistle to *the Corinthians* before this first. But sure the beginning of the *Chapter* will lay this scruple, for to that (and not to any other farther off) the [ἔγραψα ἐν τῇ, *i. e.* ταύτῃ ἐπιστολῇ, (*I have written in this Epistle that you should not company, &c.*] doth belong, and that the [νυνὶ δὲ ἔγραψα] *I have now written, verse* 11. will inforce, for so in the 3, 4, and 5 *verses* we read, *I verily, as absent in body, but present in spirit, have judged already as though I were present, concerning him that hath done this deed; in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, when you and my spirit are gathered together with the power of the Lord Jesus Christ; to deliver such an one unto Satan*, &c. The *Apostle* though absent, yet having an *Apostolick* ruling *power* or *jurisdiction* over them, passeth *censure* (as formally, as if he had been amongst them) upon that *fornicator* or *incestuous person*: and by that *spirit* or power of his, whereby he was present in their *Assemblies*, doth therein pronounce this *censure* of *excommunication*, or *delivering up to Satan* against him, that by this means he may reduce that notorious offender (that is the importance of those 3. Verses) and that others be not tainted by his example, *verse* 6, &c. (And then *verse* 9. having a little digrest, *v.* 7, 8.) he resumes his matter again, and saith it over briefly in another phrase, with an ἔγραψα μὴ συναναμίγνυσθαι, *i. e.* this then was it that *I wrote to you in*, or *by Epistle*, (because I was not present) that you should not *company with such*. By which it appears that the *delivering* a man to *Satan*, and the commanding μὴ συναναμίγνυσθαι, are all one (or one but a light addition to, or variation from the other) all other men being so far concern'd in such a ones being so *delivered*, as not to *company* with him; yet that not so much (as men now adays think) lest they should be *polluted* by him, (*i. e.* by that act of communion with him, as under the Law by touching an *unclean* thing) as to help discipline him, that the insensate sinner may see himself left alone to no society but *Satans* (avoided, abandoned by all) and so be brought to a sense of his detestable dangerous condition, (and others kept from thinking his actions *exemplary* or fit to be imitated by them.) And therefore though this discipline be not used upon sinners *out of the Church*, *verse* 12. for they will not be wrought on by the *Christians* abandoning their company, yet saith Saint *Paul*, *verse* 11. with a *professor of Christianity*, one that lives in the *Church*, and yet is guilty of this sin, or the like, μὴ συναναμίγνυσθαι, μηδὲ συνεσθίειν, (for so I conceive the words must be joyned, all betwixt being in a *Parenthesis*) *neither to company nor eat with him*, (in stead of which, 2 *Thess.* 3. 14. 'tis μὴ συναναμίγνυσθε simply, only with a συμειοῦσθε (which it seems is a preparative to it) *set a mark or brand upon him, and do not company with him*) which in either place whether it belong only to exclusion from communion *in sacris*, or to be extended to interdiction of *ordinary civil society*, I profess my self not over confident; For the former only, this may be said; 1. That although the sound of the words μηδὲ συνεσθίειν (especially as we render it, *no not to eat*) seem to contain the latter also, yet perhaps the equipollence of that other phrase [*delivering to Satan.*] may restrain it to the former. 2. Because the *interdiction* of *conversing* or eating with *Christian* offenders might (now at least) make it necessary for a Man to go out of the world, as well as the *interdict* of *heathen-fornicators* company would have done then. 3. Because the phrase [ἐξαρεῖτε ἐξ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν] which in the close of the Chapter is set to express the former *censure*, is *verse* 2. applyed to this of Excommunication, οὐκ ἐπενθήσατε ἵνα ἐξαρθῇ, *ye have not mourned that he might be removed from among you*, and so is by the *Canons* of the *Councils* solemnly applyed to these *Ecclesiastical censures*, suspension either from the *Church* or from *office* in it.

Sect. 89. And yet on the other side the Jews were so severe to some, as to deem it unlawful either to *eat* or familiarly to *converse* with them, as *Samaritans*, *Publicans*, *Heathens* and *sinners* (so call'd κατ' ἐξοχὴν, *i. e. notorious* sinners) and a notable evidence and example of that practice of theirs we have in the 3*d.* book of *Maccabees*, where speaking of the ἀποχωρῆντες ἐξ αὐτῶν, *deserters*, or those that fell off to any notorious breach of their law, the Author saith, ἐβδελύσσοντο καὶ ὡς πολεμίους τῷ ἔθνει ἔκριναν, καὶ κοινῆς ἀναστροφῆς, καὶ ἐυχρηστίας ἐτύγχανον, they did express a *detestation* of them, *judged them as enemies of the Nation, and denied them the civility of common converse or good usage*, all friendly entertainments, &c. and the same is called after in that place, χωρισμὸς, a *separating* from them, ἀποστροφαὶ, (though it be read corruptly, and without sence, καταστροφαὶ) *aversation*, and expresst by ἀπεχθῶς ἐφαίνοντο, *they appeared enemies to them*: and even the Jewish *Niddui* or first degree of Excommunication, being *a remotion ad* 4. *passus, not suffering any man to come within four paces of him* that was *so censured*, was an interdiction of *familiar conversation* or *eating with him*. And therefore perhaps some of that their discipline may be here imitated, and retained; but then again for the former opinion, Christ by his contrary practice seemed to dislike that custom of theirs, and though he brought excommunication into the *Church* or *in sacris*, 'tis not necessary he should continue that other that extended to *civil commerce*, and therefore still perhaps may not.

Sect. 90. The best decision perhaps will be, that this censure ordinarily belongs only to *society in Sacris*, but yet sometimes the state of affairs so requiring, and when some other defect may be so supplyed, The *Governours* may proceed to the second *interdict*, that no man shall *talk* familiarly, or entertain, or *eat* with them, that all men shall avoid their company, discountenance them, and not so much as say God speed, allow them ordinary *Christian civility*, by this means to besiege, and starve them up, and so, if possible, humble and reduce them. To which purpose it is observable what the learned and judicious *Hugo Grotius* μακαρίτης hath noted concerning this matter, that in a *Christian Church* where either through the recentness of their plantation *communes conventus non sunt, there are no constant common Assemblies* of the *Christians* in it, or where upon the same occasion there is no setled *Government* in the hands of a *Bishop* and *assistent Presbyters*, or where the *Church* is torn asunder by *Schisms*, (as in *Corinth*, when this *first Epistle* was written, *Chap.* 11. 18. whence it follows, *verse* 31. That *judgments* or *censures* were neglected, and upon that neglect, *diseases* and deaths among them, (I would, I could not say among us also) whereas at the writing of the *second Epistle*, the discipline together with a quiet judicature was restored, 2 *Cor.* 2. 6.) there in stead of exclusion from *communion in sacris*, that other interdict of *private commerce*, or avoiding of private familiarity hath been thought useful by the *Apostle*; To this you may apply *Rom.* 16. 17. where the *Apostle* beseeches them, *to mark and avoid such as cause divisions and offences among them*, and so 2 *Thess.* 3. 14. just now mentioned,

if

if any man obey not our word by this Epistle, note that man, and have no company with him, &c. And *if in this respect*, Matth. 18. 17. may be extended to this sence also, 'twill no way contradict or prejudice our present pretensions, it being very reasonable for *private Christians* to restrain themselves toward those who have expreſt such a contradiction to all *fraternal* methods of *Charity*, and by outward behaviour to shew a dislike of their *contumacy ad obduration*, especially when an *Apostle* at a distance shall pass that judgment on any particular man, and the present state of the *Church* leaves no place for expectation of formal *censures*, the law of the Heathen *Charondas* being not unreasonable in this case, ἀδίκῳ ἀνδρὶ, ἢ γυναῖκι μὴ ὁμιλεῖν μηδένα, ἢ ὀνειδίζεσθαι, ὡς ὅμοιον ὄντα, *that no man converse with a wicked man or woman, or bring a reproach on himself, as if he were like him.*

Another phrase to expreſs this censure is μετὰ μίαν καὶ δευτέραν νουθεσίαν παραιτοῦ, *Tit.* 3. 10. *After a first and second admonition, avoid him*, which that it belongs to the method directed to by *Christ*, *Matth.* 18. 15, 16, 18. 'tis clear at the first sight: but seeing there be three *admonitions* before *censure*, *Matth.* 18. the first of the injured person *alone*, the second of the *two or three*, the third of the *Church*, the difficulty will be, which two of those three are the μία καὶ δευτέρα *first and second* here; My opinion of it, with submission, is that the first and second here are the very same with the *first and second* in Saint *Matth.* 18. that of *one alone*, and then of that one, with *one or two more* with him. And if it be objected, that then the *excommunication* must not follow immediately upon that second, I answer that those words, being spoken to *Titus Bishop of Crete* by St. *Paul*, telling him what he should do, must needs make a difference from what it would be, if 'twere a *private man*; It appeared probable before that the *admonition* of the *Church* signified that of the *Rulers* of the *Church*, and therefore when they have admonished, there is no place for *appeal to the Church*, nor consquently for *that third admonition*, and therefore in this case, where the Governour (who is representatively the *Church* it self, a *publick*, no *private person*) after a *first and second admonition*, (and the second with *one or two*, perhaps with some or all of the *College* of *Presbyters* joyned with him) comes to be despised, the αἵρεσις follows, or proceeding to *censure* without any third *admonition* interposing. Which will appear to be the practice, if you look 2 *Cor.* 13. 2. where immediately after the *second admonition* in the προλέγω τὸ δεύτερον, characterized *verse* 1. by [*in the mouth of two or three, &c.*] he tells the offenders, οὐ φείσομαι, *I will not spare, i. e.* I will proceed to *censure*: and *verse* 10. he tells them, that this *admonition* is, ἵνα μὴ ἀποτόμως χρήσωμαι, *that I may not proceed to excision*, or *cutting off*, (for so ἀποτόμως, or ἀποτομία, which we render *sharpness*, signifies) which is there called καθαίρεσις, *taking away*, in the end of the verse; the very word which is so ordinary in the antient Canons, καθαιρεῖσθω, *tollatur*, for the *censure of excommunication*.

Sect. 91.

And the reason is there rendred, because you may know that such an one, that holds out against those *admonitions of the Church*, or Rulers thereof, ἐξέστραπται, καὶ ἁμαρτάνει, is *a perverse wilful sinner*, ὢν αὐτοκατάκριτος, *being self-condemned, i. e.* I conceive by that *non-submission* to the *Churches admonitions*, he withdraweth and divideth himself from that *communion*, and so inflicteth that *punishment* upon himself, which the *censures* of the *Church* are wont to do on *malefactors*, for that is καθαίρεσις, 2 *Cor.* 13. 10. and ἐξαιρεῖσθαι, *cutting off from the Church*, which he being an *heretick* doth voluntarily without the Judges sentence, his very αἵρεσις, *heresie* being a willing καθαίρεσις, or *excision*. So saith St. *Jerome*, *whereas fornicators, &c. are turn'd out of the Church, the heretick inflicts this on himself, suo arbitrio ab Ecclesiâ recedens*, going of his own choice from the Church; which departing, *propriæ conscientiæ videtur esse damnatio*, seems to be the *censure of ones own Conscience*: So in the *Council of Laodicea*, *Can.* 40. after an order that no Bishop shall disobey a citation, when he is called to a *Council*: 'tis added, εἰδὲ καταφρονήσειε ἑαυτὸν αἰτιάσηται, *if he contemn, he shall be conceived to accuse himself*, which is the next degree to self-condemnation. So in the 22. *Can. of the African Codex*, (or in *Justellus* his Account, the 19.) the words are clear of a *Bishop* that being *accused* before a *Council* appears not, αὐτὸς καθ' ἑαυτοῦ τὸ κατάκριμα τὴν ψῆφον ἐκφερωνηκέναι κριθήσεται, *he shall be judged to have pronounced sentence of condemnation against himself*, and so even in *Philostratus*, *l.* 7. *c.* 7. it is a saying of *Apollonius*, Ὃς ἐκλιπὼν τὸ δικάσασθαι, πῶς ἂν διαφύγοι τὸ μὴ οὐχ ἑφ' ἑαυτῷ ἁλῶναι, *he that shall decline a judicature, how shall he avoid the being thought to have condemned himself?* So in the 12. Tables, *Praesenti litem addicito*, i. e. *that he that absents himself, be always cast*; and so the *Franks* have always observed it, *ut absens causâ caderet, ni Somnia nuntiasset*, that the *absent shall be alway condemned, unless he gave a just excuse of his absence*. And the *Regulæ ab Abbate Floricensi constitutæ*, add, *Qui non comparuerit, tanquam convictus judicabitur, he that appeareth not, shall be judged as convict*, i. e. αὐτοκατάκριτος: The like phrase we find in *Josephus*, *l.* 2. *c.* 12. *de Bell. Jud. Oaths*, saith he, *among them were wholly avoided, and counted worse than perjury*, ἤδη γὰρ ἥδε παρὰ πᾶσι φασὶ τὸν ἀπιστούμενον ἄνευ θεοῦ, *for he that is not believed without swearing, they say is already condemned*, his very using an *Oath*, condemns him of lying. If you will see this interpretation more fully confirmed, I must refer you to *Marculfi formul. l.* 1. *c.* 37. and *Bignonius* on them, to *Stephan. Fornerius rerum quotid. l.* 6. *c.* 21. and out of him, *Justellus*, in the Notes on *Cod. Ecclesiæ universæ*, *p.* 38. But enough of this.

Sect. 92.

I shall take in no more places to examine for this point of the nature of this *power*, save only those in the *Gospel* (with which this discourse began) which, as we have once gone over in relation to the first enquiry, so we shall now again in order to the second.

Sect. 93.

First, then, *Matth.* 16. 19. δώσω σοὶ τὰς κλεῖς τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν, [*I will give you the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven*] where 'twill be no news to him that is vers'd in the *New Testament*, if I tell him, that βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν, *the kingdom of heaven*, signifies the *Church* of *Christ* here below *Militant*, being not a disparate body, but a fellow-member of *Christ*, with the other triumphant in Heaven. I could weary my Reader with places to this purpose, ready at every turn to justifie this interpretation, as when 'tis said of St. *John* the Baptist, *Mat.* 11. 11. that though from the beginning *there had not risen a greater than he*, (a more than Prophet in pointing out rather than prophesying of Christ, ἴδε ἀμνὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, *Behold the Lamb of God*) yet ὁ μικρότερος ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν, the least in this new Church, (this μέλλων αἰὼν---*the age to come*, as the Septuagint, *Esay* 9. 6. call it, and so *Heb.* 2. 5. οἰκουμένη μέλλουσα, *the world to come*, and perhaps *Heb.* 6. 5. δυνάμεις τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος, *the powers of the age to come*, i. e. of Christianity, and ἐρχομένη βασιλεία, the coming Kingdom, as the phrase in St. *Mark* 11. 10. may, I conceive, be rendred absolutely,

Sect. 94.

absolutely, thus, εὐλογημένη ἡ ἐρχομένη βασιλεία ἐν ὀνόματι Κυρίου. *Blessed in the name of the Lord of our father David, be the coming kingdom*; or *Blessed in the name of the Lord be the coming kingdom of our father David*; this Church or kingdom of Christ here on earth, not hereafter in Heaven) the least believer, at least teacher of the Gospel here, (not Saint there) is greater than he. So *Matth.* 8.11. upon the Centurions coming to Christ, and expressing so great measure of faith, that he professes not to have found the like in any Jew, he adds, that *Many shall come from the East, and West, all parts of the heathen world, and sit down with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven, i.e.* as that Centurion did, believe in Christ, (and become one Church with the Jews, of whom *Abraham* the Father of the faithful was the first) *and the children of the kingdom* (they that were till then the only Church, to wit, the rebellious unbelieving Jews) *should be cast out.* So clearly *Ch.* 13. 24. ὡμοιώθη ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν, the *kingdom* of Heaven, the *Church* here below, not the *kingdom* above, is *likened*, &c. For sure there are no *enemies* to sow, nor *tares* to be sown in Heaven, which in this kingdom are there said to be, *ver.* 25. (as *Rev.* 12,7. the *War* that is mentioned in Heaven, may be an argument that *heaven* in that place signifies the *Church* here below, which only being Militant can be said to have *War* in it) and so in the other Parables in that Chapter. I have named enough for an hint to any to observe many more in this Gospel, *Chap.* 18.1,3, 4. *Chap.* 19.24,25. *Chap.* 20. 1. *Chap.* 21. 43. and (which is a little nearer to the phrase in this place) *Chap.* 23. 13. the *Pharisees shutting up the kingdom of heaven before men, i. e.* keeping men from entring the *Church* from becoming *Christians*, and the like also in the other Gospels. If this notion of the *kingdom of heaven* do yet seem alien, or forced, or less proper for this place, then you may but please to observe, that a *key* refers to a lock, a lock to a door, or entrance to any place, and then the *Church* being supposed the *door* or gate, the only way of passage to Heaven, these *keys of heaven* it self must be the keys of the *Church* below, as of the door that leads thither, and then that will return to the same issue still.

Sect. 95. So then, *Peter*, and in him the rest of the *Apostles* and successor-governours of the *Church* had the *keys* of the *Church* given them, *i e.* clearly a power of shutting out, or receiving into the visible Militant Church, of removing the contumacious by *censure* of *excommunication*, and receiving in the humble penitents by *absolution*; and so of *binding* and *loosing*, (as it follows) ἐπὶ γῆς, here below, *upon the earth*, answerable to that acception of the βασιλεία τ̃ ὐρανῶν (for the Church) premised, and just agreeable to the phrase, *Mark* 2. 10. ἀφιέναι ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἁμαρτίας, to *forgive sins on earth*, which (it appears by the mentioning of the *keys* as the foundation of this power) signifies receiving men into the *Church*, disexcommunicating, and therefore the binding is there peculiarly the censure of *excommunication*, and nothing else; ὅπερ ἔδει δεῖξαι, the thing we undertook to shew from hence.

To this purpose an illustrious testimony we have in an Epistle of *Eutychianus* Bishop of *Rome* to all the Bishops in *Sicily*. *Ann. Dom.* 175. *Quorum dimiseritis peccata*, &c. *i.e. Quibus Ecclesiam interdixeritis, nisi reconciliati per satisfactionem fuerint, ipsis janua regni cœlestis clausa erit. Whose sins you do remit*, &c. *i. e. whom you turn out of the Church, unless they be reconciled by satisfaction, the door of the heavenly Kingdom shall be shut against them*, Bin. Tom. 1. Concil. f. 130.

Sect. 96. From whence, by the way, may be understood the meaning of that place, *Matt.* 12. 32. it *shall not be forgiven* him, (ἀφεθήσεται, impersonally) he shall not receive absolution, *either in this world, i.e.* in the *Church* from the Ecclesiastick *censure*, nor at the day of judgment, i.e. *in the world to come*, the phrase seeming to me to refer to that rule among the *Jews* mention'd before out of שלחן ערוך *tr. de excom. Si quis juret in hunc modum, &c. If any man swear after this manner*, [*If this be not true, let me be excommunicated in this world, and in the other*] *and be perjur'd, he cannot be absolv'd by any*: and then how ridiculous are they that ground a *Purgatory* on this place?

Sect. 97. We shall not need to make any distinct survey of the second place, *Ch.* 18. 18. because (as to the matter of this power, our present enquiry) it is *verbatim* (only the number and some little unimportant circumstances changed) the same with this former place, ὅσα δήσητε ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, & λύσητε ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, *binding and loosing* in the earthly part of the kingdom of heaven, the *Church* below. One thing only it will not be amiss again to add as an appendage common to these two places, (though we mention'd it before) and it is this, that [the ὅσα λύσητε] the mention of *absolution* is (in both) an attendant of the δήσητε or *binding* precedent, as indeed *loosing* generally presupposes a *band*, and therefore *Acts* 2. 24. (where we read, λύσας τὰς ὠδῖνας τοῦ θανάτου, and render it, *loosed the pains of death*) 'tis sufficiently clear, and confest that ὠδῖνες are there taken for δεσμοὶ or σχοινία (by the equivocalness of the Hebrew word חבל which signifies both, and is rendred by the 72. sometimes σχοινίον, *a band*, sometimes ὠδὶν, a *pang* of travail) and so should be rendred in that place, *bands of death*, in relation to which it follows, *he could not be holden*, &c. which intimates *absolution* to be *in universum*, or absolutely necessary only to those that have been *bound*, and so only after *excommunication*, the *absolution* proportion'd to the precedaneous *censure*, and that the only thing that lies upon any, *necessitate præcepti* here, or *medii* in any other respect, all other *absolution*, without this precedent *binding* censure, being (though it may be allowed very useful and profitable for the *comfort* and satisfaction of the penitent, yet) neither *commanded*, or prescribed the Priest to give, nor the penitent to receive (at least by either of these two places.)

Sect. 98. As for the third place, *John* 20.23. (which by some is thought to belong to somewhat else, rather than those censures of the Church, 1. because the phrases are other, ἀφίεναι and κρατεῖν, *remitting and retaining*, in stead of δῆσαι and λῦσαι, *binding and loosing*. 2. Because the ἀφῆτε, [*remit*] is before κρατῆτε, [*retain.*] And 3. because this is deliver'd to all the *Apostles* together, whereas the two other were spoken, only personally to *Peter*, the other of the *Church*) I in humility conceive, that, as before we shewed that this place in St. *John* belonged to the same persons to which the other two belonged, to wit, the *Apostles* and their succeeding rulers of the Church, so it is perfectly parallel to them also in respect of the *matter* of the *Commission*; and my reasons are these: 1. Because the phrases, though (as the first reason pretends) other in sound, are yet directly synonyma's with the former in the Scripture-style, I say that ἀφίεναι, *to remit*, is all one with λῦσαι, *to loose*, and κρατέω, *to retain*, with δέω, *to bind*. And therefore *Theophylact* uses together ἐξουσία ἀφιέναι καὶ δεσμεῖν -- *power and remitting* and *binding*, confounding the two places in St. *John* and St. *Matt.* together, and rendring κρατεῖν, *to retain*, by δεσμεῖν, *to bind*; and λύειν, *to loose*, by ἀφιέναι, *to remit*, in *Matth.* 16.19. and so promiscuously in other Writers. If there be the least difference, it is only this, that δέω signifies *to bind*, and κρατέω, *to bind*,

bind, and alſo *to keep bound*; in which reſpect κρατέω is more proper here in St. *John*, becauſe the order is inverted, and κρατῆτε, *retaining*, put after ἀφῆτε, *remitting*, and ſo the word which ſignifies alſo [*to keep bound*] or to not-remit, is more perfectly and critically agreeable, than δέω *to bind* would have been; and yet when *binding* is mentioned firſt, δῆσαι as exact as κρατῆται, as in the other places. But yet for all this light accidental difference, I ſhall not retract ſaying, that the words are in uſe perfectly ſynonymous; ἀφῆτε, *remit*, and λύσητε, *looſe*, eſpecially as applyed to *ſin*; both ſignifie *forgiving* of it; the firſt as ſin is taken under the notion either of a debt, or a thraldom, (for ἀφίναι is in the *New Teſtament* applyed to both, to the one in the *Lords Prayer*, to the other, *Luke* 4. 18. and both directly oppoſed to κρατεῖν) the ſecond, as of a *band*; ſo in the Septuagints Tranſlation of the Old Teſtament, *Gen.* 4. 12. (μείζων ἡ αἰτία, perhaps falſe copyed for ἁμαρτία μὴ τοῦ ἀφεθῆναι, *My ſin is greater than can be forgiven*) or more clearly, *Exod.* 32.21. Εἰ μὲν ἄφες αὐτοῖς τὴν ἁμαρτίαν, *if thou wilt*, (or, O that thou wouldſt) *forgive them that ſin*, and in divers other places (ἀφίναι, *remit*) taken for *forgive*; and ſo in like manner λύειν, *to looſe*, *Job* 42.9. λῦσαι τὴν ἁμαρτίαν αὐτοῖς διὰ Ἰὼβ, (a Tranſlation of the words which are in Hebrew נשא פני איוב *God accepted the perſon of Job* praying for them) he forgave them that ſin by *Job*, *i.e.* by his mediation. There λύειν [to looſe] is taken for [to forgive.]

So alſo for δέω, and κρατέω, to *bind*, and to *hold* or *retain*, the ſame Hebrew word עצר is rendred *Sect.* 99.
by the Septuagint δέω (ὃν δεδεμένον) *Jer.* 33.1. and κρατέω, *Dan.* 10.8. and 11.6. and ſo *Acts* 2.24. [κρατεῖσθαι] being holden, is ſet oppoſite to (λύσας) *looſing of bands*, and ſo muſt ſignifie keeping bound, (and in almoſt all other places it ſignifies to hold faſt, or take hold of, *Matt.* 18.28. 21.46. 26.4. *&c.* and is ſometimes joyned with ἔδησαν, as *holding* faſt is precedaneous, and preparative to *binding*, *Matt.* 14.3. κρατήσας ἔδησε, *laying hold on him*, *bound him*, and *Apoc.* 20.2. ἐκράτησε καὶ ἔδησε, *held and bound*) and ſo κρατεῖν, though rendred to *retain*, is taken for δέω *to bind* alſo, (or if there be any difference, 'tis this, that it ſignifies leſs than *binding*, rather than more, and ſo will not conclude any thing which the former places were not able to conclude.) And ſo you may obſerve in the Fathers, *viz.* St. *Baſil*, ſpeaking of the freedom of Chriſtians in their bands, he ſaith they are κακεπιμόνοι ἀκράτητοι, *bound, but not capable of binding*, and many the like.

Secondly, becauſe the inverting of the order of words is too light and caſual a thing to be argu- *Sect.* 100.
mentative, and therefore the ſecond reaſon is of little force, being taken only from that change, for which yet ſome reaſonable account alſo may be given from the variety of the words, which cauſed this inverſion, and conſequently no more argument will be deducible from this change of order, than from the change of words would be juſt to deduce; If the change of the words would argue ought, then I confeſs the inverting of the order, cauſed by that, would *per modum accumulationis* do ſo too, but that being once cleared to import no new thing, this which is only attendant on that, cannot be thought to do ſo, and ſo there will be no need of farther anſwer to that, when the former hath been ſufficiently anſwered.

Thirdly, becauſe the third ground of ſcruple is as unconvincing alſo, the other two being delivered *Sect.* 101.
to all the Apoſtles alſo, as well as this: the firſt to all in St. *Peters* perſon, (as 'tis ordinary for Donations made to Communities to be delivered to one of that number for the uſe of all) as is acknowledged by all but thoſe, whoſe pretended intereſt in St. *Peter* hath bribed them to inflame his, and *Decrep. Eccl.* leſſen the other Diſciples prerogative, as much as they can. And the ſecond in plain words with a *l.* 5. *c.* 7. *&* 9. Preface of Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, *Verily I ſay to you*, *i.e.* to the Diſciples with whom the diſcourſe had continued by way of mutual colloquie from the beginning of the Chapter. This I am ſure is the affirmation of the *Greek* Fathers, particularly *Theophylact* on *Matth.* 16. where he affirms that promiſe of the power of *binding and looſing* to be fulfilled in thoſe words of Chriſt in St. *John*, *whoſe ſins you do remit*, *&c.* The place was formerly ſet down at large, and need not be repeated; and if you examine the word κρατέω, throughout the *New Teſtament*, you will have no temptation to doubt it.

Having now declared out of the Scripture the foundation and progreſs of this *power*, theſe *cenſures*, *Sect.* 102.
and occaſionally interweaved the interpretation of ſome places which I conceive to depend on this matter, it were now a fit ſeaſon to proceed to the writings of the *antient Church*, and draw down the *hiſtory* of this practice through the *firſt* and *purer* times: But that hath been ſo faithfully performed by many others, particularly by *Spalatenſis*, that it would be a great inſolence to attempt to do it better. Only it will be worth our rehearſing, (though we only refer you to that *Magazin* for all farther explication of it) that there were ſome *nice differences* obſerved in this matter between the *binding* which was a *cenſure*, and the other which was only a *puniſhment*, the one conceived to *bind in heaven*, the other not. 2. Betwixt the *binding* of the *refractory impenitent*, and the *humble confitent penitent*; the firſt for the *cure* and removing the ſcandal of ſome notorious crime; the ſecond on his voluntary confeſſing his crime, and ſubmitting himſelf to be bound by way of *penance*, that ſo by being *looſed* again, he might be the more ſure of that *pardon* in Heaven, which is promiſed to thoſe which are *abſolv'd* on *earth*, and ſo *propter majorem cautelam*, to ſatisfie the *trembling* conſcience, and aſſure it, that God hath forgiven him.

Theſe are excellent profitable ſubjects, in which I deſire the Reader will ſatisfie himſelf out of thoſe *judicious Collections* of that very *learned unhappy man*: and if it be now demanded of me, whether *private abſolution* be not contained under the importance of theſe places? I anſwer, that this laſt *diſtinction* hath in effect anſwered this *queſtion*, and defined, that in caſe of *private binding*, it doth come under it, and that that, though in ſome ſence it be left *ad libitum*, or voluntary to the penitents will or choice, is yet neceſſary to every one whoſe *conſcience* either is not able to perform and go through the work of *inward* repentance with *God* alone, or is not able to ſatisfie it ſelf with ſuch performance without the *Miniſters* aſſiſtance called in.

To which purpoſe I ſhall deſire that that may be conſidered which is delivered by our Church in the *Sect.* 103.
ſecond Exhortation before the *Communion*, in theſe words, *Becauſe it is requiſite that no man ſhould come to the holy Communion but with a full truſt in Gods mercy, and with a quiet conſcience, therefore if there be any of you, which by the means aforeſaid,* (which were, *to examine their lives by the rule of Gods Commandments, and wherein they ſhall perceive themſelves to have offended, either by will, word, or deed, there to bewail their own ſinful lives, and confeſs themſelves to Almighty God with full purpoſe of amendment: and if their offences be alſo againſt their neighbours, then to reconcile themſelves to thoſe, with readineſs to make reſtitution*

reſtitution and ſatisfaction for wrong done, and to forgive others that have offended them) *cannot quiet his own conſcience, but requireth farther comfort or counſel, then let him come to me* (*i.e.* his lawful Paſtor) *or ſome other diſcreet and learned Miniſter of Gods Word, and open his grief, that he may receive ſuch ghoſtly counſel, advice, and comfort, as his conſcience may be relieved, and that by the miniſtery of Gods Word he may receive comfort, and the benefit of abſolution, to the quieting of his conſcience, and avoiding all ſcruple and doubtfulneſs.* All which being an exhortation of the *Church* belonging to a particular caſe, [*when a man by the uſe of all helps which are within his own reach, cannot attain to quiet of Conſcience, or be ſatisfied that he is fit to receive the holy Communion*;] as they do imply that thoſe foreſaid *means* may happily ſerve the turn, without opening his caſe to the Miniſter, and conſequently without receiving *abſolution*, ſo are they a *fervent exhortation* to all, in caſe thoſe means prove not ſucceſsful, to ſeek out, and make uſe of thoſe auxiliaries, which whoſoever in that caſe ſhall neglect, will be guilty of great unkindneſs to his own ſoul, and may well be thought to have betrayed it to great and needleſs danger. And it is worthy our noting from hence, that receiving of *comfort*, and the *benefit of abſolution* are by our Church here conjoyned, to ſignifie this abſolution to be beneficial to him that once *wanted comfort*, as a means of confirming that *comfort* which the Miniſter had now given him. To which end certainly 'tis very proper and ſeaſonable; for when a diſcreet, and learned Miniſter, having had the ſurvey of my ſoul, (the cognizance of my *offence* firſt, and then of my *repentance*) ſhall from the Word of God give me aſſurance, that (if I am what to him I appear to be) my eſtate is good, and thereupon *pronounce* me *abſolv'd*, as a true penitent from all my ſins; this will 1. ſeal me a right of Gods promiſe of *forgiveneſs* in Heaven, as it were *ſolemnly* and in the *Court*; and 2. extreamly *quiet me*, and confirm to me that comfort, *i.e.* that *comfortable opinion* of my good eſtate, and hope of my future happineſs, which he had given me, when I ſee him who hath no reaſon to be partial to me, and whom I cannot ſuſpect of *ignorance*, or paſſion in this particular, (both which perhaps I may upon enquiry diſcern in my ſelf) and beſide, who is ſet over me by Chriſt to this purpoſe, *pronounce* ſo clear a *ſentence* of me, and that (as the precedent words are) *by the miniſtry of Gods Word, i.e.* by applying peculiar parts of that infallible truth to the preſent condition of my Soul; and from thence *pronouncing my abſolution.* And that this is the meaning of the *abſolution* there, it is evident by that which is the ſecond thing, which I thought worthy our obſerving from hence, *viz.* what is added in concluſion, as the ultimate *end* of that *comfort* and *abſolution, the quieting of conſcience, and avoiding of all ſcruple and doubtfulneſs*; which whether they be diſtinct, ſo that the *quieting of conſcience* may be the *completion* of the *comfort*, and the avoiding of all *ſcruple* and *doubtfulneſs*, the *end* intended in, and obtained by *abſolution*, or whether both together *indiſcretè* belong to both together, the product will be ſtill the ſame, that in caſe a man be not able to *ſatisfie* his own *ſcruples*, and *doubts* concerning himſelf, the Presbyter will be able to ſtand him in good ſtead, by the *Word of God* applyed to his caſe to *give comfort*, and by *pronouncing abſolution* to him to ſeal that *comfort*, and perſwade him to a greater *confirmation* of mind, that that comfort is not *groundleſs*, and ſo take away *doubts* and *ſcruples* concerning that matter which before moleſted him, and made him unfit for the *communion*, which was the only occaſion of the *exhortation.*

Sect 103. Beſide this, it is alſo true, that in caſe of *ſickneſs* St. *James*'s *advice* (if not *command*) is punctual, that the *Presbyters* of the *Church be called* for, and that they ſhall *anoint the ſick* (*a ceremony* uſed in thoſe days by *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles* in the *curing of diſeaſes*, and *caſting out devils*, not ſo much as a *viand* toward our laſt great journey, as among the *Romaniſts* 'tis continued, but either as a *ſign* of our *Spiritual cure*, or as a *means* ſanctified by prayer to *cure the ſick*, to *deliver* from the *diſeaſe* in the beginning of the verſe) καὶ ἁμαρτίας ᾖ πεποιηκώς, ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ, *and if he be one that have committed ſins, abſolution ſhall be given him*; for ſo that phraſe will be moſt *grammatically* rendred [*not they ſhall be forgiven him*] for then it would be ἀφεθήσονται, nor that [*God ſhall forgive him*] for then it would be ἀφήσει, to agree with, ἐγερεῖ Κύριος immediately precedent, *the Lord ſhall raiſe him*, but *perſonally remittetur ei, he ſhall have abſolution.* Of which *abſolution* 1. There is little queſtion, but that it is a very proper preparative to *curing* of his diſeaſe, which is oft ſent to awake ſome drowſie ſinner, and is not removed till it have done the work in ſome meaſure, *Eccluſ.* 38. 9, 10. and therefore the ordinary preface to *Chriſts cures*, is [*Son thy ſins are forgiven thee*] as 2 *Mac.* 3. when *Heliodorus* had been ſo *ſcourged* for his ſacrilegious enterprize, and the *high Prieſt offered ſacrifice* for his *recovery*, *ver.* 32. the Prieſt is ſaid to have made *an Atonement*, and thereupon *God granted him his life*, *ver.* 33 and ſo *Eccluſ.* 2. 11. before Gods delivering in time of tribulation, there is firſt his ἄφησιν ἁμαρτίας, *remitting of ſins*, before *releaſing* from the preſſure; and ſecondly, that *abſolution*, as it is the *Miniſters* act peculiarly, and an act of *benediction* in him, contrary to the *execration* in the *Cherem*, or *anathema*, may well be thought in common reaſon to have benign influence on the *Patient*, as the *curſes* of *Parents* are generally believed to be fatal *curſes*, Δειναὶ γὰρ κατὰ γαῖαν Ἐρίννυες εἰσὶ τοιῶν, in *Orpheus*, *the curſes of Parents are ſhrewd furies that haunt a man where-ever he goes on the earth*, have an inauſpicious influence on all his *earthly* proſperities, devour and eat out his *patrimony*; and ſo alſo by the rule of contraries, the bleſſings of *Parents*, *Eccluſ.* 3. 9. may avail toward the removing of *temporal* calamities, and ſo conſequently, the *prayers* and *bleſſings*, and abſolution of the *Presbyter* the ſpiritual *father*. Thirdly, there will be as little queſtion who ſhall be the Miniſter of it, when 'tis conſidered that there is no ſuppoſition or preſumption in that place of the preſence of any, but only of the πρεσβύτεροι τῆς ἐκκλησίας, *the Presbyters of the Church*, and as little will there be of the *fitneſs*, and exceeding *expedience*, that the *ſins*, of which he is ſo peculiarly to receive *abſolution*, ſhould be *confeſſed*, and bewailed before him, from whom the *abſolution* is expected. One thing only the context may perhaps farther import, that this *Presbyterial abſolution* may not be (by force of that place) ſo abſolutely *neceſſary* to all *ſick perſons*, but only to the ἁμαρτίας πεποιηκώς, to him that hath (formerly, and ſo as upon examination of himſelf, he may reaſonably impute his *ſickneſs* to it) *committed ſins*, either as the word ἁμαρτίας denotes *greater ſins*, or as ſins contrary to our duty towards God, whoſe *Miniſter* the *Presbyter* is, or as ποιεῖν ἁμαρτίαν ſignifies to live *indulgently* in ſin, and ſo as it is not reconcileable with a * *regenerate* eſtate, as long as it continues. For 'tis worth obſerving what follows in that place, *James* 5. 16. *Confeſs* τὰ παραπτώματα *your tranſgreſſions* ἀλλήλοις *to one another*, one *brother*, *i.e. Chriſtian*, to *another*, the *ſick* to them in *health*, as πάντες ἀλλήλοις ὑποτάσσεσθε, *Be ye all ſubject*

to

* *He that is born of God,* ὁ ποιῶν ἁμαρτίαν, *doth not commit ſin,* 1 John 3. 9.

to one another, 1 *Pet.* 5. 5. *i. e.* all that are *inferiours* to all *superiours*. Where, whether παράπτωμα signifie a *treſpaſs* peculiarly *againſt our brethren*, or whether (as 'tis reſolved by *Grammarians*) lapſes, or *lighter ſins*, it ſeems to be here ſet in a diſtance from (if not oppoſite to) ἁμαρτίας, *the greater ſins*, or *thoſe againſt God*; and then as the *confeſſion* of them to the *Presbyter*, God's Officer, will in any reaſon be moſt proper, to obtain *comfort* on ſafe grounds, and the *benefit of abſolution* upon ſincere *repentance*; ſo in thoſe ſins of an inferiour rank *confeſſion* to the *wronged* brother, or to what-ever fellow-*Chriſtian*, may poſſibly be ſufficient; and aſſuredly not *unuſeful* or *unneceſſary*, if it be but for the obtaining of the brothers united *prayers*, to help to remove the *ſickneſs*, if that be inflicted (as oft *ſickneſſes* are) as a *puniſhment* for any ſuch treſpaſſes. In which caſe as the promiſe is there given of recovery *to the ſick* upon thoſe *other mens prayers*, and not otherwiſe, ſo there is little hope that God will accept thy *private prayers* for removing that puniſhment, till *thou go, and reconcile thy ſelf unto thy brother*, and deſire and obtain his prayers for thee, (as *Job*'s for his friends) when thy injuring of him had *cryed to heaven*, and fetch'd down that *inflictio*n on thee.

Nay thirdly, there will be little matter of doubt, or controverſie, but that *private*, frequent, ſpi- *Sect.* 104.
ritual *conference* betwixt fellow-Chriſtians, but eſpecially (and in matters of high concernment and difficulty) between the *Presbyter* and thoſe of his charge, even in the time of health; and peculiarly, that part of it which is ſpent in the diſcuſſion of every man's *ſpecial ſins* and *infirmities*, and *inclinations* may prove very uſeful and advantageous (in order to ſpiritual *directions*, *reproof* and *comfort*) to the *making the Man of God perfect*. And to tell truth, if the *pride* and *ſelf-conceit* of ſome, the *wretchleſneſs* of others, the *baſhfulneſs* of a third ſort, the *nauſeating*, and inſtant fatiety of any good in a fourth, the *follies* of men, and *artifices* of *Satan* had not put this practice quite out of faſhion among us, there is no doubt, but more good might be done by *Miniſters* this way, than is now done by any other means ſeparated from the uſe of this, particularly than by that of *publick preaching*, (which yet need not be neglected the more when this is uſed) which hath now the *fate* to be cryed up, and almoſt ſolely depended on, it being the likelier way, as *Quintilian* ſaith, (comparing *publick* and *private* teaching of youth) *to fill narrow-mouth'd bottles* (and ſuch are the moſt of us) *by taking them ſingle in the hand, and pouring in water into each, than by ſetting them all together, and throwing never ſo many buckets of water on them.*

I conceive, I have now diſtinctly ſet down the full importance of this power of *binding* and *looſing*, *Sect.* 105.
and how it belongs peculiarly to the publick *cenſures* of the *Church*, the *binding* by way of *excommunication*, or depriving of the common benefits of *Chriſtians*, (together with that branch of *corporal diſcipline*, or inflictions on mens bodies, peculiar to the *Apoſtles times and power*) and the *looſing*, in *reſtoring* the *excommunicate* perſon upon repentance to the *Aſſembly* of the *Saints*. And by this perhaps may be received ſome ſatisfaction to that *queſtion* agitated ſometimes, whether *Abſolution* in the *Church* be only *declarative*, or moreover *miniſterially authoritative*, which queſtion will not now have ſo much place, the matter being thus ſtated. For the *Churches abſolution* being not the *actual eternal pardon* of *ſins in Heaven*, (which is left to be *God*'s work, none but he *juſtifying* ſinners, except by way of *conſequent* upon this *promiſe* of God's) but peculiarly the freeing of the penitent from *Eccleſiaſtical cenſures* here below, and from that other farther obligation that aroſe from the *Churches binding*, there will be no matter of doubt, but as the *Governour* of the *Church authoritatively* by *commiſſion* from *Chriſt*, preacheth the *Word*, adminiſtreth *Sacraments*, and inflicts *cenſures*, ſo he may *authoritatively* too, *abſolve* on earth, free from *puniſhments* in the *Church* inflicted on ſinners, without any neceſſity of interpoſing, or medling (ſave only *indirectly*, or as I ſaid, by way of *conſequence*) with that which is due from God to them in another World; to which purpoſe 'tis ordinarily obſervable in the *Canons* of the *Councils*, that *à pace Eccleſia arceri, being driven from the peace of the Church*, is the expreſſion of being *excommunicated*, and *pacem dari*, is to be received into *communion* again. In other places we find both together, *Communio pacis*, *communion of peace*, all noting that, which excommunication deprived them of, to be the *peace* or favour, or *pardon* of the *Church* peculiarly, and not *Gods peace* or pardon, or favour directly, but either by ſuppoſing the perſon fit to be ſo dealt with, to be formerly deprived by *God* of that, or by way of *conſequence* accidentally, more ſurely faſtning him under God's diſfavour, if this wrought not on him, the good deſired effect of reformation. *Concil. Eliber. Can.* 61. *Can.* 47.

To all which, by way of *Corollary* I ſhall add, that the bare *binding* of the *Church* (abſtracted from *Sect.* 106.
our *contempt* of, and *perverſe* ſtanding out againſt it) cannot damn any which is not otherwiſe (and if he were not thus *bound*) in a damnable eſtate, that is, hath not any real influence on his damnation (ſave only to bind him farther to it, in caſe he doth not ſubmit to it) diſtinct from that which proceeds from his *ſin*, upon which he is *bound*, and from his *refractorineſs* continued in, in *deſpight* of this *cenſure*, (which no doubt may make his caſe more highly dangerous, as the *word is the ſavour of death to them that believe not*) but is rather a means tending, as it is deſigned, to the *ſaving* of him, as in the next *Chapter* ſhall appear.

On the other ſide *looſing* on earth, or the *abſolution* of the *Church* ſhall not free any *impenitent* un- *Sect.* 107.
reformed ſinner, *in foro cœli*, *i. e.* obtain *pardon* for any that is not *contrite*, (much leſs turn *attrition* into *contrition*, as the *Romaniſts*, or a *votum pœnitentiæ*, *a wiſhing we were penitent* into *penitence*, as others dream) but will rather be a means of *damning* him the deeper, of *betraying* him to, and hardning him in an *impenitent* eſtate, who is abſolved, or freed from under that *diſcipline* before he be *reform'd*; which therefore the *Church* in pure *Charity* to the man is bound not to do, but to continue him under the *puniſhment* till it produce the *reformation*.

CHAP. V.

Sect. 1. FOR the third enquiry, *the end or use to which this binding is designed, &c.* there will not be so much occasion to enlarge; 'tis speedily stated by answering that the whole end, aim, design, in inflicting of *publick Church-censures*, may be reduced to these three heads: 1. νουθεσία, for *reformation of the offender*: 2. ἀποκατάστασις, the *repairing, or making up the honour of the Church*, which suffered by him: and 3. παράδειγμα, *that others may be warned by the example of his punishment*, and not corrupted by example of his sin, but especially to reform those by these *sharper methods*, which no other calmer means of admonitions will work on, to *cut* off that member that *balsams* will not cure, or keep from *gangrening*, according to that of the *writer* of the *Answers Ad Orthodox.* Ὅτι δὲ τῆς μακροθυμίας τῶν ὑβριζομένων ὁ χρόνος διορθώσεως, τότε ἡ ἀποτομία τῆς μακροθυμίας τοῖς ἀδιορθώτοις ἔσται χρησιμωτέρα, *when by long-suffering offenders are not reformed, then excision to them which are not corrigible, is more useful than clemency.* For both those distant ways, 1. of application of Plaisters, and 2. of excision, are the same Physicians methods of preserving the whole, and proportionably to them the ministration of the *Word* and *Sacraments* are the Churches first *method*, and when that fails to produce its effect, this other of *censure* is the second, (and upon the good working of that, *Absolution*) wherein the Governours of the Church are as truly σύνεργοι, or *co-workers* with *Christ*, to *bring back* sons unto God, as they are to *beget* them in the *preaching* of the Word.

Sect. 2. To which purpose you may see and observe what the *Apostle* constantly adds to his sentences of *binding*, or *excommunication*, or delivering up to *Satan*, ἵνα σωθῇ τὸ πνεῦμα, 1 *Cor.* 5. 5. *the destruction of the flesh*, that *the Spirit may be saved*, &c. So of *Hymenæus* and *Alexander*, 1 *Tim.* 1. 20. *I have delivered them up to Satan*, ἵνα παιδευθῶσι μὴ βλασφημεῖν, *that they may be disciplined*, instructed, taught *not to blaspheme*, or *resist contumaciously*, whence the word παιδεύεσθαι, (which we render *taught*) in a *common notion*, may perhaps be more *critically* taken in a notion peculiar to this purpose, by way of reference to the *punishments* amongst the *Jews*. For of the four *punishments* put into *Esdras*'s hand by *Artaxerxes*, *Esd.* 7. 26 the second (rendred by us *banishment*, but in *Heb. eradication, i.e.* saith *Schindler*, casting out of his *inheritance*) is in the Septuagint παιδεῦσαι, and so vulgarly παιδεία for *discipline* or *punishment*, but there peculiarly for distermination, and so the fitter to express, this turning out of the *Church*, this *Church-banishment*, or distermination: So 2 *Thess.* 3. 14. μὴ συναναμίγνυσθαι αὐτῷ, ἵνα ἐντραπῇ, the end of *Excommunication* is again, *that he may be ashamed*, that he may see himself alone, no *company* but the devil thought bad enough for him, and so be brought to sense and shame of his own vileness, which is the most necessary preparative to *Reformation*; and therefore, to signifie it an act of *mercy* and *charity*, of all other the greatest, (though under the shew of *severity* and *wrath*) it follows in that place, *verse* 15. Καὶ μὴ ὡς ἐχθρὸν ἡγεῖσθε ἀλλὰ νουθετεῖτε ὡς ἀδελφόν, *Count him not as an enemy, but admonish him as a brother*, and therefore *Matth.* 18. 18. the doctrine of *binding*, &c. is used as a means of exemplifying that great *Evangelical truth*, verse 11. that *Christ* came σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός to *save*, rescue, deliver, reduce *that which was lost*, *i.e.* impenitent sinners, or those, that the soft ministry of the Word would do no good on.

Sect. 3. For there being (among others) two principal means of continuing men in sin. 1. In some an opinion, that *Christian profession*, or the bare being *Christians* (however qualified, or demeaning themselves) will stand them in stead, and prove sufficient; or if not so, yet the *creditableneß* of an *unchristian*, impious life, so long as they may be allowed but the *Christian name* (mens general design being to get the *praise of men*, not of *God*.) 2. In others a mistaking *sorrow* or *attrition*, or any the most slight *wish* that they were *penitent*, for that repentance which Christ *calls* for, and *accepts* and crowns: It follows hence, that unless men may be driven out of these *false holds*, they will never set themselves aright in the way to that great work, and therefore proportionable to these two heads, are the two exercises *of the power of the Keys* designed, the first to turn the *Christian* professor, that will go on in sin, quite out of all society of *Christianity*, not allowing him the privileges of his *Christianity*, the *Word*, the *Sacraments*, &c. unless he will walk *worthy* of so honourable a *vocation*; the second to set him his task of *repentance*, to prescribe him some κρίσεις and probations, by which he shall be discerned, whether he be in earnest contrite and willing to make his *peace* with Heaven, to take any the most laborious course to approve himself to Christ. The former of these in the act of *excommunication*, the latter in imposing the *penance*, upon which he shall be received again, and both together to *bring sinners to repentance*.

Sect. 4. When sinners by *obstinacy* provoke God, 'tis his manner to *withdraw his grace*, to deliver them up to themselves, (a worse kind of devil or Satan) that by this means they may see their former forlorn condition, their vileness first, and then their *danger*, and so he uses to bring the *secure*, proud sinner to *humility*, to the use of *prayer*, and wrestling with God, to raise him out of this *sad* estate. And so the Church in like manner by *Christs* direction withdraws the benefits and privileges of Christians, from those whom it judges *contumacious*, delivers them up to plain *barbarousneß* and *heathenism*, deals with them, as God did with *Nebuchadnezzar* driving him from the Court into the Wilderness, transforming him into the shape of a very beast; and all to this end, that his *understanding* might by that means *return* to him, the *field* teach him lessons of *piety*, whom the *palace* could not. Agreeable to which is that of *Pletho* upon *Zoroaster*, Αἱ ποιναὶ ἤτοι αἱ κολάσεις δαίμονες, ἀγχόνῃσι τὴν ἀνθρώπων ὕβριν, ἤτοι συνεχλικαὶ τῷ ἀπάγειν τῆς κακίας αὐτὸς, τῇ ἀρετῇ ἐγκαταδῦσαι. *The revengeful devils or furies do gripe men to bring them off from sin, and set them on vertue.*

Sect. 5. And then as *afflictions* are one of Gods *engines* and stratagems to besiege, enter, and take the soul, (*when he slew them, they sought him*, saith the *Psalmist*) So among the *Apostles* were those *corporal inflictions*, diseases, *&c.* superadded on purpose to make the *impression* more violent, and to work more effectually on their hearts.

The

The effectualneſs of which we may diſcern in one of the degrees of *penitents* in the ancient Church, *Sect.* 6.
namely προσκλαίοντες, whom we find *weeping* and *howling* in the *Church-porch*, not permitted to come in, lying without, for them that enter'd to tread on in their paſſage, which was certainly a means to make them *prize* thoſe *benefits* more dearly, which they ſaw themſelves interdicted, and others partakers of, and withal to read them a Lecture of their own *unworthineſs*, ſeeing themſelves of the number of *thoſe dogs and evil workers* that are without.

The ſecond end which I named, was the *repairing the honour and dignity of the Church*, which con- *Sect.* 7.
ſiſting in the *purity* of the lives of Chriſtian profeſſors, is neceſſarily loſt both in the opinion of *God*, and *men*, (eſpecially thoſe *which are without*) by the impieties and unchriſtian actions of many which are called by *Chriſts Name*, which is therefore by the Apoſtle ſaid to be *blaſphemed* or *evil ſpoken of*, when Chriſtians fall into any notorious ſins, and then there is no way to recover the *reputation* of the *Church*, and even of the *Chriſtian Religion*, and in a kind of *Chriſt* himſelf, but by expreſſing the wrath and diſpleaſure of the *Church* againſt thoſe, who walk thus *inordinately*, and ſo proclaiming unto all, that *Chriſtianity* is not a Doctrine (as *Zoſimus*, and *Celſus*, and *Julian* miſtook it) of ſecurity or impunity to any ſort of impenitents, but of ſtrict, preciſe, exact *purity*, though ſome ungracious perſons walk contrary to thoſe preſcriptions: This is the only *tabula poſt naufragium*, *plank* or means of relief, when the *fame* and good name of the *Church* is thus *ſhipwracke*, and ſo fit to be deſigned in the ſecond place.

A third gain and profit deſigned by theſe cenſures is the *warning and admoniſhing* of others; not *Sect.* 8.
leſt they ſhould be *polluted* by preſence among the *prophane*, as they that toucht the unclean thing were polluted under the Law, (any farther than by the *ſpreading*, leprous quality of their *example*) which is the common errour of the *proud* faſtidious *Phariſees* of all ages, and is clearly confuted by Saint *Paul*, 1 *Cor.* 5. 10. (where the μὴ συναναμίγνυσθαι is not extended to *Heathen fornicators*, which ſure would be able to *pollute by ſociety* as much as *Chriſtian* ſinners) and by *Clemens* or that ancient Author under his name, *Conſtit. Ap. l.* 2. *c.* 14. who hath a notable place to fortifie againſt this miſtake, ſpeaking of thoſe which (ἀνηλεῶς λέγουσι μὴ δεῖν τοιούτοις συμμολύνεσθαι, ὡσὰν λόγῳ κοινωνεῖν) *unmercifully affirm that men ought not to pollute themſelves by accompanying with ſinners, nor converſe with them*, αὐτὰ γὰρ ἃ συμβαίνει ἀγνοοῦντων ἐστὶ θεὸν, καὶ τὴν αὐτοῦ σοφίαν, ἀλόγων καὶ κτηνῶν, καὶ θηρίων ἀμιλίκτων, ἃ γὰρ γινώσκουσιν ὅτι χρὴ φυλάσσεσθαι ἃ τὴν ἐν λόγῳ κοινωνίαν οὐδεὶς πω ἐμαρτύρησε, ἀλλὰ τὴν ἐν ἔργῳ) *For ſuch reaſonings ſavour of men that know not God and his providence, of unreaſonable judges, and untamed beaſts. For they obſerve not that the communion with ſinners that muſt be avoided, is not that of converſing with, but imitating of them, not ſpeaking, but doing with them.*

But the deſign is to ſet a *brand* upon ſuch *ſins*, which otherwiſe might haply be thought *imitable*, and inſenſibly grow into faſhion, and ſo infect, and pollute, were not men thus told of their *uglineſs*, ſhew'd their *deformity*, and forewarn'd of their *danger*, which is ſure another act of mercy to all eaſie, *ſeducible* ſpectators, to the *Church* it ſelf, and to him whoſe *ſcandalous ſins* are by this means hindred from being *damners* of other men.

And as the *cenſures* themſelves, ſo the *inexorableneſs*, or at leaſt, *difficulty* of ſome Ages, (of *Ca-* *Sect.* 10.
nons of *Councils*, and practice of *Churches*) in granting of *abſolution* to *penitents*, that alſo hath been deſigned out of pure *charity* to help multiply their *fruits* of *repentance*, to ſet a value on *Gods Ordinances*, to quicken their *zeal*, to *demonſtrate* their *ſincerity* both to others and to their own ſouls, each of which might perhaps be miſſing, if *abſolution* were over-eaſily obtainable.

All which the more it is weighed, (how this *inſtitution* of *Chriſts*, (beſides that, as 'tis ſo, it ought *Sect.* 11.
not to be neglected) is an act of ſpecial *Chriſtian charity* in not *ſuffering ſin upon thy neighbour, but in any wiſe rebuking him*, *Levit.* 19. 17.) the more reproachful will it be to this age of ours, the more bitter Paſquin, and laſting σηλιτεύτικον, when it ſhall be told in *Gath* and *Askalon*, that for ſome years the arts of ſome uncharitable men have ſo prevailed, that all exerciſe of this *inſtitution* of *Chriſt* hath been *caſt* and *kept* out of this *Church* of ours; the firſt, I think, that is recorded ſince *Chriſt*'s time to have continued any conſiderable ſpace without *Liberty* of uſing that *power* of the *Keys* in *excommunication*, left unto the *Church* by *Chriſt*. The Lord be merciful to us in this matter.

As for them who either look upon this in others (or uſe it themſelves) as a matter of *ſecular* ad- *Sect.* 12.
vantage, or accruement either of *power* or *gain* to the rulers of the *Church*, and ſo as a *carnal* deſign or engine diſguiſed in the ſhape of a *ſpiritual* inſtitution, and on that ground either are willing by their *calumnies* to help rend it out of the hands of the *Church*, or being themſelves in place, either by paſſion, or miſtake, or ſloth betray it to the *odium* and cenſure of other men (whoſe ſhortneſs of diſcourſe cannot ſeparate the *order* from the *perſon*, or the *abuſe* from the *inſtitution*) I ſhall ſuppoſe they will change their minds, and their practices, when I ſhall have given them one advertiſement, which I may hope to do more effectually, not only by putting them in mind of Saint *Chryſoſtoms* judgment, who in this very matter having reſolv'd ὅτι μεγάλη ἡ τῶν ἱερέων ἀξία, &c. *that the ſacerdotal dignity in pardoning and retaining of ſins is very great*, expreſſes that preſently by this only way of probation, that a *Prieſt* if he live never ſo well himſelf, if he be not accurately careful of other mens lives, μετὰ τῶν πονηρῶν δεῖ τὴν γέενναν ἄπεισι, *he bears thoſe wicked men* (which he reform'd not) *company to hell*; and often when he is not betrayed by his own, he periſhes by other mens ſins, if he have not done all things rightly, which may tend to their recovery, and in that, ſounds all the reſpect and obedience that Saint *Paul* requires to be paid to the ἡγούμενοι: But alſo, and eſpecially if I preſent it to them in a brief paraphraſe of one place of *Scripture*, which by miſtake and raſh judgment, is wont to be produced againſt all exerciſe of *power* in *Churchmen*, but being rightly weighed, as it doth not take away the power which we only plead for, that of exerciſing *charity*, of *diſciplining*, *reforming*, *i. e.* doing the greateſt *good* to thoſe that are placed under us, ſo will it teach every man (to whom that *power* is intruſted) to learn nothing but *meekneſs* and diligence, and all kind of *Chriſtian temper* from the condition and peculiarity of this *honour*, and authority of his.

The place is that known Text, *Matth.* 20. I ſhall deduce it from the beginning of the ſence, and *Sect.* 13.
lay it plain before you, *Verſe* 21. The *mother of Zebedees children* (having heard by her ſons of

the promiſe made to the *Diſciples* by *Chriſt*, *Matth.* 19. 28. that they ſhould have the dignity of ſo many φυλάρχαι, which among the *Jews*, was a dignity next unto the *Regal*) petitions Chriſt in the behalf of her two ſons, whom ſhe conceived favoured by him above all the reſt, judging it by the expreſſions to them two, and Saint *Peter*; and her petition was this; That (ſeeing in the equality of that dignity promiſed to all, there might be yet, nay (if it were according to the old *Jewiſh* pattern, where the πρωτεῖα belong'd to *Judah* and *Joſeph*) muſt be ſome kind of inequality, at leaſt a precedence of ſome before others) her ſons that he had ſhewed ſuch ſpecial kindneſs to, might have that favour by
22. him conferr'd on them. *Jeſus* repreſſes her demand by telling her, ſhe is miſtaken in the *kind of dignity* that ſhould be inſtated upon his Diſciples, 'twas not ſuch a one as in any *worldly* reſpects, would prove very *deſirable*, but a place of great *burthen*, ſubject to great perſecutions, and even death it ſelf, of which indeed her ſons ſhould undoubtedly taſte, as *Hiſtories* teſtifie they did. If this would
23. not ſatisfie her, then let her know her importunity ſhould gain nothing; for * the diſpoſing of any ſuch honours was to be according as *God* the Father had determined it, and although *all power* were conferred upon the *ſon* by the *father*, yet there was ſmall hope that the *ſon* ſhould thwart *God* the Fathers deſtination in any ſuch act of dignifying any. This was fully ſatisfactory to the woman, and therefore ſhe (nor her ſons) reply not; But the reſt of the Diſciples upon advertiſement what had paſt, begin to mock the two brethren, and ſo there is another tempeſt raiſed which Chriſt muſt alſo calm; and therefore to this *indignation* of the *Diſciples* (not now to the *ambitious requeſt* of the *mother*, or *brethren*) he accommodates an anſwer; that they need not be offended at the *ambition* of thoſe
24. *brethren*; for if they had had their deſires, they had been but ſmall gainers by it; for in Chriſt's
25. Kingdom *preeminence* ſignified (or brought along with it) no great ſecular felicity, (ſuch as was to be found among Heathen Emperours (*the great* ones) and *Princes*, that being under them, and over others, ὠφελοῦντο ὑπ' ἀνδρῶν, in *Xenophons* preface to his Κύρου Παιδεία, were ſerved and *benefited* by their ſubjects, *This is the manner of the King*, 1 *Sam.* 8. 11. all Kings among the Nations receiving tributes and the like from their ſubjects, and by them being maintained in all that ſplendor and greatneſs that belonged to them, all their pomp, and expences of their Families and Courts being fetcht out of their ſubjects purſes and perſons, which, ſaith *Samuel* there, would make them think their preſent eſtate, wherein God was their King, much better to them, *ver.* 18. And this is meant by δυναστεύειν, *ver.* 28. having and uſing their power in order to their own profits, κατακυριεύοντες, behaving themſelves as *lords* and *maſters* over ſo many *ſervants*, (like thoſe *Nehem.* 5. 15. where the following word ἐξουσιάζειν is uſed) but quite contrary, an office of *burthen*, and *pains*, and *humility*, and doing of *ſervice*, (as
26. Saint *Mark* reads it more clearly, not ἴσον, but ἴσται, *Chap.* 10. 43. *ſhall be your Miniſter*) and he that will have that preeminence, muſt provide himſelf for that task, by the qualifications which are moſt agreeable to that, and count of that way both of acquiring and enjoying it, for otherwiſe it will not be had; (and upon theſe terms you need not envy them it) as you may gueſs by *Chriſt* himſelf, whoſe *kingdom* in this world was of this nature, not adminiſtred in that way as might bring in *ſplendour* or *profit* to himſelf, but in acts of *charity*, *miniſtring* of all kinds of *grace*, enduring, and ſerving, and dying for his people, and not requiring that ſervice, thoſe offices from them, as other Kings have done.

Sect. 14. This excludes not *Diſciples* of *Chriſt* from power, (for he regulates them by his own example, and no farther, and he, we know, was not only as God, *King of kings*, and *Lord of lords*, but as θεάνθρωπος, had *all power given unto him in heaven and in earth*, and in this his ſtate of condeſcenſion here, he was a *Maſter* over his *Diſciples*; and when he was called *Good maſter*, although he asked, *why he called him good?* yet the title of *Maſter* he diſclaims not, nay tells them clearly that they *did well*, *who called him Maſter*, and Κύριε, *Lord*, *Joh.* 13. 13.) but ſhews the lot that was like to befall them, the ſame that did him, whoſe greatneſs was expreſt in *humility*, and *charity*, and *patience*, and offices of *ſervitude*, and ſo the greater any of them ſhould be, the greater portion of theſe ſhould be expected from them, as the appendage of their greatneſs; which conſideration fully makes up the τὸ λογικὸν, or rational importance of the place, which was to be anſwer ſatisfactory, 1. to the *ambition* of the two brethren, by diſabuſing them; 2. to the envy or indignation of the reſt, by ſhewing, that this preeminence was no fit object for any ones *envy*, but *pity* rather.

Sect. 15. As for the uſe of κατακυριεύειν, 'twill be beſt rendred *to lord it*, to play the *lord*, and the importance of that, diſcerned by the word δυναστεύειν that follows, *verſe* 28. or if you will by comparing it with 1 *Pet.* 5. *verſe* 3. where 'tis explained by that which precedes in the ſame ſence, *verſe* 2. by *feeding*, or *governing* (for ſo ποιμαίνειν ſignifies) ἀναγκαστῶς, by *force*, or *violence*, ἀισχροκερδῶς, to *make gain filthy*, unlawful gain, *of the flock*, which is all one with δυναστεύειν, (as in the *Goſpel*, *heathen Kings* did over their people) contrary to that *of ruling* others by ſhewing them his own exemplary obedience, ſetting them patterns to tranſcribe, which certainly is the Clergy-mans duty, (and beſt way of ruling, if it may poſſible prevail) ὁ δεῖ μὴ πλήκτην, μὴ αἰσχροκερδῆ, who muſt be *no ſtriker*, *no covetous perſon*, *Titus* 1. 17. and to the ſame purpoſe, 1 *Tim.* 3. 3, 4, 5. and ſo ſure 2 *Cor.* 1. 24. Κυριεύειν ſignifies *imperious* behaviour in any kind, as there *over* mens *faith*, very contrary to *meek*, *gentle* perſwaſion, the method that Saint *Paul* and all followers of him ought to uſe, and I ſhall never excuſe them if they do not.

Sect. 16. All which I ſuppoſe not impertinent (as to juſtifie the *authority*, ſo) to *limit* and *regulate* the *uſe* of that, and determine it to that one *Chriſtian ſpiritual* end, the *reforming* and *winning*, and *ſaving* of ſouls; a thing of all other the moſt contrary to *oppreſſing* or *violating*, *invading* or tyrannizing over them, in brief (to them which have need of it) the only ſeaſonable *mercy* and *Charity* in the World, thus in *any wiſe to reprove*, and not *hate* or *ſuffer ſin* upon my *brother*.

Sect. 17. For the other part of the ſecond *enquiry*, who are the *objects* of theſe *cenſures*, ſubjected to the *power* of the *keys* by *Chriſt*, I anſwer, 1. *Negatively*, that the *ſupreme Magiſtrate* in every Kingdom is exempted from it, not only *à poſteriori*, becauſe the offering him up to *ſhame* and contumely (which is the work of *excommunication*) would be a certain means to expoſe him to the *contempt* of his ſubjects, and ſo be in danger to diſſolve and ſhake the peace and ſetled Government of a *Kingdom*, (which I ſuppoſe to have been the deſign of that peſtilent *Romiſh Hildebrandine* or *Gregorian* Doctrine,

* οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμὸν δοῦναι ἀλλ' οἷς ἡτοίμασται. *It is not mine to give, ſave to whom it is prepared, &c.*

Doctrine, that the Subjects of an *excommunicate Prince* were discharged from their allegiance, which was but a small encrease of the former doctrine (if that were supposed true) of Christs placing a power in the hands of the *Church* to *excommunicate Princes*, for from the concession of that, the other would generally follow of its own accord, and need no new doctrine to help it forward, the universal distemper of mens *passions* being a sufficient encouragement to the many, to cast off *allegiance* to those persons which they conceive themselves taught by *Christ*, and so by *Christianity* appointed to *despise*;) but also *à priori*, because *Christ* found the World disposed by his Father, in a regular subjection of all men, to the powers placed over them (and those higher powers at the time of *Christs* birth, as far as stories will help us to discern, were all *Regal* or *Monarchical* through the whole World) and was so far from changing that course by any new law of his, that he laboured by all means possible, to settle and confirm it on that basis, and not so much as to accept, when it was *offered* him, the exercise of any *Secular* or *civil* power, but to submit himself, and consequently all his, and so all that can plead or pretend any title from him, (καὶ ἀντιολ☉, καὶ ἰνλουσ☉, &c. say the Fathers) to the ὑπερέχουσαν ἐξουσίαν, *the supream power* in any Kingdom. For the practice and opinion of the Church to this matter, through all times, infinite testimonies might be alledged. I shall refer the Reader to *David Blondel* in his book, *de formulâ Regnante Christo*, and not endeavour a further disproving of that Doctrine which he thought more worthy of an exclamation in the language of St. *Athanasius*, *ad Epist.* Τίς ἤκουσε ταῦτα πάντοτε, ἢ τίς ὁ διδάξας, ἢ μαθὼν, ταῦτα πρὸ τοῦ ἐξῆλθε, καὶ ☉ Ἅδης ἐμέσατο; τίς δ' ἤκουσεν ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἢ ὅλως παρὰ χριστιανοῖς; *Who ever in the Church or among Christians, heard or taught, or learnt that Gregorian Doctrine? What an hell was it which vomited it out?* I shall add no more to the negative part, which being supposed, and to be remembred in that which follows, P. 187, 188, 189, &c.

I answer in the second place, positively, That the objects of this *Church-charity* or *Church-censures* are, every *open notorious* offender, (whose crimes come to our cognizance, whether by *complaint* of others, by *notoriety* of the action, or by his own *confession*) that lives, and indulges himself in any *grievous* crime, any wilful sin; Every such I say is to be *bound* by the *Church*, when after *admonition* first *less*, then more *publick*, he continues *refractory*, unreformed, and not till then. The more shame for the over-*easie* denouncers of that *censure*, that either inflict it on every *trivial* commission, without consideration whether repented of or no; or that use this *soveraign recipe*, this *generosum medicamentum*, (that, say *Artists*, must not be cast away, either on the *wanton*, or the *desperate* patient, but only on those whom we see to *want* it, and hope it may do some good on) this strong *Physick*; this last and most generous medicament so ‖ *unadvisedly* and *uncharitably*, so for any other end, rather than reforming of prophane men. Sect. 18.

‖ Hence *Avitus Alcimus*, Ep. 61. to *Constantius* the Bishop, *Illud monere præsumo ne propter leves causas, & non ad Deum, sed sæculum pertinentes, ne Laici quidam, non dicam Clerici, sanctâ communione priventur, quia nefas cujus dignitatis sit ipsa communio, qui non tam omni animositate sepositâ & cum magno dolore suspendit, & cum maximâ festinatione restituit.* vid. *Can.* 2. *Concil. Aurel.* 5. & *Leon. magn. Ep.* 89. taxing *Hilary* for that fault.

Then for *loosing*, who is capable of that, is agreed in *general*, the greatest sinners upon *approbation* of their *repentance*: As for *Novatus* who denied *absolution* to the *Lapsi*, he himself was *censur'd* and punished for that *severity*, as you may see in the 8. *Can. of the Nicene Council*, on which saith *Zonaras*, ἀνεκλήθη καὶ ἀναθεματίσθη, *he was cast out and anathematix'd in a Council at Rome*, *Cornelius* being *Pope*, and *Decius Emperour*, Καὶ μὴ περὶ τὴν πίστιν ἐσφάλλετο, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸ ἀσυμπαθὲς αὐτῷ, καὶ μισάδελφον, *Though he offended not in matter of faith, yet for his want of compassion and kindness to the brethren.* Sect. 19.

But then, what degree of *approbation* will serve turn, what time of *humiliation*, what *fruits* and evidences of *repentance* may be thought sufficient to give *capacity* of this loosing? The judgment of *Councils* and *Churches* have much varied in that particular, the * *Roman* being anciently milder than any other Churches; and how much these *latter ages* have been more favourable to the guiltiest sons of the *Church*, than the most merciful of the first ages had learned to be, even those very *Councils* that condemn'd the severity of *Novatus* and the *Cathari*, are able to testifie; I will give you but an hint or two out of the *Canons* of the Council of *Nice*, (before quoted against *Novatus*) *Can.* 11. the *Council* speaking of them that fell in the time of *Licinius* his *Tyranny*, χωρὶς ἀνάγκης, ἢ χωρὶς ἁρπαγῆς ὑπαρχόντων, ἢ χωρὶς κινδύνου, *without any violence, or plundering, or danger of either, the censure* is, that upon true and unfeigned *repentance*, τρία ἔτη οἱ ἀκροώμενοι ποιήσουσι, *Three years shall they continue among the Audients* (i.e. saith *Zonaras*, ἔξω τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἑστῶτας ἐν τῷ νάρθηκι, καὶ ἅμα πίστιν ἀκούοντας γραφῶν) *stand without the Church in the porch so long, and only partake in hearing the holy Scriptures.* Then καὶ ἔπειτα ἔτη δέκα ὑποπεσοῦνται (i.e. saith *Zonaras*, ἔτι δὲ μὴ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐνδέχεσθαι, &c.) *for the space of seven years more they shall have leave to be admitted within the Church, but to be behind a pillar, near the door, and go out with the Catechumens.* Ten years already you see, and yet farther, Δύο ἔτη χωρὶς προσφορᾶς κοινωνήσουσι τῇ λαῷ τῆς προσευχῆς, *Two years shall they joyn in prayer with the people, but without the oblation*: i.e. saith *Zonaras*, *they shall not yet be vouchsafed the participation of the holy things, till these two years be over.* This *approbation* of their *repentance* cost them, it seem, no less than 12. years. * *Vid. Grot. in Heb.* p. 810. Sect. 20.

But then the same *Council* speaking of others, that having made some profession of *Christian valour*, like *dogs returned to their vomit again*, *Can.* 12. resolves, διὰ τῶν αὐτῶν ὅρων μετὰ τῆς τριετοῦς τῆς ἐκφόρου χρόνον, *After the three years in the porch among the audients, they must be ten years at the pillar*; the *seven years* it seems are improved into ten, and 'tis probable the two years of *communicating* χωρὶς προσφορᾶς still behind, and so the probation fifteen years long. Sect. 21.

Only the Bishop had power left him of the *remitting* of this *severity*, if he saw them (ἰδὼν δάκρυα καὶ ὑπομονὴν καὶ ἀγαθοεργίαν ἢ ἐπιτροπὴν ἔργῳ καὶ σχήματι ἐπιδεικνύμενα, *by humility, and tears, and patience, and almsdeeds, demonstrate their conversion to be sincere, not feigned.* And so *Alcimus* to *Victorius* the Bishop, *Auctoritatis vestræ est, errantium compunctione perspectâ, severitatis ordinem temperare*; *'Tis the part of your authority, when you perceive the compunction of those that have sinned, to temper the order of severity*, i.e. to receive him earlier into the Church, *Epist.* 16. Sect. 22.

That which might be added in this point out of the antient *Canons*, would be endless to report, he that would see a particular description of the several *degrees* of these *penitents*, may have it very Sect. 23.

clearly

clearly ſet down in *Sozomens* Hiſtory, *l.*7. *c.* 17. and I ſhall not ſo much as enquire what grounds our latter ages have had to remit ſo much of the *antient diſcipline*, till at length it be crumbled and moultred away into a *nothing*, or a meer *formality*: what is amiſs in it, I beſeech God may be reformed.

*Sect.*24. I ſhall only add to this Chapter, that there have been in the practice of the *Church*, (I ſay not grounded in thoſe Texts of the Goſpel) two ſorts of binding; One *temporary* or *penitential* when the perſon confeſſes himſelf *penitent*, and deſires the *abſolution* of the *Church*, at leaſt when there is *hope* of *repentance*, in which caſe the cuſtom hath been to impoſe for ſome ſet time the ἔργα ἄξια μετανοίας, ſuch *works* as are agreeable to that *repentance*, and proportion'd to the former *ſin*, and not to abſolve, till what is impoſed, be performed. This the *Nicene Fathers* expreſs by this ſtile, [ἐφ' ὃν ὁ χρόνος ὥρισται καὶ καιρὸς τέτακται] *for whoſe penance the time is defined, and the ſeaſon ſet*, Zonaras by (καιρὸν ὡρισμένον τῇ μετανοίᾳ τῶν παραπεπτωκότων) *the ſpace determined for the penance of thoſe that had faln*: And *Alcimus* by *propoſitis obſervationibus interim ab Eccleſiâ ſequeſtraxi, to be appointed ſome obſervances, and in the mean time to be ſequeſtred from the Church*: *& notâ excommunicationis indictâ, donec publicâ panitentiæ profeſſione deſuescant, ſetting a mark*: (anſwerable to the σημειῶσθαι in St. *Paul*) of *excommunication upon him, till by publick profeſſion of repentance he diſuſe his former courſe*, a kind of *Niddui*, or temporary remotion; The ſecond abſolute, *& ſine præfinito tempore, without any certain definition of time.* When men are refractory, and give no hope of amendment, and that is a kind of *Schammatha*, *Alcimus*'s *irrevocable anathema*, the binding over for ever, *perennis excommunicatio*, *Turon. Concil.* 2. *c.*20. *Pariſ. conc.* 3. *can.* 5. or *uſque ad reformationem*, for ever if they reform not. The former of theſe is ſometimes, but not always, an *excluſion*, or *abſciſſion* from the *Church*, (but ſometimes on the other ſide a command to *frequent* the prayers of the Church, or the Sacrament, every Lords day for ſuch a ſpace, hath been the *penance* or *diſcipline*) nor conſequently is it a *binding* that man ſo, that his ſin is not yet *pardoned on earth*, but 'tis deſigned for other uſes, for ſatisfaction to the Churches *edification*, *&c.* But they of the ſecond ſort are truly under that *band*, and cut off from the communion of the *Church*, and by no means admitted to the *ſervices* of it.

CHAP. VI.

Sect. 1. THere is but one enquiry now behind, *i. e.* what is the real *effect* of *binding* and *looſing*, or what conjunction it hath with *binding and looſing* in Heaven. Which though it be the weighticſt conſideration of all the four, yet ſhall I have occaſion to ſay leaſt to it, and indeed only this, that a *cenſure* of the *Church* is a venerable thing, not only caſting a *Chriſtian* out of the *Church*, wherein he is appointed to ſeek ſalvation, and of which as long as he is thought unworthy, he is uncapable of Heaven; but withal a *ſuperaddition* to the *band* in Heaven, by which that ſin is made *indiſſoluble* before God, till it be *abſolved* on earth, or that *abſolution* duly ſought from the *Church*; Chriſt having affirmed of him, that in this caſe his ſins ſhall not be *pardoned* there; as on the other ſide, that being by *repentance return'd* to that capacity, *heaven* ſhall return again to be his portion, and that *pardon* by the promiſe of *Chriſt* become due to him.

Sect. 2. The plain reaſon of it is, The denunciation is *irreverſible*, and indiſpenſably *univerſal*, [*Except you repent you ſhall all periſh*] and the promiſe as infallible and immutable [He that *confeſſeth* and *forſaketh ſhall have mercy.*] Now the *binding*, if it be as it ſhould be, (*clave non errante*) ſuppoſeth the man *impenitent* and *refractory*, and ſo to continue till he uſe means to return to the *peace* of the *Church* again, and then without controverſie, whoſoever is ſo *bound on earth*, (caſt out of the Church for an *impenitent* and *refractory*, and continuing ſo) is *bound in heaven*, caſt out from all title to that by God alſo. To which purpoſe is that known antient paſſage in *Tertullians* Apol. ſpeaking of theſe Cenſures. *Judicatur cum magno pondere ut apud certos de Dei conſpectu. Summumque futuri judicii præjudicium eſt, ſi quis ita deliquerit, ut à communicatione orationis & conventus, & omnis ſancti commercii relegetur. c.* 39. *The judgments of the Church are exerciſed with great weight, as being among them that are certainly reſolved that they are in the ſight of God. And it is but a preparative pronouncing or paſſing of the future judgment, if any man offend ſo highly, that he be baniſh'd from communication, or partaking of prayer, of Church-meetings, and all holy commerce.*

Sect. 3. But on the other ſide, he that upon his *repentance*, and *approbation* of that to be *ſincere*, is (*clave non errante*, ſtill) let into the *Church* again, is *ipſo facto* ſuppoſed to have right, (and by his *abſolution* that right ſealed to him *viſibly*, and *Chriſts promiſe* particularly for it) to *heaven*.

Sect. 4. Now if it be demanded, Whether a true *repentant* ſinner once *bound* by the Church be not preſently *looſed in heaven*, i. e. *pardoned* and forgiven at the firſt minute of his *repentance*, without (or before he receive) *abſolution* from the *Church*? I anſwer, that in caſe of *publick* or *ſcandalous* crimes, the *reformation* muſt be *publick* and notorious alſo. And to that purpoſe *confeſſion* and *ſatisfaction* before the *Congregation*, and him that *bound*, *i.e.* the *Governour* of the *Church* (to repair the injury done to the former by the ill *example*, and to teſtifie the *ſincerity* of the *repentant* to the latter) is neceſſarily required to the *approving* of this *repentance* even to *God*, without which *non remittetur peccatum*, there is no more *poſſibility of looſing in Heaven*, than hope of *abſolution on earth*. But on the *ſincere performance* of this, as there is no doubt but God will have *mercy*, will *looſe in Heaven*, will *juſtifie* and *pardon* that (ſuch a) penitent ſinner; ſo is the *Church-ruler on earth bound to looſe* him here below, to *reſtore* him to the *Church* alſo, as ſoon as by his *ſubmiſſion* to his *penance* he *approves* himſelf to him to be ſuch; and though 'tis poſſible he may be *ſincerely penitent* in *Gods* ſight, before he

he *appear* so to the *Church*, yet is he obliged to seek thus to *approve* himself to the *Church*, if his case have come under her *cognizance*, or in case he desire to have any of that *assurance* which is to be had from the *Church*; or by title to the *promise* in those texts.

And yet this exercise of the *keys*, is not to be conceived so *absolutely* necessary, that none can be *damned* without that *seal* of *damnation*, or *binding*, or *non-forgiveness*, nor again that none can be *saved*, or *forgiven* without the *seal* of *remission*; For sure the neglect of the *Bishop* in the first case, his not-performing his office of *excision*, is no way able to *rescue* the *impenitent* from the eternal guilt and *punishment* of his sins, but rather a means to leave him *remediless* unto it (his *binding* being indeed such a *remedy*, if it be made use of) and the bare want of the *remission* or *absolution*, so it be joyned with readiness to perform all that is *preparative* to it, and an hearty desire to be partaker of it, is in the merciful gracious Court of Gods *audience* sure to be accepted, when there is no space or room for more. For the words of *Christ* (*whatsoever you shall bind*, &c.) though they be universal, *binding all* in *Heaven* that are *bound on earth*, yet are they not *exclusive*, so as none shall be *bound in Heaven*, but such as are *bound on earth*, or in the *Church* below. Nor on the other side [*whatsoever you shall loose on earth, shall be loosed in Heaven.*] 'Tis [*Whatsoever ye, that I*] but not [*Whatsoever not ye, that not I*] and consequently, this double affirmation of *Christ* may be perfectly true; whosoever stand *bound* here, stand *bound* there; and whosoever are *absolved* here, are *absolved* there; and yet for all that are many *bound* in *Heaven*, which are not bound in the *Church*; and *loosed in Heaven* which are not *absolved* by the *Church*. And if the phrase used in St. *John* [*Whatsoever ye retain, it is retained*] seem to any to have an *exclusive* sence, thus, that what we *absolve* not here, we *do retain*; and consequently, that whom we *absolve* not, God will not *absolve*; I answer, that this is a mistake arising from the *equivocalness* of the word [retain] which in the *Greek* κρατέω (as we shewed) signifies no more in this place than δέω, or *binding* in the other *Gospels*, in which because that intimates not an *exclusive power*, neither will it be reasonable that this shall. And so much for the fourth particular also. *Sect.* 5.

To which, before we part from it, it will not perhaps be unseasonable (though I hope I shall not be obliged to justifie the *truth of the relations*) to annex a passage or two out of the latter stories of the *Greek Church*, (believed generally by them, and mention'd on affirmation of particular knowledge by some which have come from them to this place, and lived amongst us) which will acquaint us with the awe, and signifie the *opinion*, which it seems they have of the real efficacy of these *censures* of the *Church*. It is related (saith *Crusius* in *Turco-Gracia*) in the *Constantinopolitan histories*, that the *Sultan Mahomet* among other things concerning the *Christian Religion*, asked the *Patriarch Maximus*, περὶ τῆς ἀφορισμοῦ, *concerning excommunication*, of which he had heard ὅτι ὅτ' ἂν ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ ἱερεῖς τῶν χριστιανῶν ἀφορίσωσιν ἄνθρωπόν τινα, ἡ σαλεύεται ἐν τῇ γῇ καὶ φαίνεται ὅτε τὸν τάφον ἀφορισμένου, ἀντέχει ὡς τύμπανα καὶ φλάντες, *That if the high Priests, and Priests of the Christians should excommunicate any person upon just cause, the body of that man dissolves not in the earth, but remains entire and woole; and when the sepulchre of any such is opened, they appear like drums or timbrels and black*, i. e. the *body* swell'd, but whole, and withal much discoloured: And that upon *absolution* the *body is dissolved to dust*. In the truth of which tradition the *Sultan* desired to be confirmed by the *Patriarch*, who upon search made, found (saith he) that a certain *loose woman* having defamed a former *Patriarch*, *Gennadius Scholarius*, was by him *excommunicate*, and so died. Her *Sepulchre* Maximus *caused to be opened*, and (ὦ θαυμασίων Θεοῦ, *O the wonders of God*, saith he) εὑρέθη ὡς ἐτέθη, ἐξογκωμένη δὲ μόνον, καὶ μέλαινα, *She was found as she was at the time of her burial, only swell'd and black*. This (saith he) was certified to the *Sultan*, who sent some of his Nobles to view it, which they did with admiration, and caused the corps to be sealed up in a *coffin* with the *Imperial Seal*, and returned at a set day. Then the *Patriarch* opened it, and ἐτέλεσε λειτουργίαν, καὶ ἀνέγνω εὐχὴν συγχωρητικήν, *officiated and read the prayer of absolution: Whereupon the joynts of her hands and feet were immediately loosed.* They *sealed* it up again, and returning after three days found all turn'd to *dust*. This they reported to the *Sultan*, who wondred, and was astonished, and said, ὅτι θαυμασία καὶ ἀληθὴς ἡ πίστις αὐτῶν, *That the Religion and faith of the Christians was wonderful and true*. This same story is related again at large, *l.* 2. *Turco-Gr. sect.* 32. in the *Patriarchal History* of *Emanuel Malaxus* in vulgar Greek. A like example there is also of one *Arsenius*, who died *excommunicate*, *l.* 2. *sect.* 43. *p.* 151. and also of *Johannicius*, a *Pseudo-patriarch. l.* 2. *p.* 156. of whom, saith he, εὑρέθη ἀφορισμένος τυμπανιαῖος, *the excommunicate was found hard and swelled as a drum or timbrel*. And that these relations of the ἄλυτοι and τυμπανικοὶ are not without all truth, a man would be tempted to believe by the confident assertion of * *Jacobus a Goar* a *French* man, who spent six or seven years among them, and affirms *long a apud eos experientia compertum esse, excommunicati cujusvis corpus post mortem non putrescere*, that they had long experience of this truth, and that he himself had met with many witnesses who testified it upon knowledge, and that even the *Latines* that live among them, which are wont to scoff at their impostures, do not accuse this as such, but reverence it as an argument of the power of the Church, and for other examples and testimonies, he that shall desire them, may have store of those Notes of *Jac. a Goar*, *p.* 688. and 689. The truth of the passages, I hope it will not be expected of me to assert or confirm, (nor can I any further than the forementioned authority will bear) I shall rather give the Reader my conjecture, how this perswasion became so general, and these stories so confidently reported among them. It was, I suppose, from the observing, but not understanding in the *Gospel* the phrases of *binding and loosing*, which not knowing to what they belong'd (for the *modern Grecians* are far from being very learned) they may have applyed them to the *dissolving* or not *dissolving* of mens bodies in the earth, which they there expreis by ἀδιάλυτον, and ἀδιάλυτον, and λύονται, the word of the *Evangelist*. If this be not it, I have no more to say of it, but that it was a πάρεργον. * Not. in Eucholog. p. 688.

And now having taken this licence a little to expatiate, I shall enlarge my teather a little wider; and having said thus much of this custom of *excommunication* among *Jews* and *Christians*, proceed yet farther, *ex abundanti*, and by way of *appendix*, shew the consent of others, even of *Heathen* people in this matter, by that means (if not to confirm, as by an instance, that antient truth of *Clemens*, so oft repeated by him, Ἕλληνες δὲ καὶ πάλαι, The *Grecians knowledge* and solemn practices, are *gene-* *Sect.* 6.

rally

rally ſtoln *from the Jews*, yet) to ſhew the opinion of other men, imbued with other principles of *Theology*, by which the deſign of this former Treatiſe may with a *rational* man, who is not a Divine, be ſomewhat eſtabliſhed: I ſhall inſtance but in two particulars (becauſe it is but ἐκ παρέδρου, or as *ex abundanti*, that I ſay any thing of it.) The firſt, of the antient *Grecians*, as I find it mentioned by *Diod. Siculus*, *Bibl.* 16. in the diſcourſe of the ἱερὸς πόλεμος, the *ſacred War* betwixt the *Phocenſes* and *Lacedemonians* on one ſide, and the *Thebans*, &c. on the other; of which there is mention in *Thucydides*, but a full narration in *Diodorus Siculus* in the place fore-cited. From that one *Author*, in one *Page* theſe few things may be learnt by way of ſtory. 1. That on occaſion of *ſacrilege* or *invaſion* of the rights of their *Gods*, ἀποτεμνόντες τὴν θεὸν, as the *plowing up a piece of ſacred ground call'd Cirrhea* (which was the crime of the *Phocenſes*) or the taking in *War*, and ſeizing on the like place call'd *Cadmea* (which was the *Lacedemonians* fault) the Senate of the *Amphictyones* upon complaint of the ἱερομνήμονες or *recorders of holy things*, did *devote* or *Anathematize*, even a whole Country or *Region* at once, as that of the *Lacedemonians*, and that other of the *Phocenſes*. 2. That what was thus done, was *confirm'd by the Grecians* generally, *i.e.* by the *twelve* chief Cities of *Greece*, which were *independent* the one upon the other, and the *Amphictyones*, the *delegates* of thoſe *Cities*) τὰ δὲ Ἑλλήνων συνεπικυρώντων τὰ δόγματα τῶν Ἀμφικτυόνων, &c. 3. That though *Sacrilege* was the *occaſion* of this devoting, yet was it not the immediate *cauſe* or crime, wherein it was founded, but their not ſubmitting to ſome former puniſhments, not paying the *mulcts* which had been inflicted on them by the ſame *Judges* for that crime. The puniſhments of thoſe firſt crimes are there mentioned to have been great ſums of money laid on the offenders (κατεδίκασαν αὐτοὺς πολλοῖς χρήμασιν, and πολλοῖς τάλαντοις κατεκρίθησαν) and upon the not paying of that, this *devoting* follows. If this devoting were no more than a confiſcation, and that therefore made to the *Temple* of *Apollo*, becauſe that was the Plaintiff and had ſuffered the *injury*, then, I acknowledge, this *judgment* of the *Amphictyones*, being a *ſecular* judicature, will not come home to our *excommunication* as an *Eccleſiaſtical puniſhment*. Only it may paſs for an obſcurer *image* of it; And to that end it may further be obſerved in the *fourth* place, that the nature of this puniſhment conſiſted, 1. in the ſhame that it brought upon the offenders, ſuch as *Philomelus* tells his *Phocenſes*, ἀνάνδρων ὑπάρχει περιορᾶν, *'tis the part of unmanly perſons not to lay it to heart, or conſider it*: 2. In the conſequents of it, in that it would κίνδυνον ἐπιφέρειν καὶ τῷ τῶν πάντων εἴδει ἀνατροπὴν, *bring danger and ſubverſion to all their lives*, and that in two reſpects; 1. In reſpect of God, to whoſe *vengeance* they were thus *devoted*, (anſwerable to the παραπαῖ fore-mentioned, added to the ἀνάθεμα) in which reſpect it is, in order to the *Phocenſes*, called there καθιερῶσθαι, being *conſecrated* or *devoted*: 2. In reſpect of *men*, to whoſe *miſchief* alſo they were expoſed, (parallel to what we read of *Cain*, when he *was caſt out of Gods preſence*, *any man*, ſaith he, *that meets me, will kill me*) and therefore in order to the *Spartans*, it is call'd there μισοπονηρίας ἀξιοῦσθαι, *an expoſing them to the common hatred of all men*. 5. That for them that were under any ſuch ſentence, there was no way, but to obey the *mulct*, that was formerly inflicted on them, *i.e.* to reform their *contumacy*, which they that were not *able* to do, or not *willing*, and therefore pretend they were not *able*, (διδάσκων ὡς ἐκτίσαι μὲν οὐ δύνανται τὰ χρήματα διὰ τὸ μέγεθος τῆς καταδίκης) have no way left, but endeavour to *null the ſentence*, by proving it was unjuſt, (ἄκυρον κρίσιν ποιῆσαι, κρίσεις ἀδίκους δεικνύναι, ἀδίκους ἀποφάσεις ἀκυρῶσαι, by *ſhewing that it was no fault*, on which the former *puniſhment*, (to which their contumacy had been expreſt) was *inflicted*. And to make good this *plea*, their beſt and indeed only way was that of force, *viz.* to make *Philomelus* their General, and to provide him an Army, which was accordingly done, and after ſome three or four proſperous fights on that ſide, the concluſion was, that at laſt agreeably to the cauſe, in the ſight of his proſperous impiety he was *routed* and *ſlain*. And ſo you have a brief of the firſt paſſage. The other is that known one of the *Druids* among the antient *Galls*, mentioned by *Cæſar de Bell. Gal. l.* 6. the ſumm of it is this. Among the *Galls* two only ſorts of men there are, ſaith he, *qui in aliquo ſunt numero & honore*, *which are of account and honour among them*, The *Druids*, and the *Equites*, or *Noblemen*, all the reſt being *peazants* and *ſlaves*. The former of theſe are thus deſcribed, by their offices or employments, *Illi rebus divinis intersunt, ſacrificia publica & privata procurant, religiones interpretantur, ad hos magnus adoleſcentium numerus diſciplinæ causâ concurrit, magnoque ii ſunt apud eos honore; nam ferè de omnibus controverſiis publicis, privatiſque conſtituunt, & ſi quid eſt admiſſum facinus, ſi cædes facta, de hæreditate, de finibus controverſia eſt, iidem decernunt, præmia pœnaſque conſtituunt: Si quis aut privatus, aut populus, eorum decreto non ſteterit, ſacrificiis interdicunt. Hæc pœna apud eos eſt graviſſima; Quibus ita eſt interdictum, ii numero impiorum ac ſceleratorum habentur, ab iis omnes decedunt, aditum eorum ſermonemque defugiunt, ne quid ex contagione incommodi accipiant, neque iis petentibus jus redditur, neque ullus honos communicatur. His omnibus Druidibus præeſt unus, &c. They are the men employed in all the ſervice of God, perform the publick and private ſacrifices, inſtruct the youth, and are honoured by them, are the judges in well-nigh all both publick and private controverſies; if any outrage or murder be committed, any difficulty about bounds, or inheritance, they decree and determine both rewards and puniſhments. If any private perſon or people ſtand not to their decrees, they forbid him their ſacrifices. This is of all other the moſt grievous puniſhment, they that are under this interdict, are accounted as impious and enormous perſons, all men refuſe their company, come not near them, nor diſcourſe with them, leſt the contagion hurt them; they receive no advantage by the Laws of the Kingdom, nor are capable of any honour in it. Of all theſe Druids there is one Prefect or Preſident, &c.* And it ſeems this cuſtom and inſtitution among them was conceived to have had its original from *Britain*. *Diſciplina in Britanniâ reperta, atque inde in Galliam tranſlata eſſe exiſtimatur, & nunc qui diligentiùs eam rem cognoſcere volunt, plerumque illò diſcendi causâ proficiſcuntur. This diſciplinee was found in Britain, and thence brought unto the Galls, and they that are willing to have any exact knowledge of it, do now ordinarily go thither to learn it.* The ſtory being in it ſelf thus clear and full, will have little need of my Comment, or obſervation on it; all that I meant to do was to ſhew you the *conſent* of other Religions, and *Nations*, and by that to conclude, that the *Heathens* thought not that unreaſonable, which now *Chriſt* hath by ſtanding Law eſtabliſh'd in his *Church*, and many that are called *Chriſtians*, are ſo willing to caſt out of it. And ſo much of this παρεπόμενον alſo.

Edit. Rhodoman. p. 425.

L. 1. *p.* 73. *P.* 425.

Page 432.

CHAP.

CHAP. VII.

AND now by way of concluſion of this whole diſcourſe, I ſhall add ſomewhat of the *utility* of this piece of *diſcipline*, if with another *preparatory* to it, it might by the *Governours* of every *Church* be carefully exerciſed: That other *preparative* which I mean, is that, if not *Apoſtolical*, yet *Eccleſiaſtical* inſtitution of *confirmation*. The intention of which, and deſign of our *Church* in it, every man ſufficiently knows, (although it have been much and with very ill conſequence of late neglected) and therefore I ſhall not here inſiſt on it; and beſides it hath been ſet down at large in * another diſcourſe. This whole office of *confirmation*, and the neceſſary preparatives of it, that of the *Miniſters Catechizing* (and throughly inſtructing all the youth of both ſexes, and of all ſorts within his cure, and explaining to the underſtanding of each, and laying home to his heart all the duties undertaken in his *Baptiſm*) being ſolemnly premiſed, according to the rules and intention of our *Church*, and all duties perform'd and obſerved by the *Curate*, the *Child* and the *Biſhop* (and none permitted to come to the *Lords Table* that hath not laudably paſt through this courſe) would (in the opinion of a *godly* and *learned* man, who did much ſtudy the ways of advancing *piety* and *learning*) tend moſt probably to the keeping men at leaſt within bounds of *Chriſtian civility*, from falling into *enormous* ſins, which they had in their own perſons ſo ſolemnly *vow'd* againſt. And therefore the uſe of that diſcipline were extreamly to be wiſh'd for, that it were revived in each *Chriſtian Common-wealth*; And if it ſhould be objected, that having been ſo long neglected, in this, it cannot now poſſibly be recovered again, becauſe of the vaſt number of thoſe that have been either not at all, or elſe but *formally*, and *perfunctorily*, or without precedent *preparation confirm'd*; I anſwer, that that argument proves not the *impoſſibility*, but only *difficulty* of doing it, or if the *difficulty* be ſo great, as to advance into a kind *of moral impoſſibility*, yet ought it not therefore to be left *unattempted*, (we are required to *endeavour* the doing of things which appear morally *impoſſible* to be done; becauſe *God* may enable us to do that, which, till we try, we conceive *impoſſible*; and though the not *performing* may not be damning, yet the not endeavouring may) or if ſtill the difficulty of an *univerſal reformation* in this kind *diſcourage* even from *attempting* it, yet may it be *reaſonable and feaſible* for every *Paſtour*, now to begin with all the *youth* of his *Pariſh*, which have not yet come to the *Lords Supper*; and keep them to this *probation*, and ſo for ever hereafter conſtantly to continue, and then, though the elder ſort of this preſent age come not under this *method*, nor conſequently this means of *reformation*, yet perhaps the *examples* of, and inſtructions beſtowed on thoſe under them, may work ſomewhat on them: and howſoever, the *ſtock* of the ſucceeding age will now be wrought on, and ſo Poſterity be mended, though the *preſent* age cannot; which to every good Chriſtian will be worth conſidering. This courſe being thus taken for the *planting*, and *rooting* all good reſolutions, and obtaining the bleſſing of God, upon the young and tender, (by the *prayers* of the *Church*, and the purport of Chriſts promiſe of *habenti dabitur*) together with the uſe of the *Sacrament* of the *Lords Supper*, and attention to *reading*, and *preaching* of the *Word*, might very probably hope to be *ſucceſsful*; but then becauſe poſſibly it may not, (ſome *Chriſtians* will be *perjur'd* and *impudent*, rather than be *chaſt* and *conſcientious*, after all this) therefore comes in the *uſe* and *utility* of the *cenſures* of the *Church*, as a *Tabula poſt naufragium*, a means of bringing him to *repentance*, that by the former means could not be kept *innocent*; of *reducing* him by the *Rod*, that the *crook* could not *keep* from ſtraying. And if 'twere thus uſed, if every one that fell after *confirmation*, were firſt *admoniſht* by *one*, then if it ſerved not, by *two* or *three*, and then upon *refractorineſs*, or indulgence in ſin, *delivered up to Satan*, turn'd out of all *Chriſtian Communion* without any partiality or reſpect of perſons, this would be as probable a means as the wit of man *could* invent, either by the fear and expectation of this *cenſure*, to deter them and prevent thoſe enormities, that are now ſo ordinary among Chriſtians, or elſe by *ſhame*, and other conſequent *inconveniences*, as by *Cauſticks* to work the cure. For it cannot but be obſerved, what force *ſhame*, and *credit* have on the minds of men. A ſin that is gotten into ſome *countenance* or *reputation*, though it be deſtitute of all other lovelineſs or ability to *tempt* any, doth yet carry all before it without *reſiſtance*; the fear of *ſhame* makes men *vicious*, that otherwiſe are not *inclined* to it, and certainly the ſame means would be able to commend *vertue* to us: there is not that infinite natural averſation againſt all *goodneſs* in the minds of men (unleſs as that word ſignifies the *paſſions*, or *carnal* affections) as that men would be very wicked to loſe by it; *afflictio dabit intellectum*, and ſuch *afflictions* as theſe that fall upon the *fame*, are not the moſt eaſily ſupportable, and therefore may poſſibly help even a *ſenſual* man to ſome *underſtanding*; and though the certain truth of this Obſervation cannot otherwiſe be proved, but by our *reſolution* to make *experience* of it; yet ſeems it to me, to have the *Authority* and *Teſtimony* of Saint *Paul* himſelf in theſe words, (though uſually, by thoſe that are led by the *ſound* of them, otherwiſe applyed) 2 *Cor.* 10. 4. *the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God*, (or *to God*, or (by an *hebraiſm* very ordinary) *very or exceeding mighty*) *to the pulling down of ſtrong holds*, &c. which words that they belong to the point in hand, will 1. be probable by the *Context*, where the Apoſtle ſpeaks of *proceeding* againſt *offenders*, which he calls θαῤῥῶν εἰς ὑμᾶς, *being bold towards them*, verſe 1, 2. and ἐκδικῆσαι παρακοὴν, *to revenge or puniſh diſobedience*, verſe 6. and this according to the ἐξουσία or *authority which the Lord had given him for edification or inſtruction, and not for deſtruction*, (which before I ſhewed you belong'd unto the *power of cenſure*) and then he adds a caution to remove a *prejudice*, that unreformed ſinners had againſt him, that his *letters were ſevere*, and ſo he, when he was abſent; but far from all ſuch *ſeverity* when he came amongſt them; κατὰ πρόσωπον ταπεινὸς ἐν ὑμῖν, *vile or tame, or unconſiderable*, when he was among them, *i.e.* that he threat-

Sect. 1.

* *Vindic. of Lit.*

ned to *excommunicate*, but when he came would not do it, which he calls ἐκφοβεῖν διὰ τῶν ἐπιστολῶν, *terrifying by letters*, verſe 9. and ἐπιστολαὶ βαρεῖαι καὶ ἰσχυραὶ, *weighty or powerful letters*, ver. 10. *i. e. ſevere and terrifying*, which yet he threatens ſhall be equalled by his actions, *when he comes among them*, *verſe* 11. and ſo all along you ſee the buſineſs is about *cenſures*. And then 2. this ſence of the words will be more than *probable*, by weighing the words themſelves, wherein στρατεία ἡμῶν ſignifies confeſtly the *Apoſtles Miniſtery*, (as it doth alſo in the only other place, where 'tis uſed in the *New Teſtament*, 1 *Tim.* 1. 18. *That thou mighteſt war a good warfare*, i. e. diſcharge the duty of thy Miniſtery, as thou oughteſt, according to the importance of the Hebrew צבא, which is ſometimes rendred στρατεία, *warfare*, ſometimes λειτουργία, *Miniſtery* [then ὅπλα τῆς στρατείας, *the weapons of that warfare*] are the means to diſcharge that *duty* in the *Miniſtery*, of which nature though there be many more, *preaching*, *catechizing*, *adminiſtration of Sacraments*, *confirmation*, &c. yet the *context*, or *antecedents*, and *conſequents* of this place belonging, as was ſhew'd, to the buſineſs of *cenſures*, will reſtrain it in this place peculiarly to thoſe. Then, that theſe are not [σαρκικὰ, *carnal*] ſignifies that they are not *weak*, for ſo σὰρξ at every turn in theſe *Epiſtles* ſignifies *weakneſs*, (and from thence oft-times the Law becauſe it was ſo *weak*, ſo unable to give *ſtrength* to any *diſciple* of *Moſes* to perform that; as in the *Epiſtles* to the *Romans* and *Galatians* 'tis inſiſted on) and ſo to omit more places of *Teſtimony*, in the next precedent Verſe, though we *walk in the fleſh*, *i.e.* though we are weak, as men, and have no power over you, yet as *Miniſters*, we are not, our *Miniſtry* is with *power*, and therefore it follows, as an explication of [οὐ σαρκικὰ, not *carnal*] but δυνατὰ τῷ θεῷ, *mighty*, *or powerful*, *through*, *or to God*, or *exceeding powerful*. And wherein doth this *mightineſs* or *power* expreſs it ſelf? Why πρὸς καθαίρεσιν ὀχυρωμάτων, we render it, *pulling down of ſtrong holds*, and ſo it may literally be rendred, as the end of *excommunication*, *pulling down of all fortreſſes*, that maintain or ſecure a man in ſin, but more critically, the word καθαίρεσις ſignifies *excommunication* it ſelf, both *Verſe* 8. and *Chap.* 13. 10. and generally in the *Canons* of the *Councils*, and then ὀχυρώματα, *ſtrong holds*, may ſignifie *all impenitent obdurate ſinners*, that will not otherwiſe be wrought upon, and are called, *verſe* 5. *Every high thing*, *that exalteth it ſelf againſt the knowledge of God*, i.e. againſt *piety* or *Chriſtianity*; and ſo the words being thus interpreted in the *retail*, and then put together again in the *groſs*, will run thus: [*The weapons of our warfare are not carnal*, *but mighty through God*, *to the pulling down of ſtrong holds:*] *i.e.* the *cenſures* of the *Church* are exceeding *powerful*, and that *power* conſiſts in *excommunicating pertinacious offenders*. The truth of which obſervation, if not interpretation, will be undoubted to him that doth but remember, what this Diſcourſe hath ſo oft inculcated, that *excommunication was delivering a man to Satan*, and a conſequent of that, in thoſe firſt times *corporal inflictions*, *diſeaſes*, (and ſometimes *death* it ſelf) which, if any humane thing, would moſt probably work upon one. Only it may be objected, that that *conſequent* was peculiar to the *Apoſtles* times, and is not now in uſe, and conſequently that a great *part* of the *power* of *Eccleſiaſtical cenſures* is now loſt, and ſo now *the weapons of our warfare* may be *carnal*, our *cenſures* unſufficient to perform their task; to reduce *impenitents*, though theirs were not. To which I anſwer, by confeſſing the objection, that indeed it is ſo; and very reaſonable it ſhould, *Chriſtian Princes* having now taken the tuition of the *Church* into their hands, and ſo thoſe keen *weapons* in the ſpiritual hand not ſo neceſſary; as you know the *Manna* ceaſed to be rain'd from Heaven, when the People were come into the *promiſed Land flowing* with *milk* and *honey*. Only I ſhall then reply, that therefore it is more than fit, that ſome means ſhould be uſed, in caſe of any diſcernable defect, to interpoſe by way of ſupply, and add the more than moral perſwaſive power of ſome other fit engine beſide that of the *cenſures* of the *Church*, eſpecially in caſes of enormous, infamous crimes, which may be done by the *Secular arm*, in ſuch caſes (when the *Eccleſiaſtical cenſures* perſwade not) the impreſſion of inflicting *penalties*, ſevere enough, as may be found expedient, *uſque ad reformationem*, until they make themſelves capable, (by teſtimonies of amendment) to receive releaſe both from God and man; that ſo by that means, as *God* ſupplyed the want of *humane* aid, by his extraordinary from Heaven; and when the *Secular Magiſtrates* diſcharged not their duty, exerciſed not the power given them to the purging of the *Church*, from rotten, vicious, prophane, incorrigible members, *God* gave this power to the *Apoſtles* of inflicting *diſeaſes* on *Malefactors*; ſo now that *extraordinary* power being withdrawn from the *Church*, the Magiſtrate ſhould think himſelf moſt ſtrictly *obliged* to perform his *duty*, for which if it ſhould be required, that we produce the expreſs commands or directions of Chriſt and his Apoſtles, or Primitive preſidents; I anſwer, That will be unjuſt to require of us, 1. Becauſe in *Scripture times*, there were other means to ſupply that want, the *Devils corporal inflictions* on them that were delivered to him, and ſo any other might be ſpared: 2. Becauſe this duty naturally belongs to the *Magiſtrate*, who alone hath ordinarily ἀναγκαστικὴν δικαιοκρισίαν, *compulſive juriſdiction*, which as it was practiſed by the *Kings* in the *Old Teſtament*, ſo was it not interdicted by *Chriſt* in the *New*, but all left in that matter by him as he found it; which being granted, it may truly be ſaid, that as *Chriſt*, or the *Apoſtles* give no *directions* for this, ſo they *needed* not to give any. 3. Becauſe both then and in the *Primitive Church*, the *Secular power* was not *Chriſtian*, and therefore the aſſiſtance could not be expected from them, which now moſt reaſonably may, to awake, and *hazen*, and drive thoſe that will not be allured and *drawn*, that ſo even in this *world* there may be no *peace*, *quiet reſt*, *tranquillity*, or *ſecurity to the wicked*.

ISA. c. 1. v. 15, 16, 17, 18.

Waſh ye, *make you clean*, &c.

THE END.

OF

FUNDAMENTALS,

SCHISME

AND

HERESIE.

The Contents.

CHAP. I. *THE Notation of the word* Fundamental.

CHAP. II. *The diviſion of the diſcourſe into four parts; What are Fundamental in general.*

CHAP. III. *A particular view of Fundamentals, Jeſus Chriſt indefinitely.*

CHAP. IV. *Jeſus Chriſt Crucified.*

CHAP. V. *Jeſus Chriſt raiſed, &c.*

CHAP. VI. *Other Articles of Belief in Chriſt.*

CHAP. VII. *The Faith in Baptiſm.*

CHAP. VIII. *Of the Creeds in general, and firſt of the Apoſtles Creed.*

CHAP. IX. *Of the Nicene and Athanaſian Creeds together; and ſeverally of the Nicene.*

CHAP. X. *Of the Athanaſian Creed.*

CHAP. XI. *Of the Superſtructure, and the particular branches thereof.*

CHAP. XII. *Of the Doctrines that hinder the ſuperſtructing of good life on the Chriſtian Belief, firſt among the Romaniſts, a Catalogue of them, eſpecially that of the Infallibility of the Church.* 2. *Among others,* 1. *that of the Solifidian.*

CHAP. XIII. *Of the Fiduciarie.*

CHAP. XIV. *Of Chriſt's dying for none but the Elect.*

CHAP. XV. *Of the irreſpective decrees of Election and Reprobation.*

CHAP. XVI. *Of the predetermination of all things.*

CHAP. XVII. *Of the Spirits acting all things within the man.*

CHAP. XVIII. *Of the Miſtakes concerning Repentance.*

CHAP. XIX. *Of the neceſſaries to the ſuperſtructing of good life on this Foundation.*

A Prayer.

OF

FUNDAMENTALS.

CHAP. I.

The Notation of the word Fundamental.

Sect. 1. IN this inquiry, the *literal* notation of the word [*Fundamentals*] muſt firſt be examined and reſolved on, as the *Ground-work* of this whole diſcourſe. And herein the moſt advantageous *method* and leaſt lyable to miſtake will be to proceed by theſe degrees.

Sect. 2. First, that the word *Foundation* being a *relative*, and, as it is uſed in our preſent diſquiſition, a *figurative* word, it will be needful to premiſe wherein this *relation*, and wherein this *figure* doth conſiſt, it being evident, what *Ariſtotle* ſaith, that the whole being of any *relative* is πρὸς τὶ, in order to that whereto it hath *relation*, and ſo likewiſe that ſome *primary literal* ſignification is prerequired to that other of *Metaphorical* or *Figurative*. And accordingly it will here be ſoon reſolved, that a *foundation*, being *primarily* of uſe in *Architecture*, hath no other *literal* notation but what belongs to it in *relation* to an *houſe* or other *building*, nor *figurative*, but what is *founded* in that and *deduced* from thence. *Foundation is a relative and figurative word.*

Sect. 3. But then ſecondly, it is not every *building* to which a *foundation* refers (ſome *ſtructures* being *erected* without any *foundation*) but ſuch as is *cemented* and faſtned to ſome *firm*, *ſtable* body under *ground*, *i.e.* to a *foundation* ; We are taught this *diſtinction* by our *Saviour*, *Matt.* 7. that an *houſe* may be (and is ſometimes) ſet upon the *ſand* or upon the *earth*, *Luk.* 6.49. and is then ſaid to be χωρὶς θεμελίου, *without a foundation*) not always ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν, *upon a rock*, and though the word οἰκοδόμησε, *building*, be there uſed of both thoſe, yet the τεθεμελίωτο, *being founded* is applied only to the latter *ver.* 25. And the diſtant *fates* of thoſe two ſorts of *houſes*, which is there ſet down, together with the *character* of the *Architects*, the *fooliſh* and the *wiſe*, will aſſure us that this which we now inſiſt on, is no *nicety*, for aſſoon as ever the *rain deſcended*, the *floods came*, and the *winds blew* and *beat* upon that *houſe* of the *fools* erecting, the *houſe fell* (and *brake* to pieces, *the fall thereof was great*) ver. 27. Whereas all the *violence* and *importunity* of the ſame *ſtorms*, and *winds*, and *torrents* could make no impreſſion on the other *pile* of the *skilful Architects* erecting, upon this one account, τεθεμελίωτο γὰρ, *for it was founded upon a rock*. And ſo in like manner the difference is ſet by the *author* to the *Hebrews* betwixt σκηνὴ, the *moveable tent* or *tabernacle*, and θεμελίους ἔχουσα πόλις, *a City that hath foundations*, *Heb.* 11. 10. which is all one with the ἀσάλευτον βασιλεία, *the Kingdom that cannot be ſhaken* or *moved*, *Heb.* 12. 28. *The relation of it to ſuperſtructure.* *Building on the ſand, and on a rock.*

Sect. 4. And the difference of *building* upon the *earth* or *ſand*, from that other of *ſuperſtructing* or *founding* upon a *rock*, is obſervable in this, that though the *whole* body or bulk of the *earth* or *ſand* be of an *heavy* and *ſtable* nature, yet the *ſurface* or upper part of either of them, but eſpecially of the *ſand*, is ſo *light* and *ſoluble*, that there is no way imaginable to *cement* or faſten any thing to it, any more than to the *air* or *water* ; whereas to a *ſtone* or *rock*, which being it ſelf *firm*, is alſo faſtned *deep* within the *earth*, a *ſuperſtructure* of any proportionable magnitude may be ſo faſtned, that without a σεισμὸς or *concuſſion* of the *earth* it ſelf, (which *ſhaketh* the *foundations*, *Acts* 16. 26.) the *building* ſhall not be *ſhaken*, and therefore *Coloſſ.* 1.23. τεθεμελιωμένοι *built on a foundation*, is equivalent to ἑδραῖοι, *firm*, and oppoſed to μετακινούμενοι, *moved*, and ſo *Chriſt* ſuppoſes in another *parable*, that the *gates* of ᾅδης, the ſtrongeſt *oppoſition* imaginable in nature ſhall not *prevail* againſt that *houſe* which is thus *built*, *Matt.* 16. 18. *The difference betwixt them.*

Sect. 5. Thirdly then, the *figurative* or *metaphorical* notation of this word, and not the *primarie* or *literal*, being that which belongs to this place, and yet that bearing a direct *proportion* to the *literal*, and ſo requiring a *proportionable relation* to ſome *figurative building* or *ſuperſtructure*, in order to which it may be ſtyled a *foundation* or *fundamental*, the next and that indeed the *Principal enquiry* will be, what *ſuperſtructure* it is to which this *Foundation* doth refer, or in reſpect to which peculiarly any *article* of *Faith* may be denominated *Fundamental*. *The Superſtructure to which Foundation here relates.*

Sect. 6. And to omit the mention of all others, which have no appearance of *pretenſion* to this matter, two only *fabricks* or *ſuperſtructures* there are, which can come into this competition, each called by the name of οἰκία or οἶκος *houſe*, The firſt οἰκία πατρός, *my fathers houſe*, *Joh.* 14. 2. The ſecond (with little change) οἶκος θεοῦ, *the houſe of God*, 1 *Tim.* 3. 15. The firſt is evidently *Heaven*, the place whither *Chriſt* was then going, as their *harbinger* to *prepare* for them ; The ſecond is expreſly ſaid to be the *Church*, in the words immediately ſubſequent ; ἥτις ἐστὶν ἐκκλησία θεοῦ ζῶντος, *which is the Church of the living God*, the *Church of God* in oppoſition to the *Idol-Temples*, the *Church of the living God* in oppoſition to the *liveleſs* falſe *deities*, the *Diana* of the *Epheſians* and the like, whoſe *pictures* were *inſhrined* and adored in thoſe *heathen Temples* ; And each of theſe are *metaphorical buildings* (anſwerable to the *figurative* *Two ſorts of Superſtructures.* *Heaven.* *The Church.*

figurative foundations) and being capable of two ſorts of conceptions, either as they are in *fieri*, in *building*, or as in *facto eſſe*, when they are already *built*, they may here ſignifie the *repleniſhing* or *peopling* of theſe two, 1. bringing *Saints* to *Heaven*, and 2. *proſelytes* into the *Church*, or elſe by a *Metonymie* of the adjunct, they may denote 1. that *Celeſtial*, and 2. that *Chriſtian* condition, which is in either of them enjoyed, the ſtate of *bliſs* in the one, and the ſtate of *Chriſtian obedience* in the other.

Sect. 7. In proportion then to theſe two *ſuperſtructures*, two notions of *Fundamentals* may be conceived, one ſignifying that whereon our *eternal bliſs* is *immediately*, and *regularly* ſuperſtructed, the other whereon our *obedience* to the *faith* of *Chriſt*, giving up our *names* to him, is *founded*; the one in order to our *living happily* and *eternally* in another world, the other to our *living ſoberly*, and *juſtly*, and *piouſly* in this world.

Heaven cannot be it, for two Reaſons. The firſt.

Sect. 8. And if the former were it, wherein our preſent ſearch were terminated, if the queſtion were, what were now *fundamental* to *bliſs* or *heaven*, then 1. there could be no reaſon to explain the *fundamentals*, as by conſent of parties they are explained, by the *credenda*, matters of *belief* or *faith*; for though the *acknowledgment* of *Gods veracity*, and the *explicite*, unſhaken *belief* of *all* that is *revealed* to him by *God*, be the ſtrict *duty* of every *Chriſtian*, and the *disbelieving* of any ſuch *affirmation* of *Gods*, is *ſin*, and *damnable*, yet the *foundation* being that which ſupports the *ſuperſtructure* to which it *relates immediately*, and without the intervention of any thing elſe, 'tis certain, that *eternal bliſs* is not *immediately ſuperſtructed* on the moſt *orthodox beliefs*; but, as our *Saviour* ſaith (*if ye know theſe things, happy are ye if ye do them*) the *doing* muſt be firſt *ſuperſtructed* on the *knowing* or believing, before any *happineſs*, or *bliſs*, or *heaven* can be *built* on it; and without all queſtion the *agenda*, the things that are to be *done*, *works* of *piety* and *juſtice*, &c. are as neceſſarily required to *found* our bliſs, to bring us to *heaven*, as the *belief* of any the moſt pretious *Articles* can be ſuppoſed to be; and therefore it may be juſtly feared, that the *title* of *Fundamentals*, being ordinarily beſtowed on, and confin'd to the *doctrines* of *faith*, hath occaſioned that great *ſcandal*, or *block* of *offence* in the *Church* of *God*, at which ſo many *myriads* of *ſolifidians* have ſtumbled, and fallen irreverſibly, by conceiving *heaven* a *reward* of *true opinions*, of which *vicious practices*, though never ſo *habitually* and indulgently continued in, to the laſt, would never be able to deprive them; which as it hath been the disjoyning of that καλλίστη ζυγωγία, *moſt excellent yoke*, of *faith* and *good works*, and hath betrayed many knowing men to moſt unskilful and ridiculous *preſumptions*, and *ſecurities* in *ſin*: ſo can it not well be provided againſt, without the *diſcovering*, and *renouncing* of this *falſe*, and ſubſtituting a *truer* ſtate of this queſtion.

The ſecond.

Sect. 9. *Secondly*, If this were the notion of *Fundamentals*, there could be no *certain* way of *judging* what are ſuch, the excuſe of *invincible ignorance* being, in the far greateſt number of men, ready to be *confronted* againſt the *neceſſity* of their *believing all* the ſeverals of any ſuch ſuppoſeable *Catalogue*; and for that *ſuppletory* of an *implicite belief*, which is by the *Romaniſt* conceived to be of uſe, and *ſufficient* for thoſe, who are not capable of an *explicite*, whatſoever degree of truth can be conceived to be in that, it muſt be founded in the *contradictory* to the preſent *pretenſion*; for were it once granted that the *belief* of ſuch *Articles* were *fundamental* to *heaven*, it were not imaginable that they which have not heard, ſhould ever arrive thither, When that, which by St. *Paul*'s authority is become a known *maxim*, was before demonſtrable in it ſelf, and is ſo ſuppoſed by his argument, *Rom.* 10.14. that *faith cometh by hearing*, and that they *cannot believe* what they have not *heard*. Many other inconveniences there are conſequent to this ſtating of this *queſtion* (and particularly that of which our *experience* hath given us evident *demonſtration*, that by thoſe which thus ſtate it, there hath never yet been aſſigned any definite *number*, or *Catalogue* of *Fundamentals* in this ſence:) but I ſhall no farther enlarge on them.

Fundamental to a Church, to Piety and Chriſtian life.

Sect. 10. The other notion of *Fundamentals*, is that whereon I ſhall more confidently pitch (as that which will remove, in ſtead of multiplying, difficulties, and accord all, which either the *Scriptures*, or the *Antients* have aſſerted on this ſubject) thereby underſtanding that which was deemed neceſſary to be laid by the *Apoſtles* and other ſuch *Maſter-builders*, as a *foundation* to the peopling or repleniſhing (or bringing in *proſelytes* to) the *Church*, and ſo to the ſuperſtructing *Chriſtian obedience* among men; In which reſpect it is, that as the *Church* of *Corinth* (and ſo any other *ſociety* that hath received the *faith* of *Chriſt*) is called θεοῦ γεώργιον, *God*'s *Plantation*, 1 *Cor.* 3.9. ſo it is alſo called θεοῦ οἰκοδομὴ *God*'s *building*, a *ſtructure* erected by his *artificers*.

This notion of Fundamental confirmed by S. Athanaſius

Sect. 11. That this hath been eſteemed the due and proper acception of this word, I ſhall teſtifie by this one evidence, which I acknowledge to have given me the firſt hint of this notion, the words of the great *Champion* of the *Catholick Faith* ſet down in the *Council* of *Nice*, St. *Athanaſius* in *Epiſt. ad Epictetum*, where ſpeaking of the *Confeſſion* of *Faith* eſtabliſhed by the Canons of that *Council* againſt the *Arian* and other *Hereticks* he hath theſe words, Ἡ δὲ ἐν αὐτῇ ὁμολογία τῆς πίστεως καὶ τὰς θείας γραφὰς ὁμολογουμένη πίστις αὐτάρκης ἐστὶ πρὸς ἀναίρεσιν μὲν πάσης ἀσεβείας, σύστασιν δὲ εὐσεβείας ἐν Χριστῷ. *The faith confeſſed by the Biſhops in that Synod according to the divine Scriptures is of it ſelf ſufficient for the averting of all impiety, and the eſtabliſhment of all piety in Chriſt.* Theſe words of that eminent *Father* of the *Church* might be of ſome farther uſe, toward the due underſtanding of the *Articles* of the *Nicene* and *Athanaſian Creeds*, but at the preſent the advantage of them will be but *general*, that the way of *meaſuring* and defining the *neceſſity* of any *articles* of *faith*, (the ἀναγκαῖα εἰδέναι, *neceſſaries to be known*, as *Juſtin Martyr* ſpeaks, placing under that head, the *Creation* of the *world*, the *framing* of *man*, the *immortality* of the *ſoul*, and *judgment* to *come*, Παραινεῖ. p. 9.) is by the αὐτάρκεια or *ſufficiency* of them to enable the *teacher* to perſwade *good* life, to ſupplant thoſe *vices*, which Chriſt came to baniſh out of the world, and to *radicate* thoſe *vertues* which he came on purpoſe to *implant* among men, which is directly that notion, or *Character* of *Fundamentals*, which we have now given, thereby ſignifying thoſe *articles* of the *Faith*, on which all the parts of *Chriſtian piety* and *obedience* (and none of *impiety* or *diſobedience*) may be regularly *ſuperſtructed*, or in conſequence to which being once *revealed*, and *believed*, all rational or conſidering men, when Chriſtian life is propoſed to them, muſt diſcern themſelves obliged to entertain it, to forſake in every branch their unchriſtian courſes of ſin, and to betake themſelves to an uniform obedience to the Commands of *Chriſt*; from whence, I ſuppoſe, it is, that the word οἰκοδομεῖν, *building* or *edifying*,

edifying, is uſed every where in the New Teſtament for *improving* or *advancing* in *Chriſtian practice* and the *duties* of good life, as laying the *foundation* is *preaching* the *faith* of *Chriſt* among them, 1 *Cor.* 3. 11. On which ſaith *Theophylact*, Μεθ' ὃ ἀξίωμα ἐ θεμέλιον ἐ πίστως, ἐπικοδομῶμεν ἕκαστοι---ἀγαθὰς πράξεις, &c. *After we ſhall have received the Foundation of Faith*, i.e. *the Faith of Chriſt*, as the *Foundation*, we *build upon it, every one, good actions of all ſorts* and *degrees*, as he there ſpecifies, making the Chriſtian actions of *life* to be the *ſuperſtructure*, to which this *Foundation* refers, and in relation to which it is called a *Foundation*. So *Theophylact* on *Heb.* 6. 1. makes the τὸ περὶ πίστως διδάσκεσθαι, their being *inſtructed in the Faith of Chriſt*, to be περὶ ἐ ἀρχὴν τρέφεσθαι, *to deal only in the beginning*, the elements, the firſt and moſt imperfect rudiments, ὥσπερ εἰσαγωγικάς τινας, ſuch as novices, beginners, they that are but now upon their entrance, are wont to be converſant in, whereas the ſuperſtructing good life on this, is, ſaith he, ἐπὶ ἐ τελειότητα φέρεσθαι, *being carried to perfection*; and again in yet plainer words, Ἀρχὴ μὲν γὰρ, ᾗ θεμελίῳ ἡ πίστις, ᾗ ἄνευ ταύτης οὐδὲν ἐδραιωθήσεται, &c. *The Faith is the beginning* and *the foundation*, and *that without which nothing ſhall* or *will be firmly built*; ſtill making the Faith, or belief of the *Articles* the foundation, in reſpect of the ἄριστ ον *the excellent Chriſtian life*, which was by the Apoſtles, and Chriſt deſigned to be built on it. To theſe I ſhall add the words of St. *Auguſt.* in *lib. de Fide & Symbolo. Hæc eſt fides quæ paucis verbis in Symbolo novellis Chriſtianis datur*; *Quæ pauca verba fidelibus nota ſunt ut credendo ſubjugentur Deo, ut ſubjugati rectè vivant, rectè vivendo cor mundent, corde mundo quod credunt intelligant.* This is the Faith which being comprized in few words is in the Creed delivered to all young Chriſtians to be held, which few words are made known to believers to this end, that by believing they may be ſubjected to God, that being ſubjected to him they may live well, by living well they may cleanſe their heart, that by the clean heart they may underſtand what they believe.

Edifying.

Tom. 3.

CHAP. II.

The diviſion of the diſcourſe into four parts; What are Fundamentals in General.

Sect. 1. THe Notion of the word being now explained, that which is yet behind will be regularly reducible to theſe *four* heads; *Firſt*, What thoſe things are in *general*, and then in *particular*, to which this notion of *Fundamentals* belongeth, and withal, what *propriety* all and each of theſe have toward the ſupporting this *ſuperſtructure*, the *planting* a *Church* of *Chriſtian livers*. *Secondly*, What are the *particular branches* of this *ſuperſtructure*. *Thirdly*, What *Doctrines* there are infuſed among *Chriſtians*, which are moſt apt to obſtruct or intercept the *ſuperſtructing* of *Chriſtian life*, where the foundation is laid. *Fourthly*, What things are neceſſary to the *erecting* of this *ſuperſtructure* on this *foundation* already laid, whether in a *particular Chriſtian*, or eſpecially in a *Church*, or ſociety of ſuch.

Four branches of diſcourſe propoſed.

Sect. 2. The *General* way of defining what theſe *fundamentals* are, muſt in all reaſon be taken from the practice of the Apoſtles, as the *interpreter* of *God's appointment*, and judgment in this matter. For it being certain that the Apoſtles, which had Commiſſion from *Chriſt* to Preach, and admit *diſciples* over all the world, to bring *impenitent Jews*, and *Idolatrous Gentiles* to the *obedience* of *Chriſt*, were by him alſo directed in their way, counſelled in the choice of the fitteſt means of performing ſo great a work; the argument will be infallibly concluſive on both ſides, *poſitively*, and *negatively*, that whatever the Apoſtles joyntly agreed on, at their entrance on their ſeveral *Provinces*, to be the ſubject of their firſt *Sermons* in all their travails, that was by them (and conſequently by *God* himſelf) deemed *fundamental*, in our preſent ſence, and what ever was not by them thought thus neceſſary, muſt not by us be obtruded on, or forced into that *Catalogue*.

The general way of defining Fundamentals, by what the Apoſtles taught every where.

Sect. 3. For the clearing of this, it is firſt evident that there was in the *Apoſtles* times ſuch a *foundation* laid (θεμέλιος κείμενος) in *every Church*, as in that of *Corinth*, 1 *Cor.* 3. 11. ſtyled παραθήκη, 1 *Tim.* 6. 20. *a good depoſitum* or *truſt*, which *Timothy* had *received* from the *Apoſtles*, for the direction of his *miniſtery*, πίστις ἅπαξ παραδοθεῖσα, *Jude* 3. the *faith once*, or *at once delivered to the Saints*, ὑποτύπωσις ὑγιαινόντων λόγων, 2 *Tim.* 1. 13. a *form*, or *breviate*, or *ſummary of wholſome words*, or *ſound doctrine*, which he had heard from St. *Paul*, μία πίστις, *one Faith*, *Eph.* 4. 5. in proportion to which followeth there ἓν βάπτισμα, *one baptiſm*, wherein there was made *profeſſion* of that *Faith*, and to which none (of years and knowledge) was ever admitted, who had not been ſufficiently inſtructed by the *Catechiſt* in every part of this *foundation*, (which to that end the *Catechiſt* received from the *Biſhop* with his ſhort expoſition of it, ſee St. *Ambroſe*, *Ep.* 35. *l.* 5.) and being ſo inſtructed made *open confeſſion* of it, and moreover, by *vow obliged* himſelf there, to *ſuperſtruct* all *Chriſtian practice* upon it.

The Foundation laid, 1 Cor. 3. 11. 1 Tim. 6. 20. Jude 3. 2 Tim. 1. 13. Eph. 4. 5.

Sect. 4. *Secondly*, that this was approved of by them in common upon *conſultation*, (and ſo *ſeemed good to the holy Ghoſt* and to them, in order to their end, the bringing of *Jews* and *Gentiles* to *repentance*) and accordingly was left *behind* them, delivered down to the *Biſhops* of all *Churches* of their *plantation*, not only as a *rule* of *faith*, but as a *ſymbolum*, or *badge* of the *Apoſtles* having *planted Chriſtianity* among them. All which is clearly teſtified by *Tertullian*, *Irenæus*, and other the *firſt writers*; See *Irenæus*, *l.* 1. *c.* 11. and 19. *l.* 3. *c.* 4. *Tertullian de virgin. veland.* in the *beginning*, and *de Præſcription.* throughout.

Approved in common by the Apoſtles.

Sect. 5. *Thirdly*, that all that was neceſſary in order to that end (the μαθητεύσαι πάντα τὰ ἔθνη the *diſcipling of all nations*) was comprehended in this *form* or *ſummary*, it being certain that what *God* did not deem *neceſſary*, was not *neceſſary*, and that nothing that was ſo deemed by *God*, was *omitted* or left behind by them, whoſe office and care it was to *declare the whole will of God*, and to lead others, as themſelves had been led, into all *neceſſary truth*.

Comprehenſive of all neceſſaries—— to the planting of a Church;

Sect. 6.

not to the conversion of every particular person.

Sect. 6. *Fourthly*, that what we thus affirm of the *neceſſity* of theſe things to the *ſuperſtructing* of *Chriſtian practice*, muſt not ſo be underſtood, that the *hearing*, and *believing* of each of them be thought *abſolutely neceſſary* in every *ſingle Jew* or *heathen*, that he may *repent*, and *convert* and live a *Chriſtian* life, or without which he cannot; but *neceſſary* to the *diſcharge* of the *Apoſtolical* office, which was to *reap* whole *fields*, to bring in *whole cities*, and *nations* to *Chriſt*.

Sect. 7. They that were to *plant* a *Church*, were to deal with men of ſeveral and diſtant *affections*, and *tempers* and *intereſts*, an *heterogeneous* body made up of a multitude of various *inclinations*, and of different *habits* of ſin, and degrees of *radication* of thoſe habits, and to each of theſe ſome proper application was to be made by thoſe that came on *Chriſt*'s errand to *cure* their *ſouls* (as *Hippocrates* adviſes his *Phyſician* to have μαλαγμάτων γένια, *mollifying preparations* for all turns, and to carry them about with him) and ſo a whole *Diſpenſatory* was little enough to meet with, and ſuffice to *all* their wants, or at leaſt ſome *Catholicon* of a *tranſcendent virtue*, proportionable to the obſtinacy of any the moſt deſperate *maladie*: But this confuſion of *diſeaſes* and *rapſodie* of difficulties was not to be ſuppoſed in each *ſingle ſinner*, and conſequently there was not the ſame *neceſſity* of the whole tale of *Fundamentals*, for the *converting* or reducing of him.

Some Jews reduced to good life without this foundation.

Sect. 8. There is no doubt but there were *reformed Jews* before *Chriſt*'s time, whom the *pedagogie* and *rudiments*, and imperfect documents of the *Law*, with thoſe *influences*, and *aſſiſtances* of *God*, which were then afforded, brought home unto *God*, and among them ſome צדיקים *righteous*, and ſome חסידים *merciful men*, which had arrived to the *abundance* of *goodneſs*, as they ſtyle it. And of this kind were the *Eſſeni*, who though they be not ordinarily conceived to have been *Chriſtians*, yet are deſcribed by *Philo*, under the name of θεραπευταὶ, ſo very like *Chriſtians*, that there is no reaſon to doubt, but that *Chriſtian* piety might be infuſed into *ſome*, without the *explicite* knowledge of *all* and every of thoſe *articles*, which yet, in general ſpeaking, or as it was to be *planted* through the world, are rightly deemed, and reſolved to be *Fundamental*.

Syneſius a Biſhop before he believed the Reſurrection.

Sect. 9. Thus 'tis affirm'd by *Photius*, and *Evagrius*, (and hath as much authority, as their names can give it) that *Syneſius* had embraced the whole *Chriſtian Law*, ſo far as to be advanced to the dignity of a *Biſhop*, without any *clear* acknowledging, or believing one main part of our *Foundation*, that of the *Reſurrection* of the *body*, and his own 105*th Epiſtle* (wherein he ſo induſtriouſly *declines* the *Biſhoprick*) hath theſe words, Τὴν καθωμιλωμένην ἀνάστασιν ἱερόν τι καὶ ἀπόῤῥητον ἡγοῦμαι, καὶ πολλοῦ δέω τῷ πλήθους ὑποπέσειν ὁμολογῆσαι, *The reſurrection which you preach and publiſh, I account ſacred, and that which cannot be uttered; and I want much of conſenting to the perſwaſions of the multitude in this matter.* And though the *Biſhops*, that thus advanced him, were queſtioned, ſaith *Photius*, for the fact, yet that is no prejudice to (what we now obſerve from this example, *viz.*) the *poſſibility* of the thing. Of which alſo thoſe *Biſhops* anſwer is a farther teſtimony, *viz.* that they ſaw ſuch *excellent graces* in him, that they could not imagine, that *God* would long defer to *crown* them with the addition of this eminent branch of *Chriſtian faith*, the clear *belief* and acknowledgment of the *reſurrection*; And as that fell out according to their expectation, ſo it is thereby evident, that that branch of *belief* was in in him ſupervenient to *Chriſtian practice*, and not all *Chriſtian practice* built on that.

Sect. 10. Nay ſuppoſing that he that hath not been inſtructed ſufficiently in all, and each branch of the *Foundation*, were yet with fewer helps brought to the *ſincere* undertaking of the *whole Chriſtian obedience*, as if a *Catechumenus* before every one of theſe *articles* were explained unto him, ſhould yet *reſolve* (upon reading the *Sermon* on the *Mount*) to live a life of the greateſt *Chriſtian perfection*, this perſon were not in any reaſon to ſuffer any *diminution* to be deemed the *worſe*, but rather the *better* for that, (as they, that *having not the Law, do yet by nature the things of the Law*, are far from being *diſparaged* by the *Apoſtle*, nay θαυμασοὶ τινὲς εἰσι, ſaith *Theophylact*, are lookt on as *admirable* perſons, ὅτι τῷ νόμῳ οὐκ ἐδεήθησαν, καὶ τὸν νόμον ἐπλήρωσαν, *that they wanted not the Law, and yet fulfilled the Law*; The danger being certainly very great to them, that by force of all the divine *articles* of our *Faith* are not reduced to *Chriſtianity purity*, and not to them, who on a weaker *foundation* do yet ſtand firmly rooted, and grounded in the *love* of *Chriſt*.

Sect. 11. And this is agreeable to what was premiſed of the nature of a *foundation* in a *material building*, that though a *tabernacle* or *moveable* building may, yet a *Temple* or ſtable edifice cannot be ſuppoſed to be *built* and ſtand *firm* without an entire *foundation*, and conſequently that this *ſummarie* of *wholſom words* is neceſſary to the *Architects*, in order to their *ſuperſtructing* a *Pile*, their *planting* a *Church* of *Jews* and *Gentiles*, though not *abſolutely* ſo, for the reducing of each *ſingle* perſon.

CHAP. III.

A particular view of Fundamentals, Jeſus Chriſt indefinitely.

Jeſus Chriſt the Foundation. 1 Cor. 3. 11.

Sect. 1. I Now proceed to a more *particular* view of this *Foundation*, which is ſometimes moſt *compendiouſly* ſet down in *Scripture*, either under the abbreviature of *Jeſus Chriſt*, or with the addition of his *crucifixion* or *reſurrection*, or other remarkable paſſages concerning him; Or elſe more largely and explicitely in the *Creeds* or *Confeſſions* of the *Univerſal Church*.

Sect. 2. For the more *compendious*, it is St. *Paul*'s affirmation, 1 *Cor.* 3. 11. that *Jeſus Chriſt* is the one only *Foundation*, and no man can lay ἄλλον θεμέλιον any *other*, which is the interpretation of what is elſewhere ſaid, that *Jeſus Chriſt* himſelf is λίθῳ ἀκρογωνιαίῳ the *chief corner-ſtone*, or again the κεφαλὴ γωνίας, *head of the corner*, the principal *ſupporter*, on which the weight of the *ſtructure* reſts, the *foundation* of the *foundation*.

Sect. 3.

Sect. 3. In proportion to which it is that the *deceivers*, or *false teachers*, or *Antichrists*, 2 *Joh.*7. are expressed by this *Character*, *they that confeß not Jesus Christ coming in the fleßh.* This one being a *comprehensive article* that *supposes* and *contains* all others under it.

*Sect.*4. For besides that the *Jews* to whom the *Gospel* was first to be preached, and to some of whom this character of *Antichrist* was given, believed in the *one Creator* of the *world* already, and so that *article* concerning the *Deity*, and the *Attributes* thereof needed not be *preached* either to them, or to their *proselytes* from the *Gentiles*; It is farther manifest that the *belief* of *Christ* being founded on the *testimony* of the *Father*, *Mat.*3.17. and the *doctrine* of *Christ* containing in it the *declaration* and manifestation of the *knowledge* of the *Father*, so as he was never *known* to the *world* before this *Son out of his bosome* thus revealed him, the belief of *Christ* must necessarily suppose and pre-require the *belief* of the *Father*, and therefore it follows in Saint *John*, ver.9. that he which *abides in the doctrine of Christ*, ἔτος καὶ τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὸν υἱὸν ἔχει, *he hath both the Father and the Son.*

Sect. 5. So again the *miracles* which *Christ* did were done in his *father*'s name, and thereby gave all that *testimony* to his *doctrines* of *piety* and *reformation*, which the *Father*'s proclaiming them from heaven would have been able to do.

Sect. 6. And that being thus supposed of all in gross, and so giving a *full authority* to all that should be *revealed* by *Christ*, the several parts of the *Revelations* afforded us by him will soon be discerned to be extreamly conducible to this end of reforming men's lives, such as will answer all imaginable *objections* and exceptions of *flesh* and *blood* against it, and make it perfectly *reasonable* for any *rational* creature to undertake the *service* of *Christ*, and most extreamly *irrational* and *unmanly* to seek out or to continue in any other service.

Sect. 7. Such are *Christ's promises*, divine, unconceivable *promises*, a *bliß* to be enjoyed to all *eternity*, and that by way of return for a *weak obedience* of some few *years*; Such are his *threatnings*, most *formidable* menaces of *endleß woe*, to them that will still *despise the riches of his goodneß, and forbearance*; Such is the treaty which he negotiates with us, and offer and tender of a *reconciliation*, a πάρεσις, an act of *oblivion*, of all *forepast sins*, and of a new *Covenant*, on most moderate, easie terms of *sincere* (without unsinning) *obedience* for the *future*; And *Lastly*, such are his *precepts*, a sort of commandments, which are most agreeable, and grateful to our *reasonable* nature, and which tend, beyond all other means or *instruments*, to the *improving* and *perfecting* the most *valuable* part of us, that which alone denominates us *men*, and annexing incomprehensible *rewards (an eternal weight of glory)* to the bare *practice* of those things, which are at the very present, though they were not *commanded*, and if they should not be *rewarded* in another life (I mean abstractively from these *enhaunsments* of them) infinitely esteemable and preferrable before the *Contraries*, which must farther cost us so extreamly dear, if we will choose and pitch our design upon them, and resolve to go through with that *unthrifty* purchase.

Sect. 8. So that this one *corner stone*, *Jesus Christ*, is a most competent, ample *foundation*, on which to *superstruct* the largest *pile* of *building*, to erect a *Church* of *pious* livers, and to bring all *rational* men within the compass of it, and it is not imaginable what could have been added to this, or what *method* could probably have been *effectual* to any man, which is not wrought on by the *concurrence* of all these.

Sect. 9. This will more evidently appear, if we compare this one with all *other* ways which have been used at any time toward this end of *inducing*, and *obliging*, and *engaging* men to good life. *The Christian foundation compared with the Natural.*

Sect. 10. In the course of *nature*, (the first way of *Oeconomy*, under which the world was governed, by a *Law* written in *men's hearts*, *naturale judicatorium*, *lumen super nos signatum*, *a natural judicatory*, *a light sealed upon us*, in our first composure) though there were a competent *revelation* of our duty, and a double obligation to perform it, 1. that of *piety* to our *maker*, 2. that of *reverence* to our own souls, the ἡγεμονικὸν, the *superiour ruling* part of us, and these two improveable into many other, and thus *actually advanced* and *improved* by *natural* men, upon *study* and consideration, (and so all the *heathen wisdom* was the farther explaining of those *obligations*, their *natural philosophy* was but a kind of *comment* on the *creation*, and is therefore by the *Jews* entituled בראשית the first word of the Book of *Genesis*, that *story* of the *creation*, and that a most proper ground-work of *obedience* to that *Almighty Creator*; and their moral *philosophy*, especially that of *Epicurus*, a consideration of the most ravishing *beauty* and *delight* and *joy*, the result of the practice of every *virtue*, that of *Socrates* (which had the *Oracle's Testimony* and admiration) a *comment* on the γνῶθι σεαυτὸν, the *knowledge* of a man's *self*, that of *Pythagoras* on the αἰσχύνου σαυτὸν, the *revering* of a man's *self*, and that of *Aristotle*, the placing of all humane *felicity* in continued *actions* of *virtue*, and that also a *foundation* very fit to *superstruct virtue* upon) yet there were great *defects* and *vacuities* and *imperfections* in this *Oeconomy*.

Sect. 11. *First*, the prescribed *duties* wanted of their full stature, especially if compared with *Christ's* πλήρωσις his *suppletories* and *superadditions*.

Sect. 12. *Secondly*, there remained very advantageous *accesses* for temptations to enter and invade men, the *fortifications* being very slender to secure their resistance, little knowledge of the *immortality* of the *soul*, or any thing beyond this life, whether *reward* or *punishment*, no *assurance* that *repentance* would be admitted for any sin, an absolute *desperation* of any good without the help of *purgatives*, and a perfect ignorance of all means of *purging*, and many other such wants, which are all abundantly supplied in the *Christians foundation*, *Jesus Christ*.

Sect. 13. And upon that account the *Apostle* could safely challenge the *wise men* of the *heathen world* with his ποῦ σοφὸς; *Where is the wise man of the World?* 1 *Cor.* 1. 20. Let all the *Philosophers*, *moralists* or *naturalists*, bring forth their richest *provisions*, shew such *engines* of *approach* and *battery*, for the supplanting or beating down of *vicious* life, for the engaging men to *reform*, and live like men, as this *foolishness* of *preaching*, this *despised*, but *saving doctrine* of the *Gospel* hath afforded us.

Sect. 14. So likewise for the *Judaical* or *Mosaical* œconomy, though that brought many additions to the *light* of *Nature*, and was a σκιαγραφία, an *obscure* representation as of that *Gospel*, and promises of *everlasting life*, so of those *precepts* which are now most clearly *revealed* by *Christ*, yet was that *obscurity* a very great *defect*, the *shadow* was so extreamly *dark*, that the *vices* of men made advantage of it to shrowd and *secure* them in their *sins*. *With the Judaical.*

Sect. 15. The *ceremony* and *Law* of *circumcision*, &c. which was meant by *God ſacramentally* to impreſs the duty of ſtrict *purity*, to *cut* off the *περιτομὴν καρδίας*, the *ſuperfluity* of *naughtineſs*, all inordinate *exceſſive luſts* of the *fleſh*, was yet but a *character* impreſſed on the *fleſh*, and did not explicitely deſcend to the *prohibiting* of the *deſires*, but was on the contrary made advantage of by *luſt*, *Rom.* 7. 8. and the *outward circumciſion* in the *body* of a *child* of *Abraham* was thought to commute for all *impurity*.

Sect. 16. So again the *Phylacteries* on their *wriſts* and *foreheads* were look'd on as *ſpells* and *charms*, which would yield them *impunity* for their *diſobedience*; And the ſtrict ordinances againſt converſing with *Gentiles*, leſt they ſhould learn and joyn in their *abominations*, bred more of *pride*, and *contempt*, and *uncharitableneſs* to their *perſons*, than of *alienation*, or *deteſtation* of their *ſins*.

Sect. 17. And ſo that way of *Oeconomy*, in many reſpects, was not ἄμεμπτον & *blameleſs*; The clear *commands* and the explicite *promiſes* of *Chriſt* and the proclaimed *neceſſity* of *real*, ſubſtantial *fruits* of *repentance*, inſtead of the *leaves*, the *arrogance*, and *hypocriſie* of external performances, were a *neceſſary ſuppletory* to the *Law* of *Moſes*, and to that may belong alſo the *Apoſtle's* τῷ γεγραμμένῳ; τῷ ἀνυπάτῳ τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ; Let all the *Scribes*, or *Doctors* of the *Law*, the *ſearchers* or *profound Interpreters* of the *Scriptures*, bring forth ſuch *evidences* of their *efficacy*, or good ſucceſſes in the *reforming* and purifying of mens *lives*, as the *Apoſtles* had done by theſe ſo contemptible deſpicable means, the *Goſpel* of the *Croſs* of *Chriſt*.

Sect. 18. I might farther extend the compariſon to all poſſible pretenders, the *Idolatrous heathens*, the *corrupters* of the *Law* of *Nature*, and the *Mahomedans*, that have *ſuperſtructed* on, and added to the *Law* of *Moſes*; But both of theſe are ſo ſcandalouſly known to have laid grounds for all *impurity*, the former in their *myſteries* and *devotions*, the latter in their ſenſual carnal *paradiſe*; the one allowing it their *votaries* in the *preſent poſſeſſion*, the other promiſing it them in a *reverſion*, that I ſhall not need enlarge on ſo remote conſiderations, but conclude and ſhut up all that might be ſaid on this ſubject, with that judgment of an *heathen Philoſopher* paſt on this matter, *Chalcidius* in his *comment* on *Plato's Timæus*, whoſe Writings have come to us only in *Latine*, *Ratio Dei* (no queſtion in the *Original* λόγος Θεοῦ, in St. *John's ſtyle*) *Deus eſt, humanis rebus conſulens, quæ cauſa eſt hominibus benè beatèque vivendi, ſi non conceſſum ſibi munus à Summo Deo negligant*, *The reaſon, or Word of God is God taking care of humane affairs, and is the cauſe unto men of their living well and happily, if they do not neglect that gift granted by the Supream God.* A ſaying that contains in it the *ſumme* of our *Chriſtian Goſpel*, (which, it ſeems by this and *other* paſſages, he had gotten a *ſight* of, and underſtood in the *ſimplicity* of it) that *Chriſt* the *eternal Word* or *reaſon* of his *Father*, had two great *deſigns* in his proſpect, *effects* of his *providence* and care of *mankind*, the *firſt* to bring men to *good life*, to *reformation* of every evil courſe, *ſubduing* of *paſſions*, &c. the *ſecond* to render them *happy* here by ſo doing and *bleſſed* eternally, and this managed ſo *powerfully*, and effectually for them, that nothing, but their own *ſtupid*, and *obſtinate negligence* and *contempt* of this *divine donative*, can deprive them of theſe *benefits* of it.

with the heathen and Mahomedan.

CHAP. IV.

JESUS CHRIST Crucified.

Sect. 1. AND as *Jeſus Chriſt indefinitely* taken is ſet down to be this *Foundation*, ſo elſewhere is *Jeſus Chriſt Crucified*, 1 *Cor.* 1. 23. & 2. 2. and accordingly the whole *Goſpel* is ſtyled λόγος ὁ τοῦ σταυροῦ, *the word which is of the Croſs* of *Chriſt*, c. 1. 18. and that (ſuppoſing it be *believed*) *ſufficient* to *ſuperſtruct* on it the *converſion* of the whole world to a new and *Chriſtian* life, and accordingly it is there ſtyled τοῖς σωζομένοις ἡμῖν δύναμις θεοῦ, *to thoſe that eſcape* out of the *deluge* of *infidelity*, the very *power of God*, and ver. 24. the *power of God*, and the *wiſdom* of *God*, the *powerfulleſt* and *wiſeſt method* toward the accompliſhing of this work, which is farther explained, *Rom.* 1. 16. by δύναμις εἰς σωτηρίαν, the *power of God to ſalvation to every one that believeth, to the Jew firſt, and alſo to the Gentile.* If this *doctrine* of the *Croſs* be once *received*, there is no more wanting to *engage* and *oblige* all *rational* men to that *renovation* of their *lives* which is oft called σωτηρία *ſaving* or *delivering* them out of their *evil ways*, and will aſſuredly bring them to *ſalvation*, in the notion, wherein we *vulgarly* take it.

Chriſt crucified the Foundation.

Sect. 2. That the *Croſs* of *Chriſt* hath this *propriety* may appear by theſe *five effects* or branches of it, 1. It is the higheſt *confirmation* imaginable of the truth of all that he had delivered from his *Father*, He laid down his life for the *teſtifying* of it. 2. It is the *exemplifying* (and that is the moſt *Rhetorical argument*, the moſt powerful way of *perſwading*) the higheſt and hardeſt part of the *Chriſtian's duty*, that of *laying down* our *lives* for the truth, *reſiſting unto blood* in our τὰ πρὸς ψυχῆς Ὀλύμπια *our ſpiritual Olympicks*, our *ſtriving againſt ſin*. 3. It is a *ſealing* that *Covenant* betwixt *God* and us, which he came to preach, a *Covenant* of *mercy*, and *pardon*, and everlaſting *ſalvation* to all that perform the *condition* of it, and to none elſe, and that is of all others the greateſt and moſt effectual *engagement* to that performance. 4. It is the *ſacrifice* for the *ſins* of the *whole world*, the λύτρον or *means* of *expiation*, or pardon, upon our unfeigned return and change, and that is abſolutely neceſſary to found our *hope*, as that *hope* is neceſſary to *excite* our *indeavours*. 5. It was the *ceremony* of *conſecrating Chriſt* our *high Prieſt*, to his great *Melchiſedekian* office of *bleſſing* us, in which as his *reſurrection* inſtated him, ſo that was by way of *reward* to his *ſufferings*, *Phil.* 2. 9. and ſo all that *ſufficiency* of *ſtrength* which is required for the *turning* every one from *iniquity*, *Acts* 3. 26. being an *effect* of that *bleſſing* of his, the *doctrine* of his *death*, from the *merit* whereof this *quickning power* doth flow, is a *foundation* of all *chearful* attending on his *ſervice*, to which he is ſo ſure to afford his *aſſiſtance*.

What propriety the Croſs hath to this.

CHAP.

CHAP. V.

JESUS CHRIST raiſed, &c.

Sect. 1. ELſewhere this *Foundation* is determined to one other *ſingle article*, that of the *reſurrection* of *Chriſt*, *Rom.* 10. 9. which ſuppoſing and comprehending the *crucifixion* under it, and being viſibly and undeniably wrought by the *immediate* and *omnipotent power of God*, and not imputable to any other poſſible means, was a moſt *illuſtrious Teſtimony*, and *conviction* of the *innocency* of *Chriſt*, thus ſignally *vindicated*, and rewarded by *God*, and conſequently a confirmation of the truth of all that he had taught, and thus ſigned with the *effuſion* of his *blood*. *Chriſt's Reſurrection the Foundation.*

Sect. 2. Of this one *article* it is our *Saviours* affirmation that it was ſo full matter of *conviction* to all gainſayers, that they which ſhould not be wrought upon by that, were to expect no farther *ſigns* or *miracles*, and the deſign of the *Holy Ghoſts* coming upon the *Apoſtles* being to fit them for the great work (for which *Chriſt* had given them *Commiſſion*) the *teſtifying* and proclaiming his *Reſurrection*, from thence ariſes the *aggravation* and *irremiſſibleneſs* of the *ſin* againſt the *Holy Ghoſt*, who had ſo abundantly *convinced* the *World* of *Chriſt's Righteouſneſs* by his *ariſing* and *going to his Father*. And accordingly in the preaching of Saint *Peter*, *Acts* 2. this was the *doctrine* that with ſuch an *Emphaſis* he inculcated upon them, ver. 22. *Men of Iſrael, hear theſe words----Jeſus of Nazareth---- ye have nailed with wicked hands and killed, Whom God hath raiſed up*, &c. and v. 24. *this Jeſus hath God raiſed up, ἧ πάντες ἡμεῖς ἐσμὲν μάρτυρες, of which we all are witneſſes*, or, *whoſe witneſſes we all are*, verſe 32. and ſo *made him Lord and Chriſt*, verſe 36. *And when they heard this they were pricked at the heart, and ſaid, Men and Brethren, What ſhall we do?* And upon this one *foundation* he immediately *ſuperſtructs* the exhortation to *repentance*, and coming in by *baptiſm* unto *Chriſt*, and *three thouſand* were that day wrought on by that method, verſe 41. *an Argument of the greateſt conviction.*

Sect. 3. Beſide this, the *Reſurrection* of *Chriſt* was a peculiar pawn and pledge of *Gods raiſing* up our *bodies* out of the *grave*, and (before that time comes) of his *quickning* our *ſouls* out of the moſt *noiſome vaults*, the *habits* and *cuſtoms* of *ſin*, wherein they lay *putrified*, this being an act of the ſame *omnipotent Spirit*, by which he *raiſed up Jeſus from the dead*, and without which it were as *hopeleſs* an attempt for ſinners to go about to riſe to *new life*, as it were for *dead* men to raiſe themſelves out of their *graves*. And conſequently the *belief* of this, was, in the former of theſe reſpects, of ſpecial importance to confirm our *hopes* of another life, on which ſo many branches of *Chriſtian piety* ſo immediately depend (that eſpecially of *laying down our lives for Chriſt's ſake*) that if our hope in *Chriſt* were *only* that of *this life*, we could never eſpouſe ſo *cold* a ſervice; And in the latter reſpect it was moſt proper to *quicken* our *hopes*, that upon our *awaking* at *Chriſts* call, and ariſing (like *Lazarus*) out of our *graves* of *ſin*, that *Chriſt*, *which gives us life*, would command us to be *looſed* from our *grave-cloaths*, reſcue us by the power of his *Spirit* from the *bands* and power of *ſin*, and enable us to *live Chriſtianly*; Which we could not hope to do without this *power of his Spirit*, to *prevent* and *aſſiſt* us, nor reaſonably *attempt* to do without this *hope*. *A pawn of our Reſurrection Corporal, and Spiritual.*

Sect. 4. Farther yet, the *Reſurrection* of *Chriſt* hath the power of a *pattern* to us, and is ſo made uſe of, and *typified* in *baptiſm*, as an *engagement* and *obligation* to us to tranſcribe that *divine* copy into our *hearts*, and to riſe to *newneſs* of *life*. And accordingly that ſeems to be the importance of the phraſe, *Rom.* 10. 9. *believing in the heart that God raiſed Chriſt from the dead*, there being no more *neceſſary* to the *ſuperſtructing* all *piety* on that one *foundation*, but to ſink down the *belief* of that one *Article* from the *brain* to the *heart*, to reduce it effectually to *practice*. *An example of new life to us.*

CHAP. VI.

Other Articles of Belief in Chriſt.

Sect. 1. BEſide theſe two, a whole *catalogue*, and *climax* of *Articles* we have ſet down, 1 *Tim.* 3. 16. *made manifeſt in* or *by the fleſh, juſtified by the Spirit, ſeen of Angels, preached among the Gentiles, believed on in the World, received up with glory*. And theſe all together ſeem to be that ἀλήθεια, *truth*, verſe 15. (as elſewhere *Faith*) of which the Church was στῦλος καὶ ἑδραίωμα, *a pillar and eſtabliſhment*, to *ſuſtain* and *keep* it (as a *pillar* firmly ſet upon the *baſis* ſuſtains and upholds the *fabrick* laid upon it) from *ſinking* or *falling*; For ſo this *truth depoſited* in the *Church*, or with the *Governours* thereof (ſuch as *Timothy* there) was to be *conſerved* and *upheld* by that means. And it is farther obſervable in that place, that it is *called* μέγα τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον, *the myſtery of Piety*, and that a *great* one, ſignifying the *price* and *value* of theſe *articles* principally to conſiſt in this, that they tend *mightily* to the begetting of *piety* in our *hearts*, and ſo are the μυστήριον, the *articles* of our *initiation*, or of our *religion* into which we are *initiated* by *Baptiſm*, as the *foundation* on which all our *Chriſtian practice* (which alone deſerves the name of *piety*, and is oppoſed to ἀσέβεια *impiety*) is ſuperſtructed and built afterward. *The Myſtery of Godlineſs.* 1 *Tim.* 3. 16.

God made manifeſt by the Fleſh.

Sect. 2. This will be more viſible by ſurveying the ſeverals, [1. Θεὸς ἐφανερώθη ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ, *God manifeſt by the fleſh.*] *God* was ſo intent upon this work of *revealing* and declaring his will to men, in order to bringing home *ſinners to repentance*, ſo very deſirous that men ſhould *reform* and *live*, and not *ſin* and *periſh eternally*, that to inforce this on us at the greateſt poſſible advantage, he was pleaſed himſelf to *aſſume*, and *manifeſt* his *will*, *in*, or by our *Fleſh*, and ſo, not only *God* from *heaven*, but *God* viſible on *earth*, to preach *reformation* among us, and if this be not able to make impreſſion on us, it is not imaginable that all the *preaching* of *men* or *Angels*, that any *inferiour method* ſhould be of force to do it. From whence it was, that all the *Devil*'s countermines in the firſt ages were deſigned purpoſely againſt this one *Article*, the *Deity* or *God-head* of *Chriſt incarnate*, making all that he *did* and *ſuffered* here an *appearance*, no *reality*, in oppoſition to which is the [ἀληθῶς] and [ὄντως] ſo oft repeated by *Ignatius*, the *reality* and *verity* of *Chriſt's eating*, and *ſuffering*, and *riſing*, &c. and every branch of ſuch *hereſie* took off (as far as it was believed) from the neceſſity of *Chriſtian life*, not only by implying him to be an *Impoſtor*, if he were not *truly* what he oft affirmed himſelf, and was by the *Apoſtles* affirmed to be, the *Meſſias*, i. e. the *eternal ſon of God*, and *God bleſſed for ever*, but by evacuating that great obligation, and engagement to *reform* our lives, taken from the *authority* and *Godhead* of him, that had ſought and ſolicited it ſo earneſtly, and came down from *heaven* and aſſumed our *fleſh* upon that one errand or embaſſie to *reveal* himſelf more *convincingly* among us.

Sect. 3. Had it been only a *Prophet*, though never ſo *great* and extraordinarily furniſhed with *ſigns* and *wonders*, he had been but a *ſervant* of *God*, and there were many *experiences* and *precedents* among their *forefathers* of the *reſiſting* of ſuch, but the *perſonal* deſcent of *God* himſelf, and his *aſſumption* of our *fleſh* to his *divinity*, more familiarly to *inſinuate* his pleaſure to us, to *admoniſh*, and *invite*, and denounce judgments, and even to *weep* over thoſe that would yet be *obſtinate*, was an *enforcement* beyond all the *methods* of *wiſdom*, that were ever made uſe of in the world.

Sect. 4. For *God*, I ſay, himſelf to do all this, and to *deſcend* ſo low, to ſo mean an *eſtate*, and to a much *meaner* uſage, a *ſhameful* contumelious *death*, to work this work moſt *effectually* upon men, was a wonderful act of *grace* and *wiſdom*, a *ſecret*, a *myſtery* indeed beyond all former ways, infinitely conſiderable towards this of turning from *every evil*.

The Arians doctrines againſt it.

Sect. 5. And upon this ſcore the *doctrine* of the *antient* and *modern Arians* and *Photinians*, which ſo induſtriouſly leſſens the *divinity* of *Chriſt* in pretence of *zeal* to *God* the *Father*, to whom they will not permit him to be *equal*, muſt conſequently take off extremely from this *Myſtery* of *Piety*, this *foundation* of a good life, laid in the *eternal God's coming down* to preach it to us: And as it is a direct contradiction to thoſe places, wherein *Chriſt* is called *God*, *Acts* 20. 28. *Tit.* 2. 13. wherein *he* and his *Father* are affirmed to be *one*, *John* 10. 30. and 1 *John* 5. 7. wherein the known *title* of the *God of Iſrael* (never named in their ſervices, but it was anſwered by all with ברוך שם εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, *God bleſſed for ever*) is by the *Apoſtle* attributed to *Chriſt*, *Rom.* 9. 5. (as alſo *Heb.*13.21. 1 *Pet.*4.11. & 5.11. 2 *Pet.*3.18. *Rev.*1.6.) and which, as *Proclus* ſaith, *convinceth* all the *hereſies* concerning *Chriſt*, *De Fide.* p 53. ᾧ ἀποτειχίζει, *and walls up the newly invented ways of injury and contumely againſt him*; So it is a great diminution and abatement of the force of that *fundamental argument*, whereon *God* thought fit, that the *renovation* of the world ſhould be *ſuperſtructed*, and how much ſoever the *contrary hereticks* the modern *Socinians* have pretended to the maintenance of *Piety*, 'tis certain they have by this taken out one principal *ſtone* from the *foundation* of it, the Θεὸς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκὶ here, *God made manifeſt by the fleſh*, which could not be affirmed of *Chriſt*, if he were not firſt *God*, before he was thus *made manifeſt* by the means of his *incarnation*.

God juſtified by the Spirit.

Sect. 5. The next ſtone in this *foundation* is, Θεὸς ἐδικαιώθη ἐν πνεύματι, *God*'s having been *juſtified by the Spirit*] i. e. the ſeveral ways of *conviction*, which were uſed in the world by the *Spirit* of *God*, to give *authority* to all that was *revealed* by *Chriſt*, as the *will* and *commands* of *God*. Such was 1. the *viſible* deſcent of the *Spirit* of *God* upon him at his *baptiſm*, *Matth.*3. which (as *preparative* to his entring on the *exerciſe* of his *prophetick office*, *Matth.*5.&c.) was the *divine* atteſtation given from *heaven* (by voice) to all that he ſhould ever *teach*.

Sect. 6. Secondly, Such was the *Spirits leading* him into the *wilderneſs*, *Mat.* ch.4. to ſubject him to the *Devil*'s examination, and thereby to give grounds of *conviction* to him and thoſe *infernal* powers, that he was the *ſon of God*.

Sect. 7. Thirdly, Such was his *power* of doing *miracles*, works of that nature, as were by all acknowledged to be above the power of *men* or *devils*, and only works of the *Spirit* of *God*, Thus was his curing of *Leproſie*, of which the *King* of *Iſrael* ſaith, *Am I a God, that this man ſends to me to recover a man of his Leproſie?* 2 *King.*5.7. and which the *Jews* proverbially called the *finger of God*, and is therefore ſaid to be done εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς, *for a teſtimony unto them*, *Matth.*8.4. an evidence of his *divinity*; Thus the giving *ſight* to him that was *born blind*, which *ſince the world began*, had not been *heard* of to be done by any, *John* 9. 32. Thus the *raiſing* of *Lazarus* and others, and at laſt his own *reſurrection* from the *grave*; All which being wrought by the *Spirit of God*, and being not otherwiſe poſſible to be done by any, were the δικαίωσις or *Judicial* way of *approving* his *Commiſſion* from *God*, and his *doctrine*, againſt all *gainſayers*, and ſo moſt eminently tends to the impreſſing the *neceſſity* of that *reformation*, which he came to publiſh.

Sect. 8. Fourthly, Such was the *deſcent* of the *Spirit* on the *Apoſtles*, *authorizing* them *witneſſes* of the *reſurrection*, and *preachers* of all that *truth* and *will of God*, which *Chriſt* had in his life *revealed* to them, which conſequently gave an atteſtation to all that the *Apoſtles* ſhould teach, being thus led by the *Spirit* into all *truth*, and ſo was of ſpecial concernment to the planting of a *Church*, and enforcing that *reformation* of *lives*, which the *Apoſtles* preſſed on all that would not be *ruined* eternally.

God ſeen by Angels.

Sect. 9. The third branch of this *myſterious* divine way of working *piety* on *earth*, is the ὤφθη ἀγγέλοις his being *ſeen by Angels*, i. e. his *divine power diſcerned* and acknowledged and *adored* by *Angels* themſelves, both *good* and *bad*; by the *good* 1. at his *birth*, *Luke* 2.13. Secondly, when after his *temptation* and *faſting* they came and *miniſtred unto him*, *Matth.*4.11. Thirdly, in the *trouble* and *agony* of his

his *ſoul*, before his *death*, *Joh.* 12.29. *Luk.* 22.43. Fourthly, *at*, and *after* his *reſurrection*, *Matt* 21. 8. And by the *bad*, both when he was *tempted*, and when he caſt them out of their *poſſeſſions*, obeying his *command*, dreading his *power*, and *believing* and *confeſſing* him the *ſon of God moſt high*, and when immediately upon his *birth*, the *oracles*, which had before ſo flouriſhed among the *heathens*, began to *droop* and decay, and from giving *reſponſes* in *Verſe*, deſcended to *Proſe*, and within a while were utterly *ſilenced*. Which as it was a moſt regular means to bring all ſorts of men, *heathens* as well as *Jews*, to *reformation* of all vices, thoſe eſpecially, which they were formerly taught in their *Idolatrous worſhips*, and were *enſlaved* to them *unwillingly* by the *tyranny* of thoſe *falſe gods or devils*, which required to be thus *worſhipped*, *Rom.* 8.20. and ſo continued to do till they were caſt out of their *Temples*; ſo was it an huge obligation on all men to *receive* and *obey* him, whom the very *devils believed* and *trembled* at, and a *teſtimony* of the greateſt force in the mouth of a whole *Province* of his greateſt *enemies*, that he was, what he aſſumed to be, the *Meſſias* of the *world*, who if he were not received by *conſent* and readily *obeyed*, would erect his *kingdom* in the *deſtruction* of thoſe *enemies* (an eſſay of which was thus ſhewn on the *Prince of darkneſs*) avenge and utterly *conſume* the *adverſaries*.

Sect. 10. The fourth is, the ἐκηρύχθη ἐν ἔθνεσιν, his being *preached among the Gentiles*, or *Idolatrous nations* of the *world*; The meſſage brought by him from Heaven was proclaimed not only to the *Jews*, but (both by *himſelf* and by the *Apoſtles*) to all the *Gentiles*, thoſe that till then had lived in all *villany* and *impiety*, and yet had now by *Chriſt mercy* tendred them upon *Reformation*, and thereby is all encouragement *afforded* to the greateſt *ſinners*, to *forſake*, and *amend* their *lives*, and by *God's* merciful *pardon* to the times of their *ignorance*, and *forepaſt ſins*, a paſſage opened to *life*, and *eternity*, for all that will make uſe of it, and this is the greateſt *engagement* to do ſo, and not to *forfeit* and *loſe* ſo *pretious* an *opportunity*. *Preached among the Gentiles.*

Sect. 11. The *fifth* branch is the ἐπιστεύθη ἐν κόσμῳ, his being *believed on in the world*; the *faith* of *Chriſt* received by many both *Jews* and *Gentiles*; Of that people of the *Jews* (a moſt *ſtubborn obdurate* people, that had *killed the Prophets*, *and ſtoned them that were ſent*) ſome conſiderable number *repented* and came in upon *Chriſt's* preaching, about *three thouſand* were added to the *Faith* at one *ſermon*, *Acts* 2. 41. before the *Apoſtles* going out from *Jeruſalem* (which wants but a *ſeventh* part of being ~~half the number of thoſe *reſerved ones* of the whole *kingdom* of the *ten tribes*~~, in *Elijah's* time, which had (ſecretly) kept out of that *Idol-Baal-worſhip*) and ſo proportionably at other *ſermons*, ſo that *Acts* 21.20. we hear of *many myriads of believing Jews*, and (taking out of theſe the *Gnoſtick heretical* party) an *hundred forty four thouſand ſealed* out of the *twelve tribes* as *faithful ſervants of God*, which had received the *faith of Chriſt*, and brought forth fruit accordingly, *Revel.* 7. and that, though but a *ſmall* number in proportion to the greater that *remained* obſtinate, yet above *twenty* times as many as they in *Elijah's* time; And when the greater *multitude* was ſo terribly deſtroyed, then the *believers* of that *Nation* were the only κατάλειμμα or *remnant* of it, and in a manner that whole people, by the *converſion* of ſome, and *ſlaughter* of the reſt, were ſoon after, though not at the time of the *Apoſtles* reſolving on this *depoſitum*, reduced to the *Faith*, and became *Chriſtian*. *Believed on among men: The Jews.*

Sect. 12. And for the *Gentiles*, they were contained in the number of thoſe which were preſent at that *ſermon*, *Acts* 2. 11. and no doubt ſome of them were wrought on by it, as even in *Chriſt's* time, the *Gentiles faith* is magnified for *great*, and above the ſize of what he had found in *Iſrael*, and they were peculiarly the *violent* that *took the kingdom of heaven by force*, whileſt the *children* of the *Kingdom neglected*, and were *caſt out* of it; And ſoon after the *Apoſtles* going out and preaching to *all nations*, they willingly received the *Faith*, and forſook their *Idols*, and within a while *all Aſia*, *Acts* 19. by St. *Paul's* preaching, and other whole *nations* by each of the other *Apoſtles*, and at length the whole *Roman Empire* became *Chriſtian*, and the *kingdoms of the world became the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Chriſt*, *Revel.* 11. 15. and the *Kings of the earth* and *of the Nations brought their glory to the Lamb*, *Rev.* 21. 24. 26. and to the ſame purpoſe, *Revel.* 17. 14. and 19. 16. and as among the *Jews*, ſo all the *world* over, thoſe that received not the *commands* of *Chriſt*, and his *doctrines* of *purity* and *perſeverance*, were ſignally deſtroyed, and they that did, were preſerved as a *peculiar people* unto him, to live, and continue in his *obedience*. *The Gentiles.*

Sect. 13. And this great ſucceſs on both ſides, among *Jews* and *Gentiles* over all the world, (part of it *hiſtorically* true at the compiling of theſe *articles*, and part of it *prophetically* true then, and *fulfilled* afterward, the *ſubduing* them either by the *word* of his *mouth*, the *preaching* of the *Goſpel*, or by the *word* of his *power*, the *deſtructions* which he ſent among them) was a moſt effectual *argument*, a *ſoveraign* method to give *authority* to this *faith*, which was thus prevailing, and becomes the greateſt inſtance of *reproach* to all *libertine* profeſſors, that they ſhould not *purifie* their *hearts* by the *faith*, when the moſt *impure Idolaters* were wrought on to do ſo, and a ſad certain abode to all ſuch (after the example of *obſtinate Infidels* and *impure Gnoſticks*) of both *preſent* and *future deſtructions*.

Sect. 14. The *ſixth* and *laſt ſtone* in this *foundation* is the ἀνελήφθη ἐν δόξῃ, his being *received up in*, or *with*, or *into glory*, *Chriſt's aſcenſion* or *aſſumption* to *heaven* being an irrefragable *argument* of *conviction* to the World, that he died an *innocent* perſon, *John* 16. 10. and conſequently that what he *taught* was the *will of God* and *truth of heaven*, to which he was *aſſumed* after his *teſtification* of it; To which when theſe two *circumſtances* are ſuperadded, *firſt*, that his *aſſumption* being in the *ſight* of *many*, was alſo *ſolemnized* by the *preſence of Angels*, and a *voice from heaven*, *Acts* 1.9, 10, 11. (and ſo ἐν δόξῃ *in* or *with glory*, after a *glorious manner*) and *ſecondly*, that it was attended with the exerciſe of *divine power*, both in the *Church* by the hands of the *Apoſtles*, and their *ſucceſſors*, whom *Chriſt* had *authorized* to ſucceed him on the earth, and in the *world* by *executing* viſible *judgments* on his *crucifiers*, &c. (and ſo ἐν δόξῃ *into glory* or *regal power*) this will be an *article* of great *energy* for the *planting* of *Chriſtian faith*, and *purity* in the *world*. *Received up into glory.*

CHAP.

CHAP. VII.

The Faith in Baptiſm.

The Father, Son, and holy Ghoſt.

Sect. 1. WHat hath thus been ſet down as ſo many branches of *fundamental belief*, and ſo of the *myſtery* of *Godlineſs*, the *ground* of *initiating* or entring men into *Chriſtian life*, is more ſummarily compriz'd in the form of *baptiſm*, the *ceremony* of this *initiation* inſtituted by *Chriſt*, wherein all that were to be *baptized*, were (if of age, firſt *inſtructed* in the *doctrine*, and then) *received*, *In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the holy Ghoſt.* Which are the *abbreviature* of the larger *Catalogue* of *doctrinals* formerly *taught* and *explained* by the *Catechiſt*, and thoſe, on which they that *adminiſtred baptiſm*, are commanded to *ſuperſtruct* all the *duties* of *Chriſtian life*, *Matt.* 28.20. *teaching them to obſerve all things which I have commanded you*; the *authority* of all and each the *perſons* of the *Trinity* being purpoſely engaged on this one great *intereſt*, and the *gathering diſciples* and receiving of *Proſelytes* over the World, being deſign'd to this one grand *end*, of introducing the *practice* of *Chriſtian vertues* among men, who do therefore in *baptiſm ſacramentally* and *federally*, i.e. under *oath* and *ſolemneſt vow* (as they *believe* any thing of theſe *fundamental doctrines* of *God* the *Father*, *Son*, and *holy Ghoſt*) undertake the performance thereof, and if they fail therein, are the moſt *faithleſs*, *perjured* perſons in the World. And certainly this *method* is in the *deſign* more probable, (how *improſperous* ſoever the wickedneſs of men hath rendred the *ſucceſs* of it) than any could have been invented to this end.

CHAP. VIII.

Of the Creeds in general; and firſt of the Apoſtles Creed.

The Apoſtles Creed

Sect. 1. THE method now leads from the more *compendious*, to the *larger* and fuller view of this *foundation*, as it is ſet down in the *Creeds* of the *Church*, and firſt in that which is called *ſymbolum Apoſtolicum*, the *Apoſtolick badge* or mark, (a *teſſera* or *token* of the *Apoſtles having* planted the *Faith* in any *Church*) the known *ſummary* of that *belief*, which had been received from the *Apoſtles*.

proved to be the Apoſtles.

Sect. 2. For although in their *Epiſtles*, which were all written to them which were *Chriſtians* already, there is not to be expected any complete *Catalogue* of thoſe *articles*, which they had every where *taught*, becauſe they were ſuppoſed by them to be ſufficiently known, and might briefly be referred to, as ſuch, without any perfect *enumeration*; yet in any *City* or *Region*, where the *Apoſtles* came to *plant* the *faith*, it is the *affirmation* of the firſt *writers* of the *Church*, as frequently appears in *Tertullian*, *Irenæus*, &c. (and there is no reaſon of doubt of the truth of it) that all thoſe *articles*, which were thought fit to be laid, as the *foundation* of *Chriſtian* life, were by them diſtinctly *delivered*; And this being a matter of *fact*, of which (as of the *Canon* of *Scripture*, or of this or that *book* in it) only the *records*, and ſtories of the firſt times are competent judges, that *Creed* which is delivered down to us by the *Antient Churches* thus planted (I mean thoſe of the firſt *three hundred* years) and by them entituled to the name The *Apoſtles*, and expounded in the *homilies* of the *Fathers*, ſome *extant*, others mentioned by *Ruffinus*, *illuſtres tractatores* which had gone *before* him in that work, is in all reaſon to be deemed the *ſumm* of that *Foundation*. Of this if any farther *evidence* be neceſſary, it will be thus eaſily made up.

Sect. 3. The time of *forming* the *Nicene Creed*, and the *occaſion* of it, (by way of *oppoſition* to thoſe *hereſies* which had then broken into the *Church*) is known to every man. Now before this was formed, it is certain, that * *all* the *Churches* of the *world*, both *Eaſtern* and *Weſtern* had a form of *confeſſion* of *Faith*, which they had received from their immediate *anceſtors*, and they from the || *Apoſtles* themſelves.

* *Eccleſia per univerſum orbem uſque ad fines terræ ſeminata, & ab Apoſtolis & à diſcipulis eorum accepit eam fidem quæ eſt in unum Deum patrem omnipotentem*, &c. *Iren. l.* 1. *c.* 2. || *Quid ſi neque Apoſtoli quidem ſcripturas reliquiſſent nobis, nonne oportebat Ordinem ſequi traditionis, quam tradiderunt iis, quibus conſtituebant Eccleſias? Cui ordinationi aſſentiunt multæ gentes barbarorum, quorum qui in Chriſtum credunt, ſine charta & atramento ſcriptum habentes in cordibus ſuis ſalutare, & veterem eruditionem diligenter cuſtodientes, in unum Deum credentes*, &c. *Iren. l.* 3. *c.* 4.

Sect. 4. And of this there is no place of doubting, but that it was the very ſame which we now call the *Apoſtles Creed*, not only becauſe there was never any other aſſigned by any, or affirmed to have had that *general reception*, but becauſe the *teſtimonies* of the *Antients* are expreſly for this. *Ruffinus* and *Vigilius cont. Eutychen* teſtifie clearly for the *Weſtern Church*, and *Ruffinus* again, and *Cyril* of *Jeruſalem* for the *Eaſtern*.

Sect. 5. And *Marcellus Biſhop of Ancyra* in the Great Council of *Nice*, a famous *ſupporter* of the true *Faith*, (and a great *ſufferer* for it) againſt the *Arians*, at his taking his leave of *Pope Julius*, leaves behind him the *Confeſſion* of his *faith*, which, ſaith he, he *had received* παρὰ τῶν κατὰ θεὸν προγόνων *from his*

his predeceſſors in the Lord, And this was the ſame with that which we now ſtile the *Apoſtles Creed*, as appears in that *ſtory*, ſet down by *Epiphanius har.*72. All which will receive yet farther force from that *known* obſervation of St. *Auſtins*, that *what the Univerſal Church holds, and hath not been inſtituted by Councils, but always retain'd, is with all reaſon to be believ'd to have been delivered by tradition Apoſtolical*, (there being no other ſo *large* an *Original* to which ſo *univerſal* an *effect* may be imputed) *l.*4. *de bapt. cont. Donat.*c.24. eſpecially when to that we add *Tertullians* words of this very matter *l.de velandis virgin. Regula quidem fidei una omnino eſt, ſola immobilis & irreformabilis, Credendi ſcilicet in unicum Deum, omnipotentem, mundi Creatorem, & filium ejus Jeſum Chriſtum, natum ex virgine Maria, &c. The rule of faith is altogether one, and that alone immoveable, and unreformable, to wit of believing in one only God, omnipotent, Creator of the world, and in his ſon Jeſus Chriſt, born of the Virgin Mary, &c.* Which being a *ſummary* reference to this *Creed*, and that reſolved to be *one* over all the World, and that *unchangeable*, muſt needs be imputed to that *Apoſtolick original*, which alone can pretend to that *dignity*, and accordingly he tells us *contr. Prax. c. 2. hanc regulam ab initio Evangelii decurriſſe, that this Rule came down from the beginning of the Goſpel.*

*Sect.*6. And that every branch thereof in ſeveral, was a fit and proper *ground-work* of *Chriſtian obedience*, where-ever it were *planted*, and altogether ſufficient to found the *reformation* of whole *Cities*, and *Provinces* at once, will be diſcernible by the moſt *curſory* ſurvey. *The article thereof fundamental to good life.*

Sect. 7. The *Articles* 1. of *God* the *Father*, the * *Ruler* and *Creator* of all the *world*, Secondly, of *God* the *Son*, both in his *titles* and *offices*, and in the paſſages of his *ſtory*, from the *Aſſumption* of our *fleſh* to his coming again from *Heaven* to be our *Judge*; and thirdly, of *God* the *holy Ghoſt*; being all amaſſed together, make up this plain ſence, that all the *divine* (and infinitely wiſe) ways of *œconomy* that *God* in *heaven* could think fit to uſe toward a *rational* creature, to *oblige*, and reduce mankind to that courſe of living, which is moſt perfectly agreeable to our nature, and by the *mercy* of *God* ordinable to *eternal* bliſs, all the moſt *powerful* methods of impreſſing our duty on us, the *authority* of the *God* of *heaven*, who hath *ſoveraign dominion* over all, of *God* the *Son*, made up of all *humble* and *charitable* ways of condeſcenſion, to *invite*, and yet of all *power*, and *terrors*, to *conſtrain*, and engage our *obedience* (to execute *vengeance* on thoſe that will not be *wooed* by him) and of *God* the *holy Ghoſt*, who hath ordained a *ſucceſſion* of men, from that time to the end of the World, continually to *negotiate* this one affair of reducing *ſinners* to *repentance*: All theſe, I ſay, have been ſo ſolemnly made uſe of, and impreſſed by him, that there wants nothing but *care* and *conſideration* of our own *eternal* weal, a *tolerance* or endurance of being made *happy* here, and *bleſſed* eternally, to bring all that have believed thoſe *articles*, to forſake their *ſinful* courſes, and ſincerely to apply themſelves to the *obedience* of *Chriſt*. * Παντοκράτωρ.

Sect. 8. The firſt ſtone of this *foundation* is the conſideration and acknowledgment of the *one eternal God*, under thoſe two great relations of a *Father* and a *Prince*, and both thoſe founded in his right to the *creature* by title of *creation*; And the one *belief* and acknowledgment of this intitles him, and *engages* us to a ready voluntary *obedience* to, and *dependence* on him, and prepares for ſuch an *univerſal reception* of all that ſhall ever be *revealed* to be his *will*, that every *preſumptuous*, known act of *prevarication* is no leſs than a Στομαχία, a *rebellion* like that of the *old Giants*, a *fighting againſt God*, a conteſting with *heaven*, a *reſiſting* his *will* and our own *happineſs*, and that may be one ſeaſonable degree toward the *obliging* us to *piety*. *The article of God the Father.*

Sect. 9. The *ſecond*, and that which brings along with it all the *force* and *authority* of the former (as the *only Son* bearing the *perſon*, and *employed* in the *Embaſſy* of the *Father*) is the acknowledgment of *Jeſus Chriſt*, who, by being ſent into the World to be our *King* or *Lord*, and by the *divine* miraculous way of his entrance into it, the *powers* and *mighty works*, and *piety* of his *life*, and the *ſtupendious* manner of his *paſſage* out of the World, to reſume, in his *humane*, as well as *divine* nature, that *regal* power in *heaven*, which from all eternity belonged to him as *God*, is fitly qualified, and prepared to take poſſeſſion of his *inheritance*, to *rule* and *reign* in our *hearts* by this *faith*, and ſo to *recall* and *reduce* immediately all, that cordially *believe* the true *God* (who now in this *gracious pacifick* manner comes to treat with them) and to convince all the blind *worſhippers* of *Idol* falſe *gods*, of the *vanity* and *villany* of their former courſes, and ſo to bring them *back* to their own *peace*. *Of God the Son.*

Sect. 10. *Thirdly*, the acknowledgment of the *holy Ghoſt*, in that great office of *Paraclete*, or *Advocate* of *Chriſt*, *convincing* the *world* of the *truth*, and *divine authority* of *Chriſt*'s meſſage, and then *commiſſionating* and aſſiſting the *Apoſtles*, and their *ſucceſſors* in their continued never-ceaſing *Embaſſie* to us, *to pray us in Chriſt's ſtead* to lay down our *weapons* of *hoſtility*, and *to be reconciled unto God*, to live *friendly* and *filially*, i.e. *obediently* before him, What is it but a *continued* perpetuated *voice* from *heaven*, reſounding for ever in our ears? as if it were minutely proclaimed in *thunder* from *heaven*, to give men no *reſt* in their *ſins*, no *quiet* from *Chriſt's importunity*, till they *awake* from the *lethargick* ſleep, and *ariſe* from ſo *dead*, ſo *mortiferous* a ſtate, and permit him *to give them life*. *Of God the holy Ghoſt.*

*Sect.*11. That which follows of the *Holy Catholick Church*, as it is (with the reſt) an attendant on this *article* of the *holy Ghoſt*, the end of whoſe *deſcent* was to gather a *Church* or ſociety of *holy Chriſtian* livers over the *whole world*, ſo is it the interpretation of thoſe two parts of the *myſtery* of *piety* formerly explicated [*Chriſt's* being *preached among the Gentiles*, and *believed on in the world*] of the ἐπισυναγωγὴ ἐπ' αὐτὸν, 2 *Theſſ.*2.1. the *gathering together* of a *multitude* over the *world*, among *Gentiles*, as well as *Jews*, to that banner ſet up by *Chriſt*, enrolling themſelves in his muſters, engaging their *faithful obedience* to him; And if we will not be made the *mark*, and *aim* of all his *arrows*, be lookt on as the profeſſed *oppoſers* of all his *methods*, and therein of all *piety*, and of our own ſouls, *Of the Holy Catholick Church.*

we

we muſt think our ſelves obliged to haſten into that number, and that in reſpect of the *holineſs*, as well as the *aſſemblies*, of the *practice*, as well as the *profeſſion* of *Chriſtianity*.

Sect. 12. And the conſideration and ſerious belief of this, that *God* hath taken ſuch care to anticipate, and prevent every man, to draw him early into his *Church*, there to inſtruct and oblige him to all *Chriſtian* performance, to give *piety* the *prepoſſeſſion*, before other *competitors* (home-bred *luſts* or vitious cuſtoms of the world) ſhould be able to pretend to him, and ſo to engage him in *holineſs* firſt, and then in *bliſs*, is another argument of great *energy* to work effectually on mankind, and recommend this *obedience* to them.

Of the Communion of Saints.

Sect. 13. So likewiſe the κοινωνία τῶν ἁγίων, which ſeems to me (and is elſewhere explicated) to belong to the *communication*, *Acts* 2. 42. as that ſignifies *liberality* of the *Saints* which firſt received the *Faith* of *Chriſt*, and as it is there explained by their having ἅπαντα κοινὰ *all things common*, ver. 44. and that again by *ſelling* their *poſſeſſions*, and diſtributing them to *all*, *as every man had need*, ver. 45. and again by αἰνοῦντες θεὸν καὶ ἔχοντες χάριν, *praiſing God*, *and having*, *or exerciſing charity to all the people*, ver. 47. (making their *liberality* a ſpecial branch of their *Euchariſt*, their bleſſing and *worſhipping* of *God*) as it is an evidence of the great force that the *Goſpel* of *Chriſt* had then upon mens ſouls, melting them into that *liberal* effuſion of all that they had, into an abſolute contempt of all that is moſt doted on in the World, κτήματα καὶ ὑπάρξεις, *poſſeſſions* of all kinds, and by parting with *all indefinitely*, throwing themſelves abſolutely upon *God's* minutely *providence* for the ſuſtaining of them (which is directly the *Merchant's* courſe in the *Goſpel*, *ſelling all*, and *buying*, at that vaſt price, the one *hidden Jewel* which he had found) ſo is it an *engagement* to all that will undertake this *profeſſion*, to come with preparations of mind ſome way proportionable to theſe *examples*, to exerciſe that *charity* to men, and *dependance* on *God* in the things of this World, which ſhall evidence their πολίτευμα ἐν οὐρανοῖς, that the joyes which they depend on are in another World, and that the either *having* or *wanting* here, is no otherwiſe conſiderable, than as it is the opportunity of exerciſing the ſeveral graces, which are the propereſt means to *exalt* and *perfect* our *Nature*, and the way to our *immortality*.

Sect. 14. As for the other *larger* notion of this κοινωνία ἁγίων, ſo as to import the *ſpiritual Union* of *Faith* and *Love* between all profeſſors of *Chriſtianity*, and, (as *exerciſes* of that) *the Communication of the myſteries* (ſo ordinarily ſtiled ἅγια) of *Prayers*, of *Faſtings*, of *Tears*, of *Sufferings*, of *Rejoycings*, of *Thankſgivings*, it muſt be taken in by *analogie* with this former, and will alſo fitly be comprehended under the former *Article* of the *Church* (and therefore it is, that the *Nicene Creed* ſets [*the Holy Catholick Apoſtolick Church*] in the place of both theſe) and therefore need not be farther inſiſted on here.

The forgiveneſs of ſins;

Sect. 15. *The forgiveneſs of ſins* which now follows, is, being rightly underſtood, the moſt eminent branch of this *foundation*, and the *removal* of an hindrance which might otherwiſe obſtruct all thought or deſign of *reformation*, but being miſunderſtood is rendred *inſtrumental* to the moſt preſumptuous *obſtinate ſecurity* in ſin.

Miſ-interpreted.

Sect. 16. Should it be miſtaken for an *abſolute impunity* promiſed freely by *God*, or *abſolutely* purchaſed by *Chriſt* either for *all* men *indefinitely*, or for ſome *ſpecial* favorites of heaven, without *reſpect* to their *reformation* or new *obedience*, it were the direct *foundation* of all *impenitence*, to all that either had, or believed themſelves to have their part in it, and might by all *carnal* men probably be made uſe of as ſuch.

Sect. 17. For to a *carnal* liver, which were once poſſeſſed of this perſwaſion, that all his *ſins paſt* and *future* were *abſolutely forgiven* by the *tenure* of the *Goſpel*, and that without any *condition* of *change* required of him, what imaginable motive is there to *perſwade* him to *forſake* any one ſin, to which he hath the ſlighteſt temptation? When God is once a favourer of his groſſeſt *ſins*, or of his *perſon* in deſpight of his *ſins*, all the other *Articles* of his *belief* will ſound nothing but *mercy* and *promiſes* to him, and accordingly thoſe that have imbibed this errour, have extended the influence thereof to the whole *Goſpel*, which they will not allow to contain any thing but *promiſes*, and ſo all the commands of *Chriſt* are at once out-dated.

Rightly underſtood.

Sect. 18. But when it is rightly underſtood, and confined within thoſe due limits, which the *Goſpel* every where aſſigns it, 1. to be the pardon of ſins *paſt* and *forſaken* (which belongs not either to *future* ſins, or to any that are not *reformed*.) Secondly, to be the *admiſſion* of ſinners to *repentance*, and ſo, and by no other means, to *forgiveneſs*, (and therefore *John's* ceremony of admitting *Proſelytes* is called *the baptiſm of repentance for the remiſſion of ſins*.) Thirdly, to extend no farther to any ſort of *ſins continued* in or *unforſaken*, than as they are *reconcileable* with *ſincere endeavours* (and uſe of the means) to *forſake* and get *victory* over them (which though it ſecure us of *God's* favour and *pardon* to our *infirmities* and *ignorances*, doth denounce his *wrath* againſt our *wilful* ſins) When it is taken with theſe *reſtraints* and *conditions* on one ſide, and is then extended (as the *general promulgation* extends it (to *all* the ſins of *every ſinner* in the *world*, who ſhall by *repentance* and *ſincerity* of change be rendred capable of it. When that which is miſtaken to be *particular* and *abſolute*, is duly underſtood to be *general*, but *conditionate* (and to belong to none, who ſhall not perform the *condition*, i. e. *impartially*, and *ſincerely*, and *univerſally* reform his ways according to the *Rules* delivered by *Chriſt*, his precepts of *Chriſtian* purity, extending to the very *heart*) then is there a ſure *ground-work* laid of *renovation* and care for our *future* lives, and all objections removed, that might probably *obſtruct* that *ſuperſtructure*.

Sect. 19.

Sect. 19. As long as we are guilty of any *paſt ſin*, and have no *promiſe* (the only due *ground* of *hope*) of *remiſſion*, whatever our *future* care be, this *deſperation* of ſucceſs chills all our *induſtry*, and we *ſin* on, becauſe we have *ſinned*, we caſt off the care of all *future* thrift, becauſe we are already *bankrupted*. *The want of this to Renovation in a firſt,*

Sect. 20. So again while we make no *diſtinction* of *ſins*, and deem every invincible *infirmity* or *ignorance* (from which we have no *hope* to be freed in this life) to be as *dangerous* and *mortiferous* as the moſt *wilful act*, or favoured *habit* of *carnality*, another face of the ſame *deſperation* affrights us, and admoniſheth us to provide for our *eaſe*, when we cannot for our *ſecurity*, deters from *attempting* what we cannot *finiſh*, and permits us to be *careleſs*, when we cannot hope to be *proſperous* in our *care*. *a ſecond,*

Sect. 21. Nay, when we undertake the *baptiſmal* vow, and enter on this new life, if, as that *baptiſm* cannot be *repeated*, ſo it were impoſſible that any groſſer fall after the *firſt repentance* could receive any *cure* or *remedy*; the experience of our own *frailties*, and the conſideration of the *ſlippery* place we ſtand on, of the *watchfulneſs* of the *temper*, and the *advantage* he hath from a *falſe* party within us, which is always ready to joyn with him, and betray us, and of the great *difficulty*, the *moral*, though not *natural*, *impoſſibility*, that in ſo long a work, we ſhould continue ſo *vigilant*, as to be obnoxious neither to *ſurpriſe*, nor *fall*, would be apt (like the news of the *Anakims* in the way) to diſcourage us from leaving the accuſtomed *familiar* wilderneſs, and undertaking the *unknown* voyage to that *good land*, invironed with ſo many *difficulties*: An opinion of the *feebleneſs* or ſucceſsfulneſs of the work being as neceſſary to found a purpoſe of *undertaking* it, as either the *authority* of *commands*, or the *perſwaſiveneſs* of *promiſes*, or pungency of *menaces*, or proſpect of *miſchiefs* upon neglect, can be imagined to be. *a third reaſon,*

Sect. 22. But when all theſe *objections* are anſwered, *diſcouragements* removed, *difficulties* provided for, (as they are by this *Article* of *Remiſſion of ſins*, duly explained, and ſuperadded to the former branches of the *foundation*) they to whom all this is *revealed* and received with an *undoubting faith*, if they do not preſently ſet about ſo *eaſie*, and ſo *happy* a task, which hath ſo many *grains* of *equity* and *mercy* allowed in the weighing it out unto us, if they will not be directed into a path ſo plained and ſmoothed, that the *wayfaring men, though fools, ſhall not err therein* (that *weakneſs*, or *ignorance*, or *natural defects*, or *humane frailties*, or any thing that includes not *unſincerity* and *preſumptuous* going on in ſin, ſhall be reconcileable with their *hopes* and *God*'s acceptance) muſt needs acknowledge themſelves in the number of the *blind people that have eyes*; of the *provokers* that ſhall not, becauſe they *will* not, *enter into God's reſt*, of the *ſinners* that *have no excuſe for their ſin*. *The neceſſity of it.*

Sect. 23. In the next place *the Reſurrection of the body*, which includes and ſuppoſes a *future* ſtate of *ſouls* after that of this *life* (for to what purpoſe ſhould that world of *vexed, carcaſſes, ariſe*, if there were not as *numerous* a world of *ſouls* ready to *animate* them, and joyn with them in receiving *rewards* or *puniſhments* for all that the *ſouls* have acted by thoſe *inſtruments* in this *life*?) is moſt *neceſſary* to found, and inforce this *Renovation*; For, if there were nothing after this life, *if in the death of a man there were no ἴασις, cure* or *remedy*, *Wiſd.* 2. 1. if the premiſes of the *Atheiſt* in that *Chapter* had truth in them, his *concluſion* being founded on thoſe *premiſes*, it could not be *ſtrange*, or *irrational* for him to proceed, *Come on therefore, let us enjoy the good things that are preſent*, verſe 6. *The belief of the Reſurrection of the Body.*

Sect. 24. And if, ſuppoſing the *immortality* of the *ſoul*, the body were not aſcertain'd to return to that old *aſſociate*, if that ἐργαστήριον πνεύματος, that *ſhop* or *work-houſe* of the *good* or *evil ſpirit*, ſhould, with all that hath been wrought in it, be *conſumed eternally*, this would take it much out of the *care* of the *ſoul*, either to ſtop it in its Career of *ſin*, or to *mortifie* thoſe *affections* that are in this *earthly* part, or to *ſpiritualize* and repleniſh it with *good* works. *Fundamental to Renovation.*

Sect. 25. If the upper *ſoul*, that hopes to reign in another World, can ſo far preſerve that degree of *ſuperiority* and *dignity* of its nature, as to *reprehend* and *check* what is conſented to by the *will* or *middle* faculty, in complyance with the *fleſh*, that *inferior* and *bruitiſh*, (as it is, as oft as any ſin againſt *conſcience* is committed) and can then *hope*, that after a few years of *ſenſuality*, that importune rebellious ſervant ſhall be *eternally* caſt off, drop into a *perpetual* impoſſible nothing, take a long progreſs into a *land where all things are forgotten* (and conſequently the *good* which hath been acted in that *fleſh*, as well as the *evil*) this would be ſome colour for that novel *perſwaſion* (a fruitful principle of all *carnality*) that the man may be *regenerate* in the ſight of *God*, though he be *ſold under ſin, led captive unto the law of ſin, which is in the members*, meaning thereby the moſt conſtant compliance of the will (and actions) to all the motions of the fleſh, ſo long as the Law of God in the mind or upper ſoul diſlike, and diſſent from it, which it will ſeldom miſs to do, as long as we have any conſcience or knowledge of duty remaining in us. *The want of it very hurtful.*

Sect. 26. But when the *prevarications* and *irregularities* of the *body*, which are not *ſubdued*, as well as *check'd*, *mortified* as well as *diſliked* by the *ſoul*, ſhall receive their certain payment in the *body* (reunited on purpoſe to the *ſoul*, that that which hath *merited* by *compliance*, may be *rewarded* by *ſympathy*) when the *flames* (that by being inflicted on the *body* are experimented to *afflict*, and *enter into the ſoul*) ſhall demonſtrate to the *ſoul* her cloſe concernment in all that is permitted to come ſo near her, then it will appear to be every man's *intereſt* to joyn good performances to *ſpiritual* purpoſes and *reſolutions*, to act, as well as to deſign, to ſubdue and quell the *exorbitances* of the *fleſh*, as well as to continue the *wouldings* of the *ſpirit*; And this being abſolutely required to the *ſincerity* and *reality* of our *repentance* and *renovation*, which conſiſts not in the *ſtrife*, or *wiſh*, or *purpoſe*, but in the *actual operations* of good life, the *belief* of the *Reſurrection* of the *body*, which is ſo *inſtrumental* and *preparative* to this, muſt needs be *fundamental* to that, which is *ſuperſtructed* on it; and was therefore deemed fit to be firſt preached to all men, before *ſtrict Chriſtian* performances could *reaſonably* be required of them. *The perſwaſion gainful.*

Everlasting life.

Sect. 27. *Lastly*, the *everlasting life* both of *body* and *soul* in that *future* state, whether in *bliss* or *woe*, hath with all reason been added as the *last stone* to this *foundation*, and in it all the *promises* and *terrors* of the *Gospel*, to *perswade* and *drive* us to *repentance*.

The necessity of the belief of that.

Sect. 28. Were the *state*, wherein we expect our *reward* for the *abstinencies*, or *riots* of this *present* life, under the *prejudices* of *short*, or *finite*, as it hath the disadvantage of *absence* and *futurity*, the *promises* and *threats* of *Christ* would lose much of their *vertue* and *energie*, and being by their *spiritual* and *invisible* nature rendred so *faint* in the *original*, and yet (to make them more so) set to *sollicite* us at a *distance*, they would want a competent *instrument* to collect and convey their *rays successfully*, or so as to *effect*, or impress the *species* with any *vigor* on a dull, and withal *prejudicate* faculty. We know a *life* in *reversion* is not half so *valuable*, as that which may at *present* be entred on, and this not only in the opinion of *fools*, but of the most prudent *purchasers*; And unless there be somewhat in the *duration* to inhaunse the *value*, and to be offered in *commutation*, and to *reward* the *patience* of the *present* self-denial, *Heaven* it self would be look'd on *jealously*, as a *project* to deprive us of our *present portions*, to cheat us of our *possessions*; But when the *loss* of every *present* advantage to *flesh* and *blood*, is sure to be repaid in a far nobler *coin*, and to continue to be enjoy'd to all *eternity*, when beside the *liberal harvest* of *satisfactions* for any the most trivial *loss* or *suffering*, submitted to upon *Christ's command* or *advice* (the *hundred fold more in this life*) we are secured to reap in *another world*, *everlasting* unperishable *felicities*, and when to the *empty*, *nauseous*, *afflicting pleasures* of sin, for some one shortest *moment*, attended immediately with a far more *durable shame*, and then followed with an *immortal*, *endless gnawing death* (that is, all *jaws*, but no *stomach*) shall remain (by way of *arrear*) a *sharp*, yet *sullen* payment to all *eternity*, when every *play* or *jest* of sin, shall engage us in that *perpetual* earnest, and after the *transitory* joy is *forgotten* or *loathed*, the irreversible sentence of endless *woe* is expected, *instantly* and *infallibly* to come out, and with it an ἐσρράγισα ταμεῖα all the *store-houses* of *ease* or *mercy sealed* up, all *drops* to *cool*, or *oceans* to *quench* our misery; Then certainly upon this *perswasion* duly rooted (not in the *brain* but *heart*) an ordinary *Orator* may suffice to superstruct an admission of the *precepts* of *Christ*, and induce in a *rational* creature a willingness to be *happy* here (by a patient bearing of a *gentle*, *desirable yoke*) that so he may be *blessed* eternally.

Sect. 29. And so we have taken a cursory view of the several *Articles* of the most *antient* and *shortest Creed*, and therein exemplified the propriety of our *definition* of *Fundamentals*, and having the *Apostles* judgment in their preachings to confirm us in the truth, that the laying of so *large* a *foundation* was deemed necessary, to their design of planting the same fruits in all *soils*, *piety*, *probity*, and *purity*, in a nation of *hypocritical Jews*, and a *world* of *Idolatrous polluted Gentiles*, we have already shewed how unnecessary it is to enquire, whether any *single* sinner of either of those *provinces* might not possibly be reduced to *Christian* life, without some *one* of these *explicitely* and *actually* considered, and so have no temptation to inlarge this *Chapter* by any such consideration.

CHAP. IX.

Of the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds together; and severally of the Nicene.

Sect. 1. HAving view'd the *Apostles Creed*, and of it premised this one thing, that it was a complete *Catalogue* of all, that they (being directed by the *Holy Ghost* in their ministery) thought fit to lay the *foundation* of *Christian obedience* in every *Church*, and consequently that there was no more, in their opinion, *necessary*, in order to this end of working *reformation* in the World; It will from this *datum* demonstratively follow, either that there is in the two other *Creeds*, the *Nicene*, and *Athanasian*, nothing *materially* different from that which the *Apostles Creed* had contained (nothing really superadded to it) or else that that *superaddition* was not in the *Apostles* estimation, *necessary* to this end, and consequently that if (at the forming of them) it were by the *following Church* thought *necessary* to be thus made, or still continues to be so, this must arise from some *fresh* emergent, one, or more, which had been observable in the *Church* after the *Apostles* time.

The design of later Creeds.

Sect. 2. And which of these two is the truth, it will not be uneasie to define; For though the omission of some words, which had been retained in the *Apostles Creed*, do not signifie much, (for it is certain that they were (while retained in that) and are still, (now they are left out in following *Creeds*) *eternally* and *unquestionably* true, in the sence, wherein the *Apostles* and their *successors* understood them) nor indeed any more, than that they were *virtually* contained in other words still continued (as the *descent* to *hades*, under that of his *suffering* and *burial*, and not *rising* till the *third day*; and the *communication* of *Saints*, under the *Catholick Church*, with the *Epithet* of *Apostolick* added to it) or else that they were not *necessary* to be repeated, because already *familiarly* known and confessed, and not question'd by those *Hereticks*, against whom the variations were designed (as in the *Athanasian Creed*, the *Articles* of the *Holy Ghost*, so largely set down in *four branches* in the *Nicene Creed*, and the *three Articles* attending that of the *Holy Ghost*, in the *Apostles Creed*, are all omitted) yet those words which in the later *Creeds* were *superadded* to the former, were apparently *designed* by the Compilers for some *special* use, either by way of *addition*, or *interpretation*, to fence the *Catholick orthodox Faith* from the *corruptions*, and *depravations*, or else from the *doubtings*, and *contradictions* of *Hereticks*.

Defined.

Of the Nicene.

Sect. 3. Thus in the *Nicene Creed*, the two additions in the first *Article*, the [ἑνα, *one*] prefixed to [*God*] and the [καὶ πάντων τῶν ὁρατῶν καὶ ἀοράτων, *and of all things visible and invisible*] were, upon prudent

prudent deliberation and considering, interposed, the first of them on occasion of the *Arians*, in one respect, and both of them, in another respect, by reason of the *Gnostick* and *Valentinian*, and such like following *hereticks*, whose *heathen* and *Poetical Theology* (taken from *Hesiod*, and *Orpheus*, and *Philistion*) had rendred them *necessary*. For that those *Hereticks*, beginning with their *Simon* and *Helena*, had introduced a *plurality* of *Gods* (and so made the *Profession* of the *unity*, part of the *symbolum* that should discriminate the *Orthodox* from them) and affirmed that their *Æones* or *Angels* were begotten by *Helena* (*Simon's* Πρώτη ἔννοια, *first cogitation*) and that the *World* was *created* by them, and that the *God* of the *Jews* was but *one* of those *Angels* (and a great deal of the like) appears by *Irenæus*, *l.*1.*c.*22. And these two interserions were clear explications of the *Apostles* old form, *God the Father*, *Ruler of all*, *Maker of heaven and earth*, which sufficiently contained an acknowledgment of the *Unity* (for how else could he be *Monarch*, or *Ruler of all*?) and also asserted him the *Creator* of all the *Angels* (who were certainly comprehended under the *heaven and earth*, the phrase of *Scripture* to denote the *world*) but yet was capable of more light, by these more explicite words (*visible and invisible*) to exclude the contradictions of *hereticks*.

One God.

Of all things visible, and invisible.

Sect. 4. And though the *Creed* in the *antient Apostolick* form were sufficient for any man to *believe* and *profess*, yet when the *Church* hath thought meet to erect that additional *bulwark* against *hereticks*, the *rejecting* (or denying the *truth* of) those their *additions*, may justly be deemed an *interpretative* siding with those antient, or a desire to introduce some new *heresies*; And though *good life* might have been *founded* without those *additions*, if on such occasions they had never been made, yet the *pride* or *singularity* (or *heretical* design) of *opposing* or *questioning* them (now they are framed) being themselves unreconcileable with *Christian charity*, and *humility*, are *destructive* of the *fabrick* directly, and interpretatively of the very *foundation*, and is therefore justly deemed *criminous*, and liable to *Censures* in the *Church* of *God*.

Sect. 5. So likewise the *Oneness* of our *Lord Jesus Christ* (as before of the *Father*) referring to the several *hypostases* in the one *eternal*, *indivisible*, *divine nature*, and the *eternity* of the *Sons generation*, and his *co-eternity*, and *consubstantiality* with the *Father*, when he came down from *heaven*, and was *incarnate*, &c. *for us men* peculiarly (not for *Angels*) *and for our salvation*; and lastly the *perpetuity* of his *kingdom added* in the *close*, all these are assertions equivalent to those, which had been before compriſed in the *antient*, more *simple*, uncompounded *article*, but were useful to be thus *enlarged*, and explicated, when the *Arians* opposed the *Apostolick tradition*, and by *corrupting* detorted the words of *scripture* to their sence.

One Lord Jesus Christ, &c.

Sect. 6. This is elsewhere more largely shewed (in the *note* on 1 *John* 5. 7.) And all that will opportunely here be added, is only this, that they which, according to the *Apostles depositum*, or *doctrine* in every *Church*, believed the *descent*, and *incarnation* of the *eternal God*, on purpose to rescue Mankind from all *impurities*, to reveal the whole divine *will* for the regulating *mens lives*, to attest it by *his death*, and *evidence* it by his *resurrection*, &c. and at last to *come* to *judge* the *world*, according to this determinate *rule*, had all those branches of *Christian faith*, which were required to *qualifie* Mankind to submit to *Christ's reformation*. And 'tis the wilful opposing these more *explicite* articles, the resisting them, when they are competently proposed from the *definition* of the *Church* (and not the not-believing them thus explicitely, when either they are not *revealed*, or not with that *conviction*, against which he cannot *blamelesly* and without *pertinacy* of his *will* hold out) that will bring *danger* of *ruine* on any.

Sect. 7. That which is added of the *Holy Ghost* [*the Lord and giver of life*, *who proceedeth from the Father and the Son*, (supposing with the *Western Church*, that the [*Filióque*] was found in the first *Copies*, and *acts* of that *Council*) *who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified*, *who spake by the Prophets*] is in like manner an *enlargement*, and explication of the more brief *Apostolick* form, and the *substance* thereof was *compriſed* formerly in that *uncompounded* stile (fitter *then* for the *belief*, and *memory* of all) but was afterward prudently *enlarged* for the *repelling*, and preventing the *poyson* of *heretical* invaders, the *Montanists*, and *Macedonians*, &c.

The Holy Ghost the Lord and giver of life, &c.

Sect. 8. And so likewise that addition of the *one Baptism* prefixt to the *Remission of sins* was on purpose design'd against the *Novatians*, whose *pretensions* were considered, and condemned in the *Council of Nice*; The practices of the *Churches* in receiving those that had fallen into *gross* sins after *baptism*, had been somewhat different, in some parts *milder*, as in the *Church of Rome*, in others more *rigid*; The *Church of Rome* had given some liberty for the great *offenders*, *murtherers*, *adulterers*, and such as had fallen to *Idol-worship*, in time of *persecution*, *viz.* that after *many* years *penance* they might be restored to the *Communion*, and *peace* of the *Church*, without any *new baptism* (such as was used in admitting *heathens*) only by *imposition of hands*, or *absolution*; extending the vertue of *baptism* formerly received, to the *washing* away of these sins committed after *baptism*, in case of *sincere repentance* and forsaking of them; This the *Novatians* disliked, and thereupon *brake* off, and made a *schism* in the *Church*. And the *Council of Nice* taking cognizance of the matter, judged against *Novatus* and his followers, that there was place for a *second repentance*, and not only for that *first* before *Baptism*, as appears by the *Canons* of that *Council*. And this was it, that was referred to, in this more *enlarged* passage of their *Creed*, and the use of it thought very considerable for the *reducing* of *lapst Christians*, as the *Apostolical article* of *remission of sins* indefinitely, had been for the attracting *heathens*. And this, and all the former *additions*, being thus setled by the *Universal Church*, were, and still are, in all reason, without *disputing*, to be *received*, and embraced by the *present Church*, and every *meek* member thereof, with that *Reverence* that is due to *Apostolick* truths, that *thankfulness*, which is our *meet tribute* to those *sacred Champions* for their seasonable and provident propugning of our *faith*, with such *timely*, and necessary application to *practice*, that the *Holy Ghost*, speaking to us now, under the times of the *New Testament*, by the *Governours* of the *Christian Churches* (*Christ's mediate* successors in the *Prophetick*, *Pastoral*, *Episcopal* office) as he had formerly spoken by the *Prophets* of the *Old Testament*, sent immediately by him, may find a *cheerful* audience, and receive all uniform *submission* from us.

One baptism for the Remission of sins.

Sect. 9. And this is all that is here necessary to be said of this *second Creed*.

CHAP. X.

Of the Athanaſian Creed.

Sect. 1. OF the *Athanaſian Creed* (as it is uſually called) *two* things will be briefly conſiderable; 1. The *doctrine of it.* 2. The *curſes and damnation* denounced againſt thoſe, who do not *entirely* maintain it, without the *corruptions*, and *mixtures* of the *hereticks*.

The Doctrine of the Athanaſian Creed.

Sect. 2. The *Doctrine* is (well-nigh all of it) the *aſſerting* the *Unity* of the *Divine nature*, and the *Trinity* of *hypoſtaſes*, whether *ſubſiſtences*, as the *Greek Church* called it, or as the *Latine*, *perſonæ*, *perſons* in it, and that in *oppoſition* to ſeveral *novel* propoſitions, which had by *hereticks* been introduced in the *Church*, and ſo, (as the *vices* of men ſuggeſt *laws*) occaſioned ſuch *explications*, and *enlargements*. And of theſe again (much more than of the *Nicene ſuperadditions*) it may be reaſonably affirmed, that being the *explications* of a *Father* of the *Church*, and not of a whole *Univerſal Council*, or of the *Church repreſentative*, they were neither *neceſſary* to be *explicitely* acknowledged, before they were *convincingly revealed*, nor ſimply and abſolutely *impoſeable* on any particular man, any farther than he was a *member* of ſome *Church*, which had actually received *Athanaſius*'s explication (as it is apparent the *Weſtern Churches* did) or than it appeared concordant with the more *authentick Univerſal Confeſſions*, as every *doctrinal* propoſition of it will be found to do.

The Cenſures.

Sect. 3. As for the *Cenſures* annext, 1. in the beginning [*that except a man keep the Catholick faith* (of which this is ſet down, not as the *entire form*, but an *explication*, or interpretation of ſome *parts* of it) *whole and undefiled, he ſhall doubtleſs periſh everlaſtingly*] *Secondly*, in the *middle* [*he that will be ſaved, muſt thus think*] and [*it is neceſſary to everlaſting ſalvation that he alſo believe rightly in the incarnation*, &c.] and *Thirdly*, in the *end* [*this is the Catholick Faith, which except a man believe faithfully he cannot be ſaved*] I ſuppoſe they muſt be interpreted by their *oppoſition* to thoſe *hereſies*, that had invaded the *Church*, and which were acts of *carnality* in them that broached, and maintained them, againſt the *Apoſtolick Doctrine*, and contradictory to that *foundation*, which had been reſolved on, as *neceſſary* to bring the world to the *obedience of Chriſt*, and were therefore to be *anathematized* after this manner, and with *deteſtation* branded, and baniſhed out of the *Church*; Not that it was hereby defined to be a *damnable* ſin to fail in the *underſtanding*, or *believing* the full matter of any of thoſe *explications*, before they were *propounded*, and when it might more reaſonably be deemed not to be any fault of the *will*, to which this were imputable.

CHAP. XI.

Of the Superſtructure, and the particular branches thereof.

Sect. 1. HAving thus briefly taken a view of the *Foundation*, and therein alſo of the *Superſtructure* generally conſidered, together with the *propriety* that one of theſe hath toward the other, the doctrines of *belief* to the *renewing* of mens lives, I am now by courſe to proceed to a more particular view of this *Superſtructure*, and the *ſeveral* branches of it.

The general nature of the Superſtruction in five particulars.

Sect. 2. Where firſt it muſt be remembred, that the πλήρωσις or *filling up*, which *Chriſt* deſigned, contrary to the καθάλυσις *diſſolving*, or abrogating of the *Law* and the *Prophets*, is far from *evacuating* or annulling the obligation of any one *ſubſtantial* precept introduced by the *Law* of *Nature* or *Moſes*, but coming as an ἀπίνομις or *ſuppletory* to all former *Laws*, as a new and more perfect *correct* edition of the old *Codex*, as one general *Law* for the *reforming* and *hightening* of all *Laws*, is wholly deſigned, as may be moſt *ordinable* to this end.

Sect. 3. Firſt in *filling* up *vacuities*, turning out *ſhadows* and *ceremonies*, by explicite preſcription of the *ſubſtantial* duties, which thoſe *ſhadows* did *obſcurely* repreſent: 2. In binding ſome parts of the *yoke* cloſer than they were before thought fit to be *bound* upon men, *extending* the precepts farther than they were thought to *extend*: 3. In *raiſing* them to more elevated *degrees* of *perfection*, ſinking them deeper than the *outward actions* to the purity of the very *heart*: and 4. by *promiſes* of the moſt *amiable divine*, and *terrors* of the moſt *diſmal unſupportable* nature, *confirming* and *binding* them *all* upon us, and not allowing us *liberty*, or *impunity* in any *indulgent* tranſgreſſion of any branch of this *Law* thus *reformed* and *improved* by him.

Sect. 4. And this being the reſult of *Chriſt*'s deſign, 1. the production of a καινὴ κτίσις, an entire *new creature*, a new modelling of the *whole ſoul* for the *whole* ſpace of the *future* life; and 2. the purpoſe being to People the *whole world*, i. e. a *community* of men (whoſe *underſtandings* are not generally *deep*, and ſo muſt be *wrought* on by means *proportionable* to them) with a *colony* of ſuch *divine new creatures*; and 3. the nature of man (as a *rational* and *voluntary* agent) requiring that all this be done by way of *perſwaſion*, not of *violence*, to preſerve their *liberty*, which alone could render them capable either of *reward* or *puniſhment*; and 4. the difficulty being ſo great, and the improbability of attempting this ſucceſsfully ſo great alſo, It was but reaſon that a large and a *ſolid* foundation ſhould be laid, upon which this ſo important and weighty a *fabrick* might probably be *erected*.

Sect.

Sect. 5. But though an uniform *universal obedience* to the commands of *Christ*, which contains every *specialty* under it (and is not reconcileable with our *partiality*, the προσωπολη\ψια, *accepting*, as it were, of the *person* of any *sin* or *vertue*, the *preferring* any one *duty* to the prejudice of any other) be that which alone can own the title of the *Christian Superstructure*, without which completely erected, no *enumeration* of *particular* duties will be sufficient, yet some *specialties* there are which have a greater *propriety* to this title, than some others, and to which our *Christian* institution gives us more *peculiar* obligations; And it will not be amiss to mention some of these. *The specialties of it.*

Sect. 6. First *Piety* (the *Love*, and *Fear*, and *Obedience*, and *Faith*, and *Worship* of the *one* true *God*) in opposition 1. to *Idolatry*, 2. to *Formality*, 3. to *Hypocrisie*, on one side; and then 1. to *Sacrilege*, 2. to *Profaneness*, or *Impiety*, on the other side.

Sect. 7. First *Piety*, or the *worship* of the *true God*, the *Creator* of the *world*, the *God* of *Israel*, as that is opposed to the *Idol worship*, whether of *devils* and *souls* of *men* (in the *rites* of whose *religion* many of the *vilest* sins of *carnality* and *luxury* were practised) and to the *adoration* of *liveless*, *breathless pictures*, and *images*, so it is the reforming of the *vices*, and *sottishness* that had long overspread the *infatuated Gentile world*, and so a prime branch of that *design* of *Christ*'s *coming*, and of his sending his *Disciples* to *all nations*, to *awake* them out of this dead *sleep*, and *Lethargy* of *soul*, and by the *knowledge* of the *true God*, to bring to them the *imitation* of, and *dependence* on him. *Piety in opposition to Idolatry.*

Sect. 8. *Secondly*, as *Piety* is opposed to *slight*, *negligent*, *external formal* performances, so is it the necessary *Christian* vertue, proportioned adequately to the *omniscience* and *spirituality* of that infinite *deity*, the belief whereof is laid as a prime part of the *Foundation*. And though that inward *warmth*, if it be any whit intense, will necessarily extend it self to the *outward* man (as *motion* that begins in the *centre*, naturally diffuses it self, and affects uniformly, and shakes *every part* to the *circumference*) and consequently oblige the *body* to attend the *soul* in all *reverences* of *address* to that awful *Majesty*, who hath full title to the *obediences* of either (and this, in this conjunction, is far from meriting any unkind *censure*, or *jealousie*, the very *bodily exercise* being affirmed by St. *Paul* to be ἐπ' ὀλίγον ὠφέλιμος, *profitable for a little*, and the *fasts*, and *austerities* that were to attend the *departure* of the *Bridegroom*, being of this nature directly, and so the *Publican's smiting on his breast* being added to his *prayer* for *mercy*, on which *Christ* bestowed that *Eulogie*) Yet if, as *insectile animals*, for want of *blood*, run all out into *legs*, so the *want* or *chilness* of *devotion*, and not the *intension* of it, be that which casts the *body* into the *solemn demure* postures; if, as *Julian* reproacheth *Christianity*, the *striking* of the *breast*, and *shaking* of the *head*, the *formal* outward *humiliations* be all the *zeal* and *piety* of the *Christian*, this is no farther than *Ahab*'s soft pace, no part of that *reformation*, that *Christ* came to work, none of that *worship* in the *spirit*, which is the *tribute* required in the days of the *Messias*, and that which the *Spirituality* of *God*, to whom the addresses are made, and of the *promises*, which are *rewards* proportioned to our *spirits*, most strictly exact from us. *Piety in opposition to Formality.*

Sect. 9. *Thirdly*, as *Piety* is opposed to *hypocrisie* and *unsincerity*, and all *falseness* or *foulness* of *intentions*, especially to that *personated devotion*, under which any kind of *impiety*, *oppression*, *rapine*, *sedition*, &c. is wont to be disguised, and put off more speciously, so is it a special part of this *superstructure*, and as the defining or opining *Godliness* to be *gain*, 1 *Tim.* 6. 5. hath the *brand* and *reproach* of an *heresie*, quite contrary to the *Christian doctrine* and *practice*, so certainly the designing our *obedience* to any *part* of *Christ*'s precepts, as the means to gain our selves, and defraud others, to sin more securely before *God*, or unexpectedly before men, is of all things most unreconcileable with *Christianity*; And that so little of this *sincere piety* is to be met with in the world, the reason is clear, because *Christianity* is so far from having its *perfect* work upon mens hearts, our *brains* and our *tongues* being the only parts, that are ordinarily taken up and possessed with it. *To Hypocrisie.*

Sect. 10. *Fourthly*, the true *Christian Piety* looks upon *sacrilege* with a more perfect aversation, than any former *religion* hath done; The first *efflux* of men's *piety* after receiving of the *Faith* was the *selling* and *consecrating* their *possessions*, *Act.* 2. and the *detaining* of any such *sacred* portion is looked on (and punished severely) as the *defrauding* of the *Spirit* of *God*, c. 5. 3. And the *zeal* that is so exhausted, and laid out in *animosity* to *Idols* and *Sabbath-breaking*, that it can easily support, and put over the *Golden wedge*, and the *Treasures* of the *Temple*, and so likewise the ἀλλοτρία οὐσία, the *cheap*, *chargeless piety*, that brings no tribute to the *offerings* of God, (to which antiently it was a scandalous thing for any man to approach empty) that offers all its *sacrifices* to the *Lord*, *of that which costs it nothing*, is far from any semblance of the *Christian* reformation, is not ascended so far as the *Natural*, the *Mosaical*, the *Heathen*, the *Mahomedan* piety, and is a work of more than *Ægyptian* darkness, that the excess of light hath brought into the world. *To Sacrilege.*

Sect. 11. *Fifthly*, the *Christian* piety is, beyond all other things, diametrically opposed to *Profaneness* and *Impiety* of actions, that μεσημβρινὸν δαιμόνιον *Noon-day Devil*, that sins bare-fac'd and confident before the eye of heaven, that of the practical *Atheists*, the Ἄθεοι ἐν κόσμῳ τούτῳ, which though they acknowledge *God* in the Creed, yet reject and abandon him in their actions, and either as *Jews*, candidates of an earthy *Canaan*, or as *Turks* of a carnal *Paradise*, live as if there were never a *God* in this world, and never a *life* after it, whatsoever proportion of the *foundation* is laid in their brains, have none of the *superstructure* in their hearts. *To Profaneness.*

Sect. 12. A *second specialty*, which hath a considerable propriety to this title, is, *obedience* to *superiours*, which though *founded* in the *Law* of the first Creation, and afterward precisely commanded by *Moses*, hath this note of *eminence* (above what was formerly) set on it by *Christianity*; that it is πρώτη ἐντολή, *a prime commandment*, the very title bestowed by *Christ* on the *love* of *God*, *Mat.* 22. 38. *Mar.* 12. 30. and that with promise (for that it was not *the first commandment with promise*, is evident by the second of the *Decalogue*, which hath a *promise* annexed to it) and it is a *compound* of three of those *vertues*, to which the *Beatitudes* are peculiarly assigned by *Christ*, *Matt.* 5. of *Meekness*, and *Peaceableness*, and *suffering for righteousness sake*, and this bound indefinitely, not only on *all* under *subjection*, κἂν Ἀπόστολος, &c. saith St. *Chrysostome*, *though they be Apostles, or Bishops, or any the most sacred persons*; and *extended* as *indefinitely* ὑπερεχούσαις ἐξουσίαις, to the most *heathen*, provoking, oppressing, (as long as they be *lawful*) powers; and *lastly*, this *duty* is enlarged by *Christ* so as *Obedience to Superiours.*

to

to belong to *Eccleſiaſtical* (as well as to *Civil*) *ſuperiours*, who having the *Keys* committed to them by *Chriſt*, as to the *œconomy* or *ſtewards* of his *family*, though they be not armed with the *ſecular ſword*, or any *carnal weapons* of their warfare, yet *obedience* is a *tribute* that belongs to them, *Heb.* 13. ver. 17. as to thoſe that are to *give account* for mens *ſouls*, which they could not be ſuppoſed to do, if they had not *authority* over them: And therefore to make *Religion* a *ſtratagem* to *undermine*, or a *banner* under which to *oppoſe* and *violate government*, is a thing moſt contrary to this *ſuperſtructure*, moſt *ſcandalous* and *reproachful* to *Chriſtianity*.

Charity. *Sect.* 13. Thirdly, *Charity* to all ſorts, to all *mankind*, to *neighbours*, to *ſtrangers*, to our own, and even to *God*'s enemies, *Charity of all* ſorts, of *giving*, of *forgiving*, of *loving*, *bleſſing*, *praying* for, of *mercy* to *bodies*, of *relief* to *eſtates*, but eſpecially of *admonition*, and *reprehenſion* to *ſouls*; *Charity* in oppoſition to *injuſtice*, *covetting* and *defrauding* others, to *faction*, *diviſion*, civil inteſtine *broils*, *ſchiſms* and *ruptures* in a *Church* (that ſpecial piece of *carnality*, 1 *Cor.* 3. 3.) to *judging*, *anathematizing*, *damning*, denying the peace of the *Church* to them that are qualified for it; and laſtly to all *guilt* and *thirſt* of *blood*, all *capital puniſhing* of any, but *capital malefactors*, is a third *ſpecialty* of this *ſuperſtructure*, as certain a *badge* of this ſinking down of *Chriſtianity* into the *heart*, as the *Apoſtolical ſymbol* is of the preaching the *Faith* among us.

Purity. *Sect.* 14. Fourthly, *Purity* is a ſpecial part of this *ſuperſtructure*, and the circumciſion of the *heart*, the regulating and reſtraining of all deſires of the *fleſh* within the known limits of *conjugal* or *virginal Chaſtity*; and this in oppoſition to πορνεία of all ſorts, the unnatural, inceſtuous, adulterous conjunctions, thoſe before marriage, or after divorce, and to the ſeveral degrees of theſe in the very *eye* (and all that is proportionable to that) *Mat.* 5. 28. but eſpecially in the *heart*, ver. 8. And whatſoever mens faith, or their patience, or perſeverance were, any remarkable indulgence to this ſin, the ſeduction of *Balaam* (in the matter of *Peor*) or the deeds of the *Nicolaitans*, *Rev.* 2. 15. were ſure to bring judgments and curſes upon thoſe *firſt* daughters of *Chriſt*'s love, and if not timely repented of and reformed, will in all probability be revenged with the removal of the *Candleſtick*, plowing up the very *foundation*, the *Profeſſion* of the *Chriſtian Faith* in thoſe *National Churches* that are ſtill in any eminent manner guilty of it. The judgments of *God*, and utter deſtructions of many *Nations*, not only thoſe that were rooted out for the implanting of the *Jews*, but even of all the *Monarchies* which are mentioned either by way of ſtory, or prediction in the Scripture, are ſo ſignally diſcernible to have been the reward of this ſort of ſins, eſpecially of the *unnatural Sodomitical impurities*; and the honourableneſs of marriage in all (in order to the averting the ἄτιμα πάθη, *diſhonourable affections*, *Rom.* 1.) is ſo ſolemnly recommended in the *New Teſtament* (in oppoſition to the impure *Gnoſtick hereſie*, that was ſo unkind to marriage, as to make it a *work of the Devil*) that it may be a very opportune caution to all *Chriſtian Churches*, and *Magiſtrates*, not to impoſe *celibacy* on whole *callings*, and great multitudes of men or women, who cannot be diſcernible or ſuppoſeable to have the gift of *continence*; Nor yet by offering worldly *rewards* and advantages to all that ſhall deprive themſelves of that honourable remedy, to invite the raſheſt or the worſt of men into that ſtate of continual temptations, which hath cauſed the ſhipwrack of ſo many.

Contentedneſs. *Sect.* 15. Fifthly, *Contentedneſs* is moſt eminently one of theſe *ſpecialties*, and that both as it is oppoſed to *ambition*, *covetouſneſs*, *injuſtice*, *uncontentedneſs*, (each of which is a moſt unchriſtian ſin) and alſo as it is the *maintaining* and *eſtabliſhing* of *Propriety* in the world, which though it be not of any huge importance in reſpect of any conſiderable *advantages*, that *wealth* and *honour* can help a *Chriſtian* to, (who is, or ought to be, raiſed by *Chriſt* to a *contempt*, and *ſuperiority* over ſuch mean empty acquiſitions as theſe) yet, as the diſturbances which queſtions of right never fail to bring along with them, are very unhappy, and innumerable, and endleſs, ſo the ineſtimable benefit of peace, and quiet, and vacation for piety, and the inſtrumentalneſs of riches to works of charity (even above that more perfect way of abſolute deſpiſing of wealth, which by giving all at *once*, diſables for many thouſand future charities) have rendred it very politick and neceſſary in every Chriſtian Common-wealth, by *Laws* to ſettle, and ſecure *Propriety*, which he that hath learnt with St. *Paul* to be *content in whatſoever eſtate*, will never attempt to invade or violate.

Taking up the Croſs. *Sect.* 16. Many other branches of this *ſuperſtructure* there are which it cannot be neceſſary to mention here, but above all the *taking up* of the *Croſs* and *following Chriſt* with it on our ſhoulders: And the vigorous indeavour to caſt it off from our *own ſhoulders*, to faſten it on other mens, and to ſhake the *foundations* of *Government*, in order to any ſuch attempt, is moſt diametrically contrary to the true *Chriſtian* temper, an *enmity to the Croſs of Chriſt*.

CHAP. XII.

Of the Doctrines that hinder the ſuperſtructing of good life on the Chriſtian belief, firſt among the Romaniſts, a Catalogue of them, eſpecially that of the Infallibility of the Church; 2. Among others, 1. that of the Solifidian.

Sect. 1. I Come now to conſider what *Doctrines* there are, infuſed (diſcernibly) among Chriſtians, which are moſt apt to *fruſtrate* the forementioned *method*, to *obſtruct*, or intercept the cordial *ſuperſtructing* of *Chriſtian* life, or *Renovation*, where the *Foundation* is duly laid: For ſuppoſing the *Articles* of our *Chriſtian Faith* to be compleatly *taught*, and undoubtedly *believed*, and ſo the *foundation* to be purely laid according to the *Apoſtles* platform; And ſuppoſing farther that

that the *ſeveral* forementioned branches of the *ſuperſtructure* be ſo far *taught* and *believed* alſo; as that they are not doubted to be the *vertues* preſcribed, and preached to men by *Chriſt*; It is yet poſſible, that after all this, ſome other *Doctrines* may inconveniently interpoſe, and intercept the *uſes* and *aims*, to which *God* hath deſigned the *Faith*, and *at once* obſtruct the *ſuperſtructing* of *all Chriſtian* life upon it.

Sect. 2. Of this ſort the *Catalogue* is (or ſoon may be) far *larger*, than will be fitly inſerted in this place. For upon this occaſion we might be engaged to enter on the examination of the *Romiſh doctrines*, 1. of *Penances*, 2. of *Indulgences*, 3. of the *Treaſury* of the *Church*, made up (beſide the *blood of Chriſt*) of the *ſupererogating merits* of ſome, and applied to the *benefit* and *pardon* of *others*, 4. of the *Improvableneſs* of *Attrition* into *Contrition*, by the *Prieſts* aid, without the ſinners *change* of life, 5. of *Purgatory*, 6. of *Diſpenſableneſs* of *Oaths*, 7. of *Arts* of *Equivocation*, 8. of *Ceſſation* of *Allegiance* in *ſubjects* to an *heretical Prince*, and ſome others the like; but eſpecially of the *Infallibility*, and *inerrableneſs*, which is *aſſumed*, and *incloſed* by the *Romiſh Church*, without any *inerrable* ground to build it on, and being taken for an *unqueſtionable Principle*, is (by the *ſecurity* it brings along with it) apt to betray men to the *fouleſt* whether ſins, or errors, whenſoever this pretended *Infallible* guide ſhall propoſe them; And ſeeing it is *juſt* with *God* to permit thoſe, which *think they ſtand* ſo ſurely, *to fall* moſt dangerouſly, and becauſe what ſome *witty*, and ſubtle men of *this*, and former ages have been experimented to fall into, may in the *future* poſſibly become the *Romaniſts* caſe, and becauſe the *Aſſuming* of *Infallibility* is by way of *interpretation* the *preſuming*, and affirming every thing to be *infallibly true*, and *good*, which they ſhall ever *believe*, or teach *de fide*, or *pronounce* to be *duty* (and there is nothing ſo *falſe*, or *ſacrilegious*, but it is *poſſible* they may thus *reach*, or *pronounce* of it) for theſe *reaſons*, I ſay, it will be impoſſible to free this *Doctrine* of theirs, which hath ſo *vaſt*, and *comprehenſive* an *influence* on the *opinions* and *actions* of all who have eſpouſed it, from the * *guilt*, of which now we ſpeak, that of *hindring* the *ſuperſtructing* of *Chriſtian life*, and the ſeveral *branches* thereof, on the *Foundation*.

Doctrine among the Romaniſts.

The Doctrine of Infallibility.

* *Subditos illi (Papæ) ſimpliciter obligari ad credendum, adeò irrationabile & blaſphemiæ plenum eſt, ut etiam quacunque hæreſi peſtilentius inveniatur,* that ſubjects ſhould be abſolutely and ſimply bound to believe the Pope, is ſo irrational and full of blaſphemy, that it is found more peſtilent than any hereſie whatſoever. *Weſſelus Groningenſ. de dignit. & poteſt. Eccl.* c. 1. (written about 200 years ſince.)

Valdè periclitaretur vita juſti ſi penderet ex vitâ Papæ. Weſſelus Groningenſ. de dignit. & poteſt. Eccl. c. 1. the life of a juſt man would be in very great hazard, if it depended on the life of the Pope.

Sect. 3. And if (as the *Jeſuites* define) this *Infallibility* of the *Church* be ſuppoſed to be ſeated in the *perſons*, or *chair*, or *ſucceſſion* of *Popes*, 'tis preſently obvious and clear, that as *Almain*, and *Ocham* have not thought it *irreverent* to averr that any ſuch perſon is * *deviabilis*, *hæreticabilis*, *Apoſtatabilis*, *damnabilis*, *liable to errour*, *hereſie*, *Apoſtaſie*, *damnation* it ſelf; So they that *believe* him an *infallible guide*, muſt in conſequence to their opinion, if they purſue it, *follow* him to all theſe *dangers*; And when *Pope Stephen* hath been by St. *Cyprian* accuſed of *hereſie*, *Pope Liberius* by St. *Athanaſius*, *Pope Honorius* by all *Chriſtians*, when the *chairs* of thoſe *Biſhops*, which have not ſecured their perſons from notorious impiety of living, that *fouler* guilt than *hereſie*, (Ἀθεΐας εἶδος, *a ſpecies of Atheiſm*, as ‖ *Nilus* truly ſaith on this occaſion) can with no more pretence, or colour of proof * *ſecure* them from *defining of errors*, or *tolerating* of *ſins*; and when the writers of their lives, *Onufrius*, and *Platina*, who have told us, how much more than *poſſible* the former is, (relating the *inceſts*, *witchcrafts*, *cruelties* of *Alexander* the *ſixth*, the *Idolatrous ſacrifices* of *Marcellinus*, *Celeſtins* applications to the *Devil* in purſuit of the *Papacy*, and his diſclaiming his part in *heaven*, ſo he might obtain that *earthy* dignity) have given us reaſon to foreſee the *poſſibility* alſo, and all the ill *conſequences*, and *aboads* of the *latter*; It cannot be *temerarious* or *unreaſonable* to affirm, that what hath been, may be, and in like manner, that the *doctrines* of any *antient heretick* may, in ſome new ſhape, be imbibed by a *Cardinal*, and being ſo, may not forſake him when he is made *Pope*, but beget a *deſire* very conſequent to his *belief*, an *appetite* of *propagating* his perſwaſions, and ſo that *Practices* may be allowed, and *Articles* taught by the *Pope*, moſt contrary to the *deſign* of this *Foundation*, and the *Church* that hath impoſed on her ſons the *belief* of her *Infallibility*, draw all that underſtand it in this ſence (for I ſee *another* is now affixt to it by ſome *Romaniſts*) and pay this ready obedience to it, into the ſame ſnare of *Hereſie*, or *Impiety*, or both.

Of the Pope.

* *Summorum Pontificum plerique peſtilenter erraverunt, &c.* Moſt of the Popes have erred peſtilently. *Weſſelius Groning. de dign. & poteſt. Eccl.* c. 1.

‖ *de Primatu*, p. 57.

* Πῶς ἱερεὺς ἐνδιάβλεται ἢ Πάπας ἀρνούμενος Θεὸν, λόγοις ἢ ἔργοις; What amulet hath the Pope to preſerve him from denying God in his words, who ſo oft doth it in his works? *Nil. de Prim.* p. 57.

Sect. 4. For of this we have too frequent *experience*, how hard it is to diſpoſſeſs a *Romaniſt* of any *doctrine*, or *practice* of that *preſent Church*, for which he hath no grounds either in *Antiquity*, or *Scripture*, or *Rational deductions* from either (but the contrary to all theſe) as long as he hath that one hold, or *fortreſs*, his perſwaſion of the *Infallibility* of that *Church*, which *teacheth*, or *preſcribeth* it. And indeed it were as unreaſonable for us to accuſe, or wonder at this *conſtancy* in *particular ſuperſtructed* errors, be they never ſo many, whilſt the αἴτιον ψεύδους, this firſt great *comprehenſive* falſity is maintained, as to diſclaim the *concluſion*, when the *premiſes*, that duly *induce* it, are embraced. And then that other *errors*, and *guilts* of the higheſt nature neither are, nor ſhall be entertained by thoſe, that are thus *qualified* for them, muſt ſure be a *felicity* to which this *doctrine* hath no way intitled them, and that for which they can have no *ſecurity* for one hour, but by *renouncing* that *principle* which equally obligeth to the *belief* of *truths*, and *falſehoods*, embracing of *commendable*, and *vitious* practices, (worſhipping of *Chriſt* in *Heaven*, and under the *ſpecies* of *bread*; of the *ſon*, and of the *mother* of *God*) when they are once received, and propoſed to them by that *Church*.

The ill effects of it.

Sect. 5. But inſtead of any *fuller* view of theſe, I ſhall mention ſome few of thoſe, which our *cloſer*, and *latter experience* hath made moſt familiar to us, and given us reaſon to look on with a *quickneſs* of ſenſe, and dread, but thoſe ſuch, as being not entred into the *Confeſſions* of any *national Church*, are not properly chargeable either on *Papiſts*, or *Proteſtants*, but on particular *dogmatizers* on both parties. From whom the doctrines being infuſable into all, it will be more neceſſary to forewarn all of the danger of them.

Sect. 6.

The perſwaſion of the Soliſidian.

Sect. 6. Such is *firſt* the *perſwaſion* of the *Soliſidians*, that all *Religion* conſiſts in *believing aright*, that the being of *Orthodox* (as that is oppoſed to *erroneous*) *opinions*, is all that is on our part required, to render our condition *ſafe*, and our *perſons* acceptable in the ſight of *God*.

Sect. 7. This is a perſwaſion frequently obſervable in thoſe that are forward to *ſeparate* from all, who differ in matters of *Doctrine* from them, who place *ſanctity* in their *opinions* (as generally *hereticks* do) and make the *diſſents* of other men, the *characters* of *animal*, *carnal Goſpellers*: and the influence of this on the matter in hand [the *ſuperſtructing Chriſtian life* upon our *Faith*] is moſt evident; for if we ſhould give that perſwaſion of theirs the greateſt *advantage*, and ſuppoſe the *Doctrines* in the *belief* of which they place ſo much efficacy, to be theſe very *fundamental Doctrines*, which this *Diſcourſe* hath defined and ſpecified, yet in caſe the *believing* of thoſe *aright* be conceived the *one* and only *neceſſary* to *ſalvation*, it is evident that the *ſuperſtructing* of *good life* (the thing to which thoſe *doctrines* relate, and in reſpect of which they are ſtyled *Fundamental*) is *ipſo facto* become *unneceſſary*.

Sect. 8. For when it ſhall be once reſolved that *Orthodox* opinions are able to ſecure men of *God*'s favour, and (that being aſſumed as a *principle*) the *ſearch* of them, being a work of the *brain*, ſhall generally be diſcernible (as *Ariſtotle* obſerves of the *ſtudy* of the *Mathematicks*) to have nothing *repugnant* to *paſſions* in it, and when thoſe *articles* of *belief* are conveyed to us with ſuch *evidence* that we have no temptation to doubt of the *truth* of them, what *argument* is there remaining to any *rational* man, which can move him ſo *ſuperfluouſly*, and *unneceſſarily* to ſet upon that more laborious, and *ungrateful* task of *mortifying luſts*, of *ſubduing* of *paſſions*, of *combating* and *overcoming* the *world*, of offering *violence* to his importunate, vigorous, *carnal appetites*? If he that is to be *baptized*, might be admitted to that ſtate of *juſtified Chriſtians*, (and therein to a *right of inheriting* the *Kingdom of Heaven*) by a *profeſſion* of the *Articles* of his *Creed*, and an undoubted *perſwaſion* and *belief* of the *truth* of them, what an impertinent *tyranny* were it to increaſe his *burthen*, to *refuſe* and *delay* his *admiſſion*, till he ſhould undertake the *whole vow*, *of forſaking the Devil and all his works*, *of keeping God's holy will and commandments*, *and walking in the ſame all the days of his life*? What uſe even of *Prayer*, of the *Sacraments*, of *Charity*, of *Faith* it ſelf, in any other *notion* but that, wherein he *conſiders* it and thinks himſelf aſſuredly *poſſeſſed* of it?

Sect. 9. The iſſue is clear, the *Soliſidian* looks upon his *Faith* or *Articles* of his *belief*, as the *intire ſtructure*, not as the *Rudiments* or *Foundation*, as the utmoſt accompliſhment and *end*, and not only as the *firſt elements* of his task; and ſo this *Perſwaſion* of his moſt unhappily, but moſt *regularly*, *obſtructs* and intercepts the *building* any more upon it, which, if he conceived himſelf no farther advanced, than the laying a few ſtones, a bare *Foundation*, he would rationally think himſelf engaged and obliged to proſecute to a far greater perfection.

Sect. 10. Hitherto we have conſidered this *perſwaſion* of the *Soliſidian* at the beſt and faireſt *advantage*, and ſuppoſed the *Opinions*, on which he ſo relies, to be the *true*, *Chriſtian Apoſtolical*, and *Fundamental Opinions*; But if we ſhould proceed farther and conſider how many other *Opinions* there are abroad in the world, which being neither *Fundamental*, nor *Apoſtolical*, nor arrived ſo far as to any fair probability of *truth*, do yet pretend to be the only *ſanctified neceſſary doctrines*, and ſuch, as every man that *believes* them is a *pure Chriſtian profeſſor*, and whoſoever *queſtions* or examines the *truth* of them, is to be look'd on as a *carnal Goſpeller* (whoſe *arguments*, though never ſo *unanſwerable*, are to be *reſiſted*, as ſo many *temptations*) and many of theſe in their own *nature* (over and above this *Phariſaical* opinion of the *ſanctity* of them) very apt to *intermit* our *watch*, to *ſlacken* our *diligence*, to give a *Superſedeas* to *induſtry*, it would be moſt evident that the *Soliſidian's perſwaſions* do moſt *directly* and *immediately* reſiſt *God's* principal deſign in revealing his truths, obſtruct the *ſuperſtructure of Chriſtian life* on this *Foundation*.

Sect. 11. But I ſhall not enlarge on the mention of theſe, any farther than they are likely to fall under ſome other head of this *enſuing diſcourſe*. Mean while it is worth remembring, what *Epiphanius* obſerves of the *Primitive* times, that *wickedneſs* was the only *hereſie*, that ἀσέβεια and ἀνοσίωα, *impious* and *pious* living divided the whole *Chriſtian* world into *erroneous* and *Orthodox*, by which we are advertiſed, how far we are from performing the *engagements* of our *Chriſtianity*, if we inſiſt ſo *paſſionately*, or ſo intently on the *truth* of our *beliefs*, as not to proceed to as vigorous a purſuit of all *juſt*, *ſober*, and *godly* living, to a ſtrict uniform *Regulation* of our *practice*, according to the *obligations* of our moſt *holy Faith*.

CHAP. XIII.

Of the Fiduciarie.

The Doctrine of Faith being a full perſwaſion.

Sect. 1. THE ſecond *obſtructive*, which I ſhall mention, is that of the *Fiduciarie*, that having reſolved *Faith* to be the only *inſtrument* of his *juſtification*, and excluded *good works* from *contributing any thing* toward it, proceeds to define his *Faith* to be a *full perſwaſion*, that the *promiſes* of *Chriſt* belong to him, or an *aſſurance* of his *particular Election*; which he that doth, and ſeriouſly *believes* himſelf to *conclude aright*, that he is a *true believer*, or that the only thing which he is obliged to *acquire* and *arrive* to, is this kind of *full aſſurance*, as it excludes all *fear* or *doubting* of his eſtate, and yet farther aſſerts (as many do) *the priority* of it (in order of *time*) before *repentance*, and ſo *obliges* himſelf to be *ſure* of his *election* and *ſalvation*, before he *repents* or *amends* his *life*, is *fortified* and ſecured by this one *deceit* from all *obligation* that *Chriſtian Religion* can lay upon him to *ſuperſtruct Chriſtian practice*, or *holy living* upon his *Faith*.

Sect. 2.

Sect. 2. For 1. if *assurance* of his *good* estate be the *ens necessary*, then it is evident that *good life*, which is a thing *formally* distinct from that *assurance*, is not *necessary*: 2. If his estate be *already safe* (and if it be not, then his *believing* it, is the *believing a lie*, and *God's command* to *believe* is a *command* to *believe a lie*, and so one man is *justified* and *saved* meerly by giving *credit* to a *falsity*, and all others *rejected* and *damned* barely upon their not *believing* the like *falsity*) then it needs no *assistance* or *supply* from *good life* to make it a *good estate*, or give him grounds to *believe* it such; 3. If he be *justified* before he *repents* and *amends* his *life*, then nothing can hinder the *continuance* of his *justified estate*, in case he do *not repent* at present, nor intercept his *salvation*, in case he do *never repent*; and this, not only by force of that *maxime* generally received by these *Fiduciaries*, that he that is *once justified* can *never* be *unjustified*, nothing can *separate* him from the *favour* of *God*, or *interscind* his *justified estate*; but also without that *auxiliary*, by all rules of *discourse* and *consequence*, for he that is *this day* in a *good estate* without *repentance*, may be so *to morrow* by the same reason, and so on, to the *last day* and *hour* of his *life*; *Repentance* will be no more *necessary* to the *continuance* than to the *inchoation* of his *good estate*. *Obstructive to good life.*

Sect. 3. Or if *amendment* and *good life* be affirmed *necessary* in order to the *approving* of his *faith* or *justification* either to *himself* or *others*, though not to his *justification* it self, 1. this cannot be reconciled with the *Fiduciaries doctrine*. For his *Faith* being a *full assurance*, includes that *approbation* of his *justification* to himself, and so he that hath that *already*, needs not *good life* to help him to it, and for the *approving* it to *others*, that is perfectly *extrinsecal*, and *unnecessary*, and *impertinent* to his *justification*, either in the sight of *God*, or in his *own* eyes; for as *God judgeth* not as *man judgeth*, so neither can *man's disapproving* of any man, be a just reason to move him, who *believeth* he *sins* and *renounces* the *faith*, if he permit himself to *doubt*, to admit any the least beginning of *doubt* of the *goodness* of his *estate*, or *truth* of his *justification*, because of the *disapproving* of *men*. And *Secondly*, 'tis *God's justification*, *God's pardon* of *sin*, the *promise* or *hope* of which hath sufficient *power* to perswade *carnal* men to *forsake* sin, and enter the rules of *Christian life*, and not the *approbation* of *men*. *The pretended use of good life to the justifying of our Faith, vain in four respects: The First. The second.*

Sect. 4. *Thirdly*, In case the *Fiduciary* were in the *right* (as he must be supposed to think himself to be) the men that did not *believe* him *justified*, should be *unrighteous* judges, passing a *judgment* contrary to *God's judgment*, and why should the *Fiduciary* that supposeth himself to be *approved* of *God* without *Repentance*, take such pains to *approve* himself to *man's judgment*, which the *Apostle* disclaims being *judged* by, *Rom.* 8. 33. *The third.*

Sect. 5. *Fourthly*, How can it reasonably be said that *good life* is *necessary* to *approve* our *justification* or our *Faith*, when *good life* is acknowledged to have nothing to do in the matter of *justification*, and when *Faith* is so defined as it hath no *connotation* of *repentance* or *good life*? If *Faith* be a *full perswasion* of my being *justified*, the only *humane* way for me to *approve* this to others, *i.e.* to make *others believe* that I am thus *perswaded*, is to *testifie* it by *word* or *oath*, which is the *one means* agreed on betwixt men to make *faith* of the *truth* of any thing which no man *knows* but my self (and if *man* were supposed to *know* it, it would follow that I should not need means to induce that *approbation*.) *The fourth,*

Sect. 6. The one other imaginable means of *approving* it to *man*, were the *testimony* of *God* either by *voice* from *heaven*, or by some other like means of *Revelation*, or by my doing *miracles* in *God's name*, which might impress some *image* of *divine authority* and *veracity* upon me; And so still *good life* is not the *proper means* for that *end* of *approving* us to men, especially if others *believe* what the *Fiduciary* doth, that *Faith* may be without *good works*, and *good works*, as far as to the eye of *man*, without *Faith*, for that being granted it follows *necessarily*, that one cannot *prove* or *approve* the other.

Sect. 7. Thus did the *Jew* by *saying* and *thinking* that he had *Abraham* to his *Father*, perswading himself of his *particular irrespective election*, think it *safe* first, and consequently *prudent* to run into all *foul* sins, and no more to think himself obliged or concerned by *John Baptist's*, or *Christ's*, or his *Apostles perswasions* to bring forth *fruits* of *amendment*, immediately before the *judgments* of *God* came out against that *people*, than he had been all the *time* before; Nor could his *belief* of *God*, his *expectation* of another life (allowed by the *Pharisees*) his *obscure* belief in the *Messiah* promised, the *Law*, the *Prophets*, the *descent* of *God* from *heaven*, the raising *Jesus* from the *dead*, prevail or gain in upon him, as long as he continued to conceive these *privileges* of *Abraham's sons* to belong unto him. *The Jew's premature persuasion of his good estate.*

Sect. 8. And in like manner the *Christian* professor, who hath imbibed this *Fiduciary* doctrine, and is *confident* of his present and *unperishable* right in the *favour* of God, when he commits those *sins* against which the *Gospel* denounces, that *they which do those things shall not inherit the Kingdom of God*, he is, if he *acknowledge* that part of the *Gospel*, and retain the *belief* of his *personal election*, necessitated to *believe* those acts, when committed by him, to *cease* to be those *sins* which they would be, when another man *committed* them; And then what *necessity* soever lies on him that hath that *guilt* upon him to *reform* the *sins* that contract that *guilt*, he which is supposed not *guilty*, cannot be so *obliged*, and 'tis hard to imagine what *possible* consideration, what *messenger* from the *dead* should be able to perswade him to *repent*, till he hath *deposited* that *premature perswasion* of his being in *Christ*. *The Christians.*

Sect. 9. One special ground of the *Fiduciaries mis-perswasion* is the *Doctrine* of *God's* giving *Christ* for all the *Elect*, and for none but them, all others being supposed to be left by *God* in a state of *absolute* destitution, and dereliction, upon no other foreseen *demerit*, but only the *guilt* of *Adam's sin* imputed to them, and not removed by *Christ*. *The Fiduciary's ground, Christ's dying for none but the Elect.*

Sect. 10. And upon that *Doctrine* imbibed, 1. it is not *unreasonable* or *difficult* for him that is thus perswaded, that supposes his *danger* to flow from no *real sin*, or *guilt* of his own, but only that which being *committed* by *another* is *imputed* to *him*, to *believe*, that there is nothing *required* of him (neither *repentance* nor *good works*) but only a *full assurance* of his own being *elected*, and *rescued* in *Christ*, i. e. a *believing* his own wishes (an *aerial*, *magical faith*) to work his *deliverance* for him.

Sect. 11. *Secondly*, What should make it *necessary* for him to *repent* and *amend*; who either without *respect* to any degree of *amendment*, is supposed to be *elected* to *eternal bliss*, or without *respect* to sin, to be *irreversibly reprobated*, i. e. to any person thus considered, either as *elect*, or *left*, *reprobate*, and *non-elect* in the whole *masse* of *lapst* mankind?

Sect. 12. Nay, I might add, what *obligation* can lie on any man ſo much as to *believe* (whatſoever the notion of *faith* be, even to *believe* he ſhall be *ſaved*) when 'tis ſuppoſed by him to be certainly *decreed* that he ſhall be *ſaved*, without *foreſight* of, or *reſpect* unto this Faith of his?

Two farther obſtructions to good life.

Sect. 13. Upon theſe premiſes it cannot but be reaſonable to conclude, and uſeful farther to take notice in the next place, that theſe two *Doctrines*, 1. of *Chriſt's dying for none but the Elect*, 2. of *God's abſolute irreſpective decrees of Election and Reprobation*, are *inconvenient interpoſitions*, which are moſt apt to *obſtruct* and *hinder* the *building* of *good life*, even where the *Foundation* thereof is received *entirely*, and not *queſtioned* in any *part* thereof; Of which I ſhall therefore farther treat in the *two next Chapters*.

Sect. 14. Mean while, as an *appendix* to this *Chapter*, it will be *juſt* to take notice, that ſome men have thought it *neceſſary*, in the *definition* of *Faith*, to *change* the [*Full aſſurance*] into a milder ſtyle of [*Reliance*] which if it be not joyned with other *changes* in that *Doctrine*, as in that *particular* of the *Priority* of *Faith* before *Repentance*, 'tis certainly 1. as *erroneous*, 2. as *liable* to the charge of *obſtructing good life*, as that *other* doctrine of *Aſſurance* hath appeared to be.

Of Faiths being defined by Reliance.

The Error of it.

Sect. 15. For the *firſt*, where there is *no divine Promiſe*, on which to *relie*, (as to the *unreformed ſinner* remaining ſuch, the whole *Bible* affordeth *none*) there what is *reliance*, but *preſumption*, *reliance* on a *broken reed*, a *building* without a *foundation*? Whereas on the other ſide if any *promiſe* were producible, whereon it were *ſafe* to *relie*, what *ſcruple* could the *Chriſtian* there make againſt entertaining the *fulleſt aſſurance*? for *that* without queſtion will be *ſupported* abundantly by ſuch a *promiſe*.

The danger of obſtructing good life.

Sect. 16. For the *ſecond*, 'tis *viſible*, He that *continues unreformed* and *impenitent* in his courſe of *ſin*, and is by the *Preacher* induced to *relie* on *Chriſt* for his *ſalvation*, and is farther taught, that this *Reliance* is that *Faith* by which he is *juſtified*, and the *one* thing, that is *required* of him to his *ſalvation*, what *neceſſity* can be imagined to lie on that man to *reform* or *amend* any *vice*, or to do any thing, but *relie* on *Chriſt* for the *pardon* of it, for *juſtification* and *ſalvation*? 'Tis *ſuperfluous* to purſue this any farther, which ſo diſcernibly falls under the *inconveniences* that have been ſhewed to belong to *Aſſurance*, and are mention'd in the *former* part of this *Chapter*, too largely to be here *repeated*.

CHAP. XIV.

Of Chriſt's dying for none but the Elect.

Sect. 1. NOW for that *Doctrine* of *Chriſt's dying for none but the Elect*, i. e. (according to the opinion of thoſe which thus teach) for a *ſmall remnant* of the *world*, as it is aſſerted without any pretence or *colour* of *Scripture-proof*, nay in oppoſition to as plain diſtinct *affirmations* as can be produced for any *Article* in the *Creed*, ſo is it of very *ill conſequence* to the *ſuperſtructing* of *good life*.

Univerſal Redemption the doctrine of Scripture.

Sect. 2. That *Chriſt's dying for all* is the expreſs *doctrine* of the *Scripture*, is elſewhere manifeſted by the phraſes of the greateſt latitude, uſed in this matter, 1. κόσμος the *world*, which is a word of the *wideſt* extent, and although it be ſometimes uſed more *reſtrainedly*, yet never doth nor can in any reaſon be interpreted to ſignifie a *far ſmaller diſproportionable part* of the *world*: Secondly, *All*, which word, though it be ſometimes *reſtrained* by the *matter*, and doth not *always* ſignifie *every* perſon or thing, yet generally it muſt be extended as far as the *matter* is capable of, and muſt not be *reſtrained* without ſome conſiderable *reaſon* for doing ſo: Thirdly, *Every man*, a form of ſpeaking which *excludes* all *exceptions*, of which ſome *general* phraſes are oft capable: Fourthly, *thoſe that periſh*, thoſe that are *damned*, thoſe that *deny Chriſt*, and *purchaſe to themſelves ſwift damnation*, which being added to the number of thoſe which are *ſaved* by his *death*, and acknowledged by all *oppoſers* to be ſo, make up the whole *unlimited* number of *all mankind*: Fifthly, as many as are *fallen* in *Adam* and *dead* through him, which phraſe is by all, but *Pelagius* and his followers, ſuppoſed to comprehend every *ſon* of *Adam*, every branch of his *progenie*.

Of the Creeds. The Nicene.

Sect. 3. And accordingly, though the *Apoſtles Creed* make no other mention of this, than is contained in ſtyling *Jeſus Chriſt*, *our Lord*, i.e. the *Lord* (by title of *Redemption*) of *us all* indefinitely, and particularly of *every perſon*, who is appointed to make that *confeſſion* of his *faith*, i.e. every one that is admitted to *baptiſm*, yet the *Nicene Creed* hath inſerted ſome words for the farther explication of that *Article*, [*Who for us men and for our ſalvation came down----*] which ſignifie all *mankind* to have their intereſt in it.

The Apoſtolick.

Sect. 4. Nay if it be obſerved in the *Apoſtles Creed*, that the *two firſt articles* are *correſponding* and *proportionable* one to the other, (to [*God*] in the *firſt* Article, [*Jeſus Chriſt*] in the *ſecond*; to [*Father almighty*] in the *firſt*, [*his only ſon*] in the *ſecond*; to [*maker of heaven and earth*] in the *firſt*, [*our Lord*] in the *ſecond*) we ſhall have reaſon to infer that as [*heaven and earth*] in the *firſt* Article ſignifie in the greateſt *latitude*, *all* and *every creature* in the *world* to have been *created* by the *Father*, ſo the [*Our*] in the *ſecond* Article is ſet to denote *all* and *every* one of *us*, *every man* in the *world*, without any exception, to be *redeemed* by *God* the *Son*.

Of the Church of England in the Catechiſm.

Sect. 5. And accordingly the *Catechiſm* of the *Church of England* eſtabliſhed by *Law*, and *preſerved* in our *Liturgie* as a ſpecial part of it, expounds the *Creed* in this ſence, *I believe in God the Father which made me and all the world*; 2. *In God the Son who redeemed me and all mankind*; 3. *In God the Holy Ghoſt who ſanctifieth me and all the elect people of God*; Where, as *Creation* is common to more *creatures* than *redemption*, and *redemption* than *ſanctification*; ſo *Mankind*, to which *Redemption* belongs,

as

as it is far *narrower* than the *world*, or the *works* of *God's Creation*, ſo it is far *wider* than the *Catalogue* of *all the Elect people of God*, to whom *ſanctification* belongs.

In the Communion ſervices.

Sect. 6. So in other parts of our *Liturgie*, in *Conſecrating* the *Euchariſt*, we have this form of prayer, *Almighty God---which---didſt give thine only Son Jeſus Chriſt to ſuffer death upon the Croſs for our redemption, and made there (by his own oblation of himſelf once offered) a full, perfect and ſufficient ſacrifice, oblation and ſatisfaction for the ſins of the whole world*; And accordingly in the *adminiſtration* of that *Sacrament*, the *elements* are delivered to every *communicant* in this form, *The body of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt which was given for thee---*and, *The blood of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt which was ſhed for thee, preſerve thy body and ſoul into everlaſting life*; Which ſuppoſeth it the *doctrine* of our *Church*, avowed and profeſſed, that *Chriſt's death* was not only *ſufficient* for *all*, if *God* would have ſo *intended* and *deſigned* it, but that he was actually *deſigned* and *given* for *all*, not only as many as come to that *Sacrament* (which yet is *wider* than the *Elect*) but *us men*, or *mankind* in *general*, whoſe *ſalvation* was ſought by God by this means.

In the Articles.

Sect. 7. So in our *Articles* alſo, *Chriſt ſuffered for us---that he might be a ſacrifice not only for Original ſin, but alſo for all the actual ſins of men*, *Art.* 2. And, *by Chriſt who is the only mediator of God and men---eternal life is propoſed to mankind*, *Art.* 7. And, *Chriſt came as a Lamb---that by the offering of himſelf once made he might take away the ſins of the world*, *Art.* 15. And, *The oblation of Chriſt once made is a perfect redemption, propitiation, and ſatisfaction for all the ſins of the whole world*, *Ar.* 31. All which I have thus largely ſet down to ſhew the perfect *conſonancy* of our perſecuted *Church* to the *doctrine* of *Scripture* and *Antiquity* in this point, whereon ſo much *depends* for the *ſtating* and *determining* other *differences*, which have alſo a *ſpecial influence* on *practice*.

The ill conſequences of the denying it.

Sect. 8. As for the *ill conſequences* toward the *obſtructing* of *good life*, which are conſiderable to attend this one *doctrine* of *Chriſt's dying* for *none* but *the Elect*, they will be moſt diſcernible by attempting the *Reformation* and *change* of any *vitious Chriſtian* that *believes* that *doctrine*, or the *comfort* of any *diſconſolate deſpairing Chriſtian*, that hath gotten into this hold, and remains fortified in the *belief* of it.

In the reducing a vitious Chriſtian.

Sect. 9. For the former, 'tis *evident*, and that which he is ſuppoſed to *believe*, if he *believe* the *Foundation* (as I preſume him now to do, when I ſet the caſe of a *vitious Chriſtian*) that there is no *ſalvation* to be had for any *ſinner*, but only by the *ſufferings* of *Chriſt*, and that *redemption* by him wrought for ſuch: If therefore a *vitious* liver, believing that *Chriſt* dyed for none but the *Elect*, ſhall have any attempt made on him to *reform* and *amend* his life, 'tis certain that one *medium* to induce him to it, muſt be a *tender* of *mercy* from *Chriſt*, of preſent *pardon*, and future *bliß*, upon his *Reformation*; But if he be able to reply, that that *mercy* belongs only to the *Elect*, and he is none of them, it neceſſarily follows that he that would *reduce* this *ſtray ſheep*, muſt either prove *convincingly* to him that he is one of the *Elect*, or elſe hath no farther to proceed in this *attempt*.

Sect. 10. And if he thus *attempt* to *perſwade* the *vitious Chriſtian*, that he is one of the *Elect*, then 1. the very *attempt* confeſſes to him that a *vitious* perſon, remaining ſuch, may be in the number of the *Elect*, and from thence he will preſently be able to infer, that then he needs not *reformation* of *life* to conſtitute him ſuch, and if ſo, then *reformation* of *life* is not the *condition* on which only *bliß* is to be expected, and without which it is not to be had, it being *ſuppoſed* and *acknowledged* by both parties, that *all* the *Elect* ſhall have it, and ſo the *medium*, which was thought *neceſſary* to *perſwade* his *reformation* (the *tender* of *mercy* from *Chriſt* upon *reformation*) is already *vaniſhed*, and conſequently 'tis to no purpoſe to *perſwade* him, that he is one of the *Elect*, which was uſeful only for the inforcing this *medium*; And ſo the very *making* this *attempt* is *deſtructive* to the only *end* of it.

Sect. 11. But if this were not the reſult of this *attempt*, yet Secondly, 'tis in the progreſs agreed to be neceſſary that he *perſwade* this perſon that he is *one* of the *Elect*, And what poſſible *medium* can he uſe to prove that to a *vitious* perſon? *A priori*, from any *ſecret decree* of *God's*, 'tis certain he cannot *demonſtrate* it, for he hath never entred into *God's ſecrets*, and 'tis ſure the *Scripture* hath *revealed* nothing of it, Whatſoever it ſaith of the *Book* of *life*, never affirming that *particular* man's *name* is *written* there; And then the one poſſible way of *attempting* it is *à poſteriori*, from the *fruits* of *election*, and thoſe are not ſuppoſeable in him who is *ſuppoſed* a *vitious* liver, who lives in that eſtate (and is by him acknowledged to do ſo, for otherwiſe why ſhould he think it *neceſſary* to *reduce* him?) wherein he that lives *ſhall not inherit the Kingdom of God*. For his proof, whatever it is, will eaſily be retorted, and the contrary proved, by interrogating, *Shall the adulterer, the drunkard, the vitious Chriſtian, inherit the Kingdom of God*? If he *ſhall*, what need I that am now exhorted to *reform* my *life*, *reform it*? If he *ſhall not*, then certainly I that am ſuch, am none of the *Elect*, for all that are *elect* ſhall certainly *inherit the Kingdom of God*.

Sect. 12. The only *reſerve* imaginable is, that this *vitious Chriſtian* be perſwaded to *believe* in *Chriſt*, and if he do ſo, he ſhall by that *know* that he is one of the *Elect*, and ſo that his *ſins* ſhall be *pardoned*, &c. But if this be the method made uſe of, then 1. this is not the *attempting* to *reform*, to work *repentance* (which was the thing propoſed in this firſt caſe) but to work *faith* in him, and with men of thoſe opinions theſe are two diſtinct things, *faith* and *repentance*, and the former muſt be *before* the other, & is reſolved to do the whole buſineſs *without* the other, and conſequently this is not the way to bring the *ſinner* to *repentance*, but rather to aſſure him that he hath no *need* of it, his buſineſs may be done *without* it.

Sect. 13. *Secondly*, This very *attempt* of *perſwading* him to *believe* in *Chriſt* (as that ſignifies the *full perſwaſion* that the *promiſes* of *Chriſt belong to him*) is, ſuppoſing that *Chriſt died* for none but the *Elect*, as deſperate an attempt as the former: For why ſhould he *believe that Chriſt died* for *him*, who died only for the *Elect*, when he hath no means to perſwade him that he is one of the *Elect*, but great and ſtrong preſumptions to the contrary? For to *believe* that *Chriſt died* for him, for whom he *died* not, is to *believe* a down-right *faſity*, and ſuch is the *believing Chriſt died* for *him*, who both *believes* that he *died* only for the *Elect*, and that he himſelf is none of that *number*.

Sect. 14. And in like manner the former inconvenience returns again, for if the *vitious Christian* be adviſed to *believe* that *Chriſt died* for *him*, remaining ſuch, (and that muſt be the caſe, if this *faith* muſt precede *repentance*) it is by that advice preſuppoſed and granted to him, that *Chriſt*, which *died* only for the *Elect*, who ſhall certainly *inherit the Kingdom of God*, died for this *vitious* perſon, of whom the *Scripture* ſaith, that he ſhall not *inherit the Kingdom*; And again, if he may *believe*, what he is adviſed to *believe*, that *Chriſt died* for *him*, as now he is, an *unreformed Chriſtian*, then what needs he *reformation* to make him capable of the *benefits* of his *death*? And ſo ſtill it is impoſſible, where this opinion is imbibed and unremoved, to found any convincing argument, to *reform* a *vitious Chriſtian*.

Sect. 15. But this hath no ſuch appearance of *difficulty* to him that hath received the *doctrine* of *Univerſal*, but *conditional redemption*, *i. e.* of *Chriſt dying* for *all*, if all will take care to perform the *condition* required by him, and to which his *grace* is ready to enable him. For then how great ſoever the *ſins* of any *unreformed* perſon are, 'tis evident that *Chriſt died* for *him*, becauſe he *died* for all; that he *died* for thoſe *ſins* of *his*, becauſe he *died* for *all ſins*; Only he muſt *reform*, and *forſake* his *ſins*, or elſe he ſhall never receive *benefit* of his *death*; And then, though there be that *pleaſure* in ſin, which the *habitual* ſinner cannot be perſwaded to part with, unleſs he *muſt*, (unleſs he diſcern the *danger* of *retaining*, and the *advantage* of *parting* with it) yet when he hath ſuch *arguments* as theſe propoſed to him, *eternal bliſs* in exchange for ſhort *temporary pleaſures*, aſſurance of this upon *reformation*, and an *impoſſibility*, and abſolute *deſperation* without it, the *vitious Chriſtian*, if he have *advanced* no farther than ſo, and if his *habit* of *ſin* have not *corrupted* his *principles*, may think it *reaſonable* to *reform* and *amend* upon ſuch terms as theſe, the *Preacher* may hope to *ſuperſtruct good* life upon ſuch a *Foundation*.

In comforting a diſconſolate Chriſtian.

Sect. 16. And the like *inconveniences* are found to be conſequent to this opinion of *Chriſt's dying* for none but the *Elect*, whenſoever any *comfort* is offered to a *diſconſolate deſpairing Chriſtian*; For it is not poſſible to give him any *comfort*, but by fetching it from *Chriſt*; And that he ſhall receive no *benefit* from *Chriſt*, is the affirmation, whereon all his *deſpair* is founded, and the one way of removing this *diſmal* apprehenſion, is, to convince him that *Chriſts death* and the *benefits* thereof, either *do*, or, if he perform the *condition* required of him, *ſhall* certainly belong to him.

Sect. 17. This upon the belief of *univerſal Redemption* is preſently ſo far done, that if he ſet *induſtriouſly* and *ſincerely* to *perform* the *commands* of *Chriſt*, he can have no *ground* or pretence of *doubting*, but it ſhall prove *ſucceſsful* to him, and ſo all that he hath to do, is to endeavour by *prayer* and uſe of the *means*, and by *good hope* (of which he hath ſuch clear grounds) to *qualifie* himſelf for this *bleſſed* condition, and in the mean time hath no excuſe to continue in this *melancholy*, mournful poſture, who hath ſo *cheerful* a *proſpect* before him.

Sect. 18. But to him that believes *Chriſt died* for none but the *Elect*, and whoſe *comforter* is of that opinion alſo, there is no poſſible reply to his *objections*, or *ſatisfaction* to his ſad abodings: For that no *mercy* doth or can belong to him, he is reſolved upon this ground, becauſe *Chriſt died* not for *him*, and the *doctrine* that *Chriſt died* for the *Elect* yields him no *relief*, becauſe he is verily perſwaded that he is none of the *Elect*; and when the *number* of the *Elect* is defined to be ſo *ſmall* and diſproportionable to the number of the *reprobate*, and ſo there is really all *odds* againſt him, that he is not of the *number* of the *few*, when his *fears* ſhall help to increaſe that *odds*, and make him leſs capable of *believing*, what is ſo much leſs *probable*, when his preſent *deſpairs*, being ſo contrary to that *faith* (*aſſurance* of his *ſalvation*) which alone can *juſtifie*, in his opinion, or bear *witneſs* to his *Election*, ſhall by neceſſary conſequence bear *witneſs* againſt him, and when the *Scripture*, that ſhould, and in this caſe alone can interpoſe for his *relief*, doth certainly affirm nothing of his *particular Election*; and *laſtly*, when what it ſaith of *Chriſt's dying* for *all*, is by him miſunderſtood to belong but to a *few*, 'tis not *imaginable* what can be ſaid to this man to perſwade him that his progreſs is not *rational*, that he doth not well to *deſpair*, who hath ſo ſlight grounds to build any *hope*, and ſo much *weightier* to comply with, and aſſiſt his *fears* in *overwhelming* him.

Sect. 20. And then as *neceſſary* as *hope* is to *labour*, *encouragement* to *quickning* of *action*, ſo neceſſary is the belief of *Univerſal Redemption* to the *ſuperſtructing Chriſtian life*, where the *foundation* of *Chriſtian belief* is already laid.

CHAP. XV.

Of the irreſpective decrees of Election and Reprobation.

Sect. 1. THE ſame is diſcernible alſo, and need not more largely be declared in that *doctrine of God's decrees* of *ſalvation*, and *damnation*, which hath been taken up by ſome both of the *Romiſh* and *Reformed Churches*, affixing them to mens *particular entities*, abſolutely conſidered, without any reſpect to all *qualifications* and *demeanours*; Which, whatſoever elſe be *believed* of *God* or *Chriſt*, is (as far as it is laid to heart, and permitted to have *influence* on carnal men's *practice*) a moſt viſible *hindrance* to the *building* of *good life* upon it.

The Article of our Church.

Sect. 2. The *Church of England* having not ſo much as *named* (but purpoſely *avoided* the *mention* of) any *Decree* of *Reprobation*, and for *Election*, or *Predeſtination to life*, having ſet it down in an *admirable temper*, in order to *gratifying* all, and not *provoking* any of the ſeveral *perſwaſions*, *Art.* 17. (as might more largely be made to appear, if it were here ſeaſonable) hath yet providently foreſeen the *dangerous downfal* that from this her *doctrine* (the affirming no more, nor no more particularly than ſhe doth) is to be expected to *curious* (as well as *carnal*) men, *i. e.* to thoſe that enter into farther

farther *ſpeculations* herein, (which is the itch of *curioſity*) and content not themſelves with the *ſimplicity* of that *doctrine*, within which this *Church* hath contained her ſelf. And to prevent *particularly* all *advantage*, that might be taken from hence to the *Doctrine* of the *irreſpective decrees*, to which is inſeparably joyned the *confining* all the *Promiſes* to the *Elect*, The *Article* concludes with an earneſt expreſſion of care, and *warning* to the *contrary*, that *we muſt receive God's promiſes in ſuch wiſe, as they are generally ſet forth to us in the Holy Scripture (as in our doing we are to follow that will of God, which we have expreſly declared to us in the Word of God)* which one paſſage *excludes*, and barrs out that whole *doctrine*.

Sect. 3. As for the *particularity* of the *dangers*, and *hindrances* of *good life*, that are directly *conſequent* to this *doctrine*, they are preſently *diſcerned*; For if that *ſalvation*, which *Chriſt* came to purchaſe for a *few*, and in like manner that *dereliction* or *reprobation* that irreverſibly involves the far *greater* multitude, be not *diſtributed* according to the *qualifications* or *performances* of men, whether *works*, or *love*, or *hope*, or *repentance*, or the *want* of any, or all of theſe, but only by the *abſolute irreſpective will* of *God*, what *rational* argument can either from Chriſt's *promiſes* or *threats*, be produced in any time of *temptation* to any ſin, (which is the ſpecial *ſeaſon* for ſuch *arguments* to be offered to any) which may be of *force* to perſwade a *reaſonable* man, or *Chriſtian profeſſor*, to renounce that *preſent pleaſure* that comes in *competition* with *duty*? *The doctrine of irreſpective decrees.*

Sect. 4. Either the *promiſes* of *Chriſt*, or the *terrors* of the *Lord*, or the *authority* of the *Commander*, muſt be the *Topick* whence that *argument* is drawn, and all *force* of any of theſe is utterly taken off by this *doctrine*. *Takes off the force*

Sect. 5. *Promiſes* can be of no *force*, unleſs they be believed to be *conditional promiſes*, and unleſs that *duty*, which is propoſed to be *inforced* by thoſe *promiſes*, be acknowledged to be part of that *condition*, upon performance of which thoſe *promiſes* do, and upon neglect of which, thoſe *promiſes* ſhall not belong to any; And the *promiſes* being but a *tranſcript* of the *will* and *decree* of *God*, a *revelation* made by *Chriſt* of that *myſtery*, or *ſecret*, wrapt up before in *God's eternal Counſels* concerning us, ſuch as the *decrees* are ſuppoſed to have been, ſuch muſt the *promiſes* be concluded to be, If the *decrees* be *believed* to be *abſolute*, the *promiſes* muſt be *abſolute* too, and conſequently *not conditional*, which was the one *qualification* neceſſarily required to render them of any *force* to work on any, to *reſtrain*, or *invite* any that were drawn, or ſollicited another way. *1. Of Promiſes.*

Sect. 6. For why ſhould a man perform an *ungrateful duty*, undertake a *difficulty*, *hazard* a *danger* or *diminution*, *deny* himſelf any *pleaſurable enjoyment*, upon a bare *intuition* of *promiſes* (which by being ſuch are *repreſented* with ſome *diſadvantage*, lie under a conſiderable *prejudice*, and are *acknowledged* and experimented to be of leſs *energie* or *force* to *allure* or *perſwade*, than *preſent* poſſeſſions) when he is all the while *convinced* that all the *promiſes*, that he can poſſibly have any part in, belong to him *abſolutely* and *irreſpectively*, and ſhall no more be *ſecured* to him upon the *performance*, than upon the *neglect*, and *omiſſion* of that *duty*?

Sect. 7. In like manner the *Terrors* and *menaces* of *ſcripture* are of as little *force*; For if they fall upon mens *perſons*, and not upon their *ſins* (*omiſſions* or *commiſſions*) if they are but the *recitations* and *deſcriptions* of *God's decreed wrath*, and thoſe *decrees* and that *wrath* have no reſpect to the *actual ſins* of men, but are terminated either in the *innocent creature*, or the *child* of *lapſed Adam*, i. e. either reſpect not *ſin* at all, or elſe none but *Original ſin*, (which is no part of the *preſent deliberation*, whether it ſhall be *committed*, and I *guilty* of it or no) then why ſhould *terrors* reſtrain me from any *ſin*, when there is any *tender* of preſent *advantage* to *invite* me to it? *2. Of Terrors.*

Sect. 8. All my *fear* and *trembling* will regularly be terminated in the *decree*, on which all my *miſery* depends, and not in the *ſin*, which means me no *ill*, and conſequently the *averſion* and *diſlike* will naturally be faſtned on that *ſevere* Law, that hath bound me in *fatal chains* of *darkneſs*, before ever I ſaw *light*, and if it proceed any farther, may be likely to *aſcend* blaſphemouſly unto, and againſt that *Judge*, that hath taken *pleaſure* to enact that *law* (and ſo that *doctrine* may very probably take off from our *love* of *God*) but 'tis not imaginable which way this ſhould produce in me any *averſion* or *hatred* againſt *Sin*, which by this *doctrine* is cleared from being my *enemy*, from involving me into any *miſchief*, deſigning the leaſt *treachery* againſt me.

Sect. 9. And *laſtly*, for the *authority* of *Gods Commands* which *forbid* ſin, and *command obedience*, it can be no greater with any *man* toward the *undertaking* of *good life*, than that man *believes* the *weight* to be, which *God* lays on the *performance* of them; And if *God* heed that no more, than they that *eſpouſe* the *doctrine* of *irreſpective decrees*, muſt conſequently be ſuppoſed to believe him to do, if in his *decreeing* his *eternal rewards* of *bliſs* or *woe*, he reſpect not our *obedience* or *diſobedience*, but diſtribute both by a *rule* quite diſtant from that which is founded in his commands, or *revealed will*, it will never be thought any near *concernment* or intereſt of ours to regulate our *actions* according to thoſe *commands*, which have certainly much of *ſtrictneſs* in them, much of *contrariety* to *fleſh* and *blood*, but nothing of influence either on our *weal* or *woe*, as long as this *doctrine* is deemed to have any truth in it. *3. Of Commands.*

Sect. 10. And ſo ſtill the *virtue* and *force* of every of theſe three, which are the *common* ſtanding *inducements* and *engagements* to *obedience*, is ſhrewdly *allayed*, if not wholly loſt by this means.

Sect. 11. And 'tis not the *motive* of *gratitude* (which is ſaid to be the only ſcore, on which the *Elect* perform their *obedience*) that can make any conſiderable *difference* in this matter, that can be ſufficient to perſwade him to *abſtain* from any *tempting* ſin, whom neither *promiſes*, nor *terrors*, nor *precepts* had been able to work upon. *4. Of Gratitude.*

Sect. 12. 1. Becauſe *Gratitude* being but a *return* of *love* in him that hath a *quick ſenſe* of *God's loving* him *firſt*, cannot have any *propriety* to the producing of that *effect* in any, till he hath arrived to that *ſenſe*, nor can it *continue* to do it, when that *ſenſe* is *loſt*. And conſequently a great number of the *ſuppoſed elect* ſhall be uncapable of it, both they which are *not* yet *come* to this *aſſurance*, that they are of that number, and they that under any *anguiſh* of mind are returned to *affrightments*, or *doubtings* whether they have not been *hypocrites*, and ſo *reprobates* all this while; And as theſe *two ſorts* (according to their doctrine) comprehend a *great* and conſiderable number of the *very elect*,

(of

(of whom very few are arrived to that *pitch* of *conſtant uninterrupted aſſurance* of their *election*) ſo *Gratitude*, by being unuſeful to them that are not thus *aſſured*, muſt be acknowledged *unuſeful* to thoſe who have the greateſt *want* of it, and by being confined to the *few*, which have this *aſſurance quick*, and *undiſturbed* within them, is concluded to have a very *narrow* and *ſlender* province to work on, a very *ſmall number* of a *very ſmall number*, a *remnant* of a *remnant*, being acknowledged to be *unappliable*, and ſo conſequently *uneffectual* to all others.

Sect. 13. Secondly, Becauſe one other *doctrine* there is, which *conſtantly* accompanies the *doctrine* of *irreſpective decrees*, which *ſuperſedes* all farther *diſpute* in this matter, the *doctrine* of the *irreſiſtibility* of *grace*, in working whatſoever it works, which if it be once acknowledged, there is nothing to be affixt to *Gratitude* (or to any thing elſe in me) which whatſoever it *works* at any time works by way of *perſwaſion*, not *violence*, and cannot be ſaid ſo much as to *contribute* to the *working* of that, which is ſuppoſed to be *irreſiſtibly* wrought by the *Spirit* of *God*.

Sect. 14. Thirdly, If theſe two arguments, which are only *ad homines*, and conſider the *Elect* only in theſe mens notion of the word, had no kind of *force* in them, yet ſtill this of *Gratitude*, which is the one pretended *reſerve*, muſt needs be impertinently pretended in this matter.

Sect. 15. *Firſt*, becauſe the *good life* to which the *foundation* was laid by the *Apoſtles* preaching, is not that of a *few* perſons, *choſen* out of the *maſs*, but of *all* that receive the *Chriſtian profeſſion*, (for to *all* ſuch certainly their *preaching* was deſigned to pertain) of which number there being a *large* proportion, which (according to the *tenure* of this *doctrine*) muſt be ſuppoſed to be *non-elect*, there will not be that matter of *thanksgiving* to any of them, nor conſequently any account, upon which they can be perſwaded to make thoſe kind *returns* to *God*, which the *Elect* were more probably ſuppoſed to have *engagement* to do.

Sect. 16. And *ſecondly*, it being *Chriſt's errand*, and *buſineſs* into the World, to *call* not the *righteous*, or the *juſtified*, but the *unreformed*, or *ſinners* to *repentance*, to change them who need a change, and who, if they are by this doctrine ſuppoſeable to be already from all eternity *elected*, are not yet before their *calling* or *converſion* affirmed to be *actually juſtified*, or received into *God's favour* (any more than *Saul* was in the time of his journey to *Damaſcus*, when he *breathed out threatnings and ſlaughters againſt the Church*) the *concluſion* muſt be, that any ſuch *unreformed* ſinner will not be capable of being wrought on by any ſuch conſideration of *gratitude*, and ſo *Chriſt*, notwithſtanding this only *reſerve*, ſhall be wholly *unſucceſsful* in his aim towards thoſe, who were the *principal deſigned* perſons, to whom he came, and predeſtined the benefits of his *coming*.

Sect. 17. *Thirdly*, this of *Gratitude* being by thoſe that maintain this *doctrine* ſuppoſed to *follow faith* or *aſſurance* of their *ſalvation*, 'tis thereby acknowledged to have no *force* on thoſe who have not this *faith*, though they do *believe* all the *articles* of their *Creed*, and ſo it can be no proper expedient to remove the *hindrances* which the *belief* of the *irreſpective decrees* hath been ſaid to interpoſe in the matter in hand, or to adapt *good life* to be *ſuperſtructed* on this (whatſoever it is imaginable to be on any other) *Foundation*.

CHAP. XVI.

Of the Predetermination of all things.

The doctrine of God's predetermining all events.

Sect. 1. AND as the *abſolute predeſtination* of the *perſons* is able to evacuate all the force of theſe *fundamentals*, deſigned by *God* as motives of great *energie* to induce *good life*, ſo certainly is the opinion of *God's predetermining* and *preordaining* the *means* as well as the *end*, (i.e. all the *acts* of *man's will*, the *evil* as well as the *good*, and ſo all the moſt *enormous* ſins that are or ever ſhall be *committed*) moſt abundantly ſufficient to do it.

Sect. 2. I ſay not the *doctrine* of *God's prediſpoſing* or *preordering*, or of his *predetermining* or *decreeing* that he will ſo and ſo *diſpoſe* and *order* all things that come to paſs, whether *good* or *bad*, for that looks on the things as done, which are ſo *diſpoſed*, and conſequently includes not any *influence* or *cauſality* in the production of them, and ſo *God*, that brings *light* out of *darkneſs*, can *diſpoſe* of the *worſt* things, the fouleſt *ſins*, the very *crucifying* of *Chriſt*, ſo as to bring *health* and *ſalvation* out of them.

Of preordering.

Sect. 3. But betwixt this and *predetermining* that which is ſo *diſpoſed*, the *difference* is *wide*, as much as betwixt a *bloody* deſigners *ſuborning* his *inſtrument* to take away ſuch a man's *life*, and the *Confeſſors* repreſenting the *horridneſs* of the *fact*, and by that means bringing him to *repentance*; And though * *Ordinare* in *Latin*, and τάσσειν in *Greek* be *equivocal*, and capable of both theſe notions, yet *ordaining* and *decreeing* in our *Engliſh* uſe, is not thus liable to be miſtaken.

* vid. Junium ap. Strangium P. 555.

Sect. 4. *Secondly*, I ſay not the *doctrine* of *God's predetermining his own will*, but his *predetermining* the *acts* of our *will*, or our *volitions*; Great difference there is betwixt theſe two, as much as betwixt my *willing* a *lawful* thing my ſelf, and my *inducing* another man to do that which is *unlawful*.

Of God's predetermining his own will.

Sect. 5. For *God* doth *predetermine* his *own will*, as oft as he *decrees* to do this or that, which he might not have *decreed* to have done, or have *decreed* to have done the *contrary*; for when *God's will* is *free* to two things, to make or not to make a *world*, or *ſuch* a *world*, and the like, his *decreeing* to *make* it, and to make it *ſuch*, is the *determining* of his *will*. Thus when before all time *God* might have *created* man a *neceſſary* agent to *will* and to *do* every thing that he *wills* and *doth*, after the ſame manner as the *fire burneth*, i.e. ſo as he could not do otherwiſe, yet 'tis evident that *God* choſe to create him after the *image* of his own *liberty*, a *voluntary free* agent, that might *deliberate* and *chooſe*, and

and either do, or not do, or do this or the *contrary* to it; And so in like manner *God* may *determine* his *own will* not to *hinder*, but *permit* what he sees man inclinable to do, when he might on the other side have *chosen* to *hinder* or not to *permit*; And thus he did when he *decreed* to *permit* the *malice* of the *Jews*, the *covetousness* of *Judas*, the *popularity* of *Pilate*, to joyn all together in the *crucifying* of *Christ*, upon which it is said, that *his hand and his Counsel προώρισε γενέσθαι did predetermine* this *to be done*, i. e. *Christ* to be *crucified* (which was done by *God's predetermining* to *permit* (or not hinder) them to do what they by the *free* act of their *own wills* resolved to do) no way intimating that *God predetermined* they should do it.

Sect. 6. And this *predetermination* of *God's own will* is so far from being the *determining* of *ours*, that it is distinctly and visibly the *contrary*, for supposing *God* to *predetermine* that I shall act *freely*, and that he will not *determine* my *will* to this or that *object*, 'tis certain from thence that my *will* is *free* in respect of *God*, and not *predetermined* by him; And therefore that *ordinary* position, that *the predetermination of God's will hinders not the liberty of ours*] which by being understood of *God's will predetermining ours*, is most grosly false, and implyes a *contradiction*, a *predetermination* and not a *predetermination*, a *liberty* and not a *liberty* to the same thing, is yet most evidently true of *God's predetermining* his own *will*, or his own *will* being *predetermined*, for that, as it respecteth not *our will*, (medleth not with it at all) so it is far from *hindring* or taking away the *liberty* of it, but on the contrary, it being one act of *God's eternal will*, and so a *predetermination* thereof, that man shall be a *free* agent, and another act of the same *divine will*, that this or that act of *our will* shall be *permitted* and not *hindred* by *God*, either or both these *predeterminations* of *God's will*, necessarily infers the *liberty* of ours, which cannot but be *free*, when *God* hath *predetermined* it shall be *free*.

Sect. 7. *Thirdly*, I say not the *doctrine* of *God's presciencee*, his *eternal foresight* of all that is ever done in the *world*. For that again supposeth or looketh on the thing as *done*, which is thus the *object* of his *sight*, and hath no kind of *influence* or *causality* in the *production* of it. *Of God's Prescience.*

Sect. 8. Some difficulty there is in conceiving a thing to be *foreseen* or *foreknown* by *God*, and yet to continue *free* to be *done* or *not* to be done. And the best way of explicating that *difficulty* will be, to suppose *God's science* to be *infinitely* extended in *respect* of *time*, as his *presence* in respect of *place*, and though speaking of *infinity*, we must acknowledge our understandings to be very *imperfect*, all the measures we have to conceive any thing, being *finite*, and so unequal and very unable to comprehend that which is *infinite*; Yet if we will but conceive *God's sight* or *science* before the *creation* of the *World* to be *co-extended* to all and every part of the *World*, *seeing* every thing as it is, that which is *past* as *past*, *future* as *future*, that which is by him *predetermined*, as *necessary*, and that which is left *free* as *free*, that which is *done*, and *might* have been otherwise, as *done freely* and *contingently*, and that which is not yet done, and *may* or *may not* be done, as that which is yet *free* and *contingent*, there will remain no difficulty in affirming that his *prescience* or *foresight* of any action of mine (or which is all one, his *science* or *sight*) from all *eternity*, lays no *necessity* on any thing to *be*, which is thus *seen* to come to pass, any more than my *seeing* the *sun* move, hath to do in the *moving* of it, it being *certain*, and *necessary*, and *antecedent* in order of *nature*, that that have a *being*, that hath a capacity of being *seen*, and only *accidental* and *extrinsecal* to it, to be *seen*, when it is, and so the *seeing* but an *accessary*, not a *cause* of its *being*; and it is most evident that *God's foreseeing* doth not include or connotate *predetermining*, any more than I *decree* with my *intellect*, or *will* with my *apprehension*, which is as if I should *see* with my *ear* or *taste* with my *eye*, i. e. confound the most distant *faculties*.

Sect. 9. To this may be added, that *God* being acknowledged to *see* or *foresee* every thing as it is, it is as impossible that any thing should be in any other *manner* than he *foresees* it to be, as that it should not come to *pass*, when he *sees* it doth, or *foresees* it will come to pass; and consequently that *God's foreseeing* those things come to pass *contingently*, which do come to pass *contingently*, is a most certain proof that there are some *contingents* in the World; So likewise when *God foresees* and *foretels* that *Judas* will *freely* and *voluntarily*, and against all *engagements* and *obligations* to the *contrary*, *betray* and *sell Christ*, that the *Jews* would not be *gathered* by *Christ* when he was most *sollicitous* and *sedulous* in *gathering* them, 'tis as certainly concludible from the argument of *God's prescience*, that they will *voluntarily* and *freely* do this, and *obstinately* resist their own good, as that they will do it at all, the manner being *foreseen* by *God*, who cannot be deceived, as truly as the thing is *foreseen* by him.

Sect. 10. And if there should yet be any doubt (as *Socinus* and his followers, men very well exercised, and skill'd in the *κινῆν ἀκίνητα*, *removing* of those *things*, which have *continued immoveable in the Church*, have more than doubted) whether *God foresee* any more than he *determines*, and consequently whether it may not safely be affirmed, that he doth *not foresee all* things, because he cannot be conceived to *predetermine* all things: It will presently appear, that as this is most *irrational*, so is it most *false*; *irrational* to grant an *infiniteness* of *God's* other *attributes* and *powers*, his *omnipresence*, *omnipotence*, &c. and to question the *infinity* of his *science*; and apparently *false*, if only *God's predictions* to the *Prophets* be considered. For there we see many things to be *foretold*, and consequently learn them to have been *foreseen*, which they that make this doubt, do truly resolve cannot be *predetermined* by *God*, and, rather than they will *believe* them *predetermined* by him, deny them to be *foreseen*, viz. the *infidelity* and * *sins* of men, which *God* cannot *will* or *decree* in their opinion, and which they must consequently acknowledge to have been both *contingent* and *future*, when they were *foretold* by him, and not to have lost their *nature* by being *foretold* by him.

* Εἰ θεοὶ τὰ ἀρρωνα διέχειν, οὐκ εἰσὶ θεοί. *Eurip. in Bellerph.*

Sect. 11. Having thus separated this *doctrine* of *God's predetermining* all events, from these three other things, which the *haste* of *Disputers* have sometimes confounded with it, It will now be presently discernible how *noxious* and *obstructive* this *doctrine* is to the *superstructing* all *good life*. For 1. that which is *predetermined* by *God* is *absolutely necessary* and *unavoidable*, no man hath or can *resist* any *decree* of his; *The bounds which are placed to the Sea by a perpetual decree*, *Jer.* 5. 22. are such as it *cannot pass*, and *though the waves toss themselves, yet can they not prevail, though they roar, yet can they not pass over*, and such is the *nature* of all *decrees* of *God*; And if the *actions* of men were under any such, *The doctrine of Predetermination noxious to Practice.*

(as

(as firſt, by the *expoſtulation* there, and ſecondly, by the mention of their *rebellious* heart, verſe 23. and thirdly, by the *oppoſition* which is ſet betwixt the *ſea*, that *cannot paſs* the *bounds*, and the *ſinner* that can, it is moſt evident they are not) this would *neceſſarily* preclude all *choice*, and then, as *Tertullian* ſaith, lib. 2. *contr. Marcion. Nec boni nec mali merces jure penſaretur ei, qui aut bonus aut malus neceſſitate fuiſſet inventus, non voluntate*; *There would be no reward of good or evil, if men were good or evil by neceſſity, and not by choice*; and as *Juſtin Martyr*, *Apol.* 2. Ἐι μὲ προαιρέσει ἐλευθέρᾳ πρὸς τὸ φεύγειν τὰ αἰσχρὰ, καὶ αἱρεῖσθαι τὰ καλὰ δύναμιν ἔχει τὸ ἀνθρώπινον γένος, ἀναίτιόν ἐστι τῶν ὁπωσδήποτε πραττομένων. *If mankind had no power to avoid ill or chooſe good by free deliberation, it ſhould never be guilty of any thing that was done.* And as *Tatianus* to the ſame purpoſe, Ἐλευθερίᾳ δὲ προαιρέσεως----*God therefore gave liberty of choice to men, that the wicked might be juſtly puniſhed, being wicked by his own fault, and the righteous commended, who by the ſame liberty hath taken care not to tranſgreſs the will of God.* So certainly this *doctrine* muſt take away all *guilt* of an *accuſing*, and all *ſolace* of a *quiet conſcience*, and in like manner ſuperſede and ſlacken all *induſtry* and *endeavour*, which is the *loweſt* degree of that which hath *promiſe* to be accepted by *Chriſt*, and by faſtening all our *actions* as well as *ends* by a *fatal decree* at the foot of *God's chair*, leave nothing to us to *deliberate* or *attempt*, but only to *obey* our *fate*, to follow the *duſt* of the *ſtars*, or neceſſity of thoſe iron chains which we are *born* under.

Sect. 12. Secondly, There being little *queſtion* made by any, but that *God* both *can* and *doth whatſoever he will both in heaven and earth*, when any thing is acknowledged to be *willed* by *God* (as 'tis certain every thing is which is *predetermined* and *preordained* by him) it neceſſarily follows, that whenſoever that is *done* it is *done* by *God*, and conſequently if that be a *ſin*, *God doth*, i. e. *committeth* the *ſin*, and this without any ſo much as *concurrence* of any *will* of mine, but what is alſo *predetermined* by him; Which is evidently the defining *God* to be both the *principal* and *acceſſary* in the *committing* every *ſin*; which when it is once believed, then 1. What poſſible way is there for any man to be *guilty* of *ſin*, which we know is no farther *ſin*, then it was *voluntary* in him that did it, and he free to have *abſtain'd*, when he did commit it, or at leaſt to have *prevented* that *degree* of *force* or *neceſſity*, that is fallen upon him? And on the other ſide what poſſibility of *abſtaining* from *ſin*, when by *God's predetermination* of it, 'tis acknowledged *inevitable*? And when theſe two are taken away, the poſſibility of *guilt*, and the poſſibility of *innocence*, what *reſtraint* can the *belief* of all the *Articles* of the *Creed* lay upon any man to *flie from evil*, or *purſue that which is good*?

Revealed and ſecret will.

Sect. 13. Thirdly, The only way of defining of *ſin*, is, by the *contrariety* to the *will* of *God* (as of *good* by the *accordance* with that *will*) and if all things be *preordained* by *God*, and ſo demonſtrated to be *will'd* by him, it remains that there is no ſuch thing as *ſin*, nor any thing to be *abſtain'd* from, or *avoided* by us, nor difference betwixt *good* and *evil*, according to that meaſure of *God's will*, which by this *doctrine* is equally competible to both of them. And if the *diſtinction* of his *ſecret* and *revealed will* be here made uſe of, and only the latter of theſe conceived to be it, in *contrariety* to which *ſin* conſiſts, that ſo there may be a way of *ſinning* againſt that whilſt the *ſecret will* is *obeyed* and *performed*; Then, beſides the great *abſurdity* of affirming any thing of *God's ſecret will*, till by ſome means or other it be *revealed*, and then it ceaſeth to be (what it is pretended to be) *ſecret*, for if it be *known* it is not *ſecret*; and ſecondly, the *ridiculouſneſs* of making that *God's will*, which is ſuppoſed *contrary* to his *will*, for certainly that which is *contrary* to his *will*, is *not* his *will*, and therefore the *ſecret* being ſuppoſed *contrary* to the *revealed*, if the *revealed will* be his *will*, the *ſecret* is *not* his *will*, and if the *ſecret* be his *will*, then that which is *revealed* to be his *will*, is not his *will*; and thirdly, the *impiety* of oppoſing *God's words* to his *thoughts*, his *revealed commands* to his *ſecret decrees*, (which is as ill as could be ſaid of any man, and will never incline any to *obey God*, which hath ſuch an *unhandſom opinion* of him) beſides theſe inconveniences, I ſay, 'tis evident that *intrinſick goodneſs* conſiſts in *accordance*, and *ſin* in *contrariety* to the *ſecret will of God*, as well as to his *revealed*, or elſe *God* could not be defined infinitely *good*, or ſo far as his *thoughts* and *ſecrets*, but only *ſuperficially good*, as far as the *outſide* or *appearing* part of him, *i. e.* as far as he is *pleaſed* to *reveal* himſelf, which again is *perfect blaſphemy* to imagine, and that which equals *God* to the moſt *formal* and *hypocritical* profeſſor.

Sect. 14. Fourthly, This *doctrine* is deſtructive to all that is eſtabliſhed among men, to all that is moſt precious, 1. to *humane nature*, to the two *faculties* that denominate us *men*, *underſtanding* and *will*: For what uſe can we have of our *underſtandings*, if we cannot *do* what we *know* to be our duty? and if we act not *voluntarily*, what exerciſe have we of our *wills*?

Sect. 15. Secondly, To the *end* of our *Creation*, whether *ſubordinate* or *ultimate*; The *ſubordinate* end of our *creation* is, that we ſhould *live vertuouſly* and *glorifie God* in a *voluntary* and *generous obedience*, either of which other creatures, that act *naturally*, are not capable of, And *God's predetermining* all our *actions* deprives us of this *honour* and *dignity* of our *nature*, leaves no place of *vertue*, which is founded in *voluntary action*, and as *Origen* ſaith, *cont. Celſ.* l. 4. Ἀρετῆς ἂν ἀνέλῃς τὸ ἑκούσιον, ἀνῄρηκας αὐτῆς καὶ τὸ εἶναι. *If you take from vertue the voluntarineſs, you take away the eſſence of it.* And ſo this *doctrin* brings us down to the *level* of *horſe* and *mule*, whoſe *mouths* are forcibly *holden with bit and bridle*, when yet it is one of the *commands* of that *God*, that we ſhould not be *like* thoſe creatures: And ſo for the *ultimate* end, a *reward* and *crown* in another world, which no *irrational* creature is capable of, this of *predetermination* of all our *actions*, which renders us *neceſſary* not *rational agents*, renders us utterly uncapable of that.

Sect. 16. Thirdly, It is directly contrary to all *God's ways*, or *manner* of dealing with us, which is all by *rational* ways of *perſwaſion*, by propoſition of *terrors* and *promiſes*, the *danger* that we ſhall incur by our *diſobedience*, and the *infinite advantages* that we ſhall reap by our *obedience*; and to theſe is added the *authority* of the *Commander*, vindicated from our *neglect* by the interpoſition of the greateſt *ſigns* and *wonders*, in the hands of his *Prophets* and of his *Son*, ſuch as we cannot but *wonder* when we read them (as in the caſe of the *Iſraelites* coming out of *Ægypt* and in the *wilderneſs*) that they ſhould not *prevail* upon them, when yet they did *not prevail*; And what can be more contrary to *rational motives*, than *predetermination*? For as, if they had not that *perſwaſive efficacy* in them as to be able to *move* a *rational* man, they could not be denominated *rational*,

ſo

ſo if they were backed with a *violence*, if they were propoſed to us in the *name* and *power* of an *omnipotent immutable decree*, they could never be ſaid *motives* or *perſwaſives*; And ſo ſtill *God's gracious* dealings with men being the *aids* and *auxiliaries* neceſſary to us in the purſuit of *piety*, and the one *doctrine* and *perſwaſion* of *God's predetermination* of all events, having *ſuperſeded* and *caſſated* all thoſe ways, we have no bottom left, on which to found the leaſt *beginning* or *thought* of *piety* as long as we continue poſſeſſed with that *perſwaſion*.

Sect. 17. Fourthly, This *doctrine*, if it were *true*, muſt neceſſarily take away all *judgment to come*, all *reward* and *puniſhment*, which are certainly apportioned to the *voluntary* actions, and *choices* of men (and therefore belong not to any but *rational* creatures) and can no more be awarded to thoſe *actions* which are *predetermined* by *God*, than to the *aſcending* of the *flame*, or *deſcending* of the *ſtone*, which by *nature*, and the *providence* of *God* are thus *predetermined*, and act by *decree*, and not by *choice*. And when all *judgment to come* is once *vaniſhed*, all *reward* to engage *obedience*, and all *terror* to reſtrain *diſobedience* is once removed, and ſo in effect the *three laſt Articles* of the *Creed* rejected alſo, what hope is there that the remaining *Articles* ſhould be ſufficient to do it?

Sect. 18. To theſe *Chriſtian* and *Theological* conſiderations it will not be amiſs to add what care the Writers of *Politicks* have had to warn us of the *noxiouſneſs* of this *doctrine* to all *civil governments*, which *Chriſtian religion*, rightly underſtood, is ſo very far from *diſturbing*, that beyond all other *Aphoriſms Political*, beyond the ſageſt proviſions of the *Profoundeſt* Lawgivers, it is (would men but *live* according to the rules of it) incomparably *qualified* to *perpetuate* publick *weal* and *peace*.

Sect. 19. But for the *doctrine* of thoſe, who ſo *miſtake Chriſtian religion*, as to think it is only a *chain* of *fatal decrees*, to *deny* all *liberty* of man's *choice* toward *good* or *evil*, and to affix all *events* to *God's predetermination*: This, ſay they, is utterly irreconcileable with the *nature* of *civil government*, with the *foundation* thereof laid in *Laws*, or with the *puniſhments* and *rewards*, which are thought neceſſary to the *continuance* thereof, and *Campanella* chooſeth to inſtance *in Republicâ præſertim liberâ*, in a *Republick* or *free ſtate*.

Sect. 20. For when the *People*, which think their *liberty*, of which they are very *tender* and *jealous*, to be retrench'd or impaired by the reſtraint of *Laws*, can farther anſwer their *Rules*, though but in the *heart* (without proceeding to farther *boldneß*) that they *cannot* obſerve their *Laws*, being led by *irreſiſtible decrees* to the *tranſgreſſing* of them, the conſequence is eaſie to foreſee, the *deſpiſing* and *contemning* of *Laws*, and hating and deteſting of thoſe who are obliged to *puniſh* them, when they have *offended*, which two are ſoon inflamed, beyond the rate of *popular* diſcontents, into *actual ſeditions* and *tumults*, as ſoon as *opportunity* ſhall favour, or *opinion* of their own *ſtrength* encourage them to it.

Sect. 21. That the *Turkiſh Empire* hath not yet found the *noxious* effects of this *poyſon*, ſo commonly received among them, will, I ſuppoſe, be objected againſt the truth of this; But 'tis viſible to what *Antidotes* this muſt be imputed, 1. to their *ignorance* and unimproveableneſs in matters of *knowledge*, and *rational* diſcourſe, being generally kept *rude*, and without all *literature* (which is the *grindſtone* to *ſharpen* the *coulters*, to *whet* their *natural* faculties, and to enable them to *diſcourſe* and deduce *natural* conſequences.) Secondly, To the manner obſerved in *Governing* them, by *force*, and not by *obligation* on *conſcience*, by *violence*, and not by *laws*; Which way of managery being ſomewhat *proportionable* to the opinion of *fatal decrees*, and agreeing with it in this, that it doth really leave nothing to men's *choices*, is withal as a *contrary poyſon*, a *hot* thrown after a *cold*, very proper to abate the *energie* of it, *forcing* them as *fatally* to *abſtain*, as they can deem themſelves *forced*, or impelled to *commit* any ſuch enormity.

Sect. 22. However, 'tis manifeſt that the *force* they are under is a *real* force, and that of their *fate* but an *imaginary* conceived one, the one but in their *brains*, the other on their *ſhoulders*, and it is not ſtrange if the *iron chains* are experimented to have more *ſolidity*, and ſo more *efficacy* in them, than the *contemplative*.

Sect. 23. *Sed ſi Italos*, ſay the *Politick* writers. But if this *doctrine* ſhould ever get among the *Italians*, whoſe *wits* are more *acute* (and ſure the *Italians* have not incloſed that *excellency* from all the reſt of *Europe*) it would preſently put all into *confuſion*, they would ſoon diſcern the *conſequences*, and utmoſt *improvements* of the *opinion*, and never ſtick to caſt all on *God*, as the *author* of all; and having reſolved, with him in *Homer*, of the

Ἀλλα ἡ Ζεὺς ἡ Μοῖρα---------

that all is chargeable on the *ſuperiour* cauſe, *Jupiter* and *Fate*, infer regularly with him, (ἐγὼ δ' ὐκ αἴτιός εἰμι) the *blameleſneſs* of the *inferiour* agent, and ſo there being no *place* left for *ſin* or *law*, immediately *believe* and follow their own *wiſhes*, turn *Libertines*, throw off all *yoke* of *men* as well as *God*. In intuition whereof I ſuppoſe it was that *Plato* would not permit in his *Commonwealth* any that ſhould affirm *God* to be the *author* of all the *evils* that were committed. And *Proclus* upon the *Timæus* ſets them *down* as a third degree of *Atheiſts*, who attribute to *God* the *impreſſing* on men's minds a *neceſſity* of doing whatſoever they do.

Sect. 24. 'Tis true where there is any *remainder* of *natural piety*, he that believes the *doctrine* of *abſolute decrees*, may be thereby reſtrained from *actually* making the *concluſions*, inferring ſuch *impious horrid conſequences* (be they never ſo *obvious* and *regular*) of making *God* the *author* of *ſin*, and the like; But we know thoſe *natural* dictates are by *unnatural* ſins *effaced* in many, and when that one *reſtraint* is removed, the *concluſion* will be as eaſily *believed* as the *premiſes*, and where neither *boldneß* nor *skill* are wanting to *deduce* it, that *Concluſion* will again turn *Principle*, and reduce all *vitious enormous* living, which *Laws* were deſigned to *reſtrain*, but will no longer do it, when themſelves are look'd on as *impertinent invaders* of *liberty*, *deſpiſed* firſt, and then *hated*.

Sect. 25. One *farther* conſideration hath been added to this former, that this *doctrine* being imbibed by *Governours*, is very apt to inſtill into them *principles* of *tyranny*, if it be but by *imitating* and *tranſcribing* from *God* the notions which they have received of him, by doing that themſelves which they believe of him, *puniſhing* their *ſubjects* by no other *rule* but of their *wills*, *decreeing* their

deſtruction firſt without intuition of any *voluntary* crime of theirs, and then counting it a part of their *glory* to execute ſuch *decrees*. Thus when *Suetonius* deſcribes *Tiberius* as a profeſſed *contemner* of all *Religion*, and from thence ſoon improved into the moſt *intolerable tyrant*, he renders the *original* of it, that he believed all things to be wrought by a *fatality*. But theſe are popular conſiderations, yet not unfit alſo to be taken in as *appendant* to the former.

Sin is not nothing.

Sect. 26. Many *artifices* there are invented by the *neceſſities* of thoſe who have *imbraced* this *doctrine*, to *intercept* and avoid theſe *conſequences* of it; The *two* principal I ſhall name, 1. That *ſin* is a *non-entity*, a *nothing*, and ſo that all *things* may be *predetermined* by *God* and yet not *ſin*: 2. That though *God* be *author* of the *act* of *ſin*, yet he is not of the *obliquity* of it, as the *Rider* is *cauſe* of the *horſes going*, but not of his *lameneſs*, or *halting*, when he goes.

Sect. 27. For the former of theſe, which is a perfect *phantaſie* and *ſchool notion*, theſe things may be obſerved of it, that beſides that it would be, 1. very *ſtrange* that *God* ſhould *damn* a *multitude* of *Angels* and *men* for *nothing*; and 2. very *ridiculous*, that my *ſwearing* to a *truth* ſhould be an *entity*, and my *ſwearing* to a *falſity*, nothing; *eating* my *own bread*, *enjoying* my *own wife*, an *entity*, and *eating* another man's *bread*, *enjoying* another man's *wife*, *nothing*; and thirdly, that which would ſoon fall back into the grand inconvenience of *obſtructing Chriſtian life* (for why ſhould a *Chriſtian* be ſuch a fool, as to be *afraid* of *nothing*, to *flie* and avoid *nothing*?) beſides theſe, I ſay, it is apparent that they that thus teach, profeſs that *ſins* are *predetermined*, by name *Adam's ſin*, and *Judas's ſin*, and, if it be driven home, *every ſin* of *every* other man, as well as any other the moſt *vertuous* action. And yet farther, unleſs it could be gain'd that every *vertuous* action were *nothing* alſo, there would be little advantage in this matter, it being as *contrary* to *judgment to come*, to *rewarding* according to *works*, that one *predetermined neceſſary* action, which I could not but do, ſhould be *rewarded*, as that another ſhould be *puniſhed*, and as certain a *prejudice* to all *diligence*, or purſuit of *Chriſtian life*, that I cannot chooſe but do the *good* which I do, as that I cannot but *commit* the *ill* that I *commit*: For although it be very agreeable to the *goodneſs* of *God* to abound in giving *grace* and *enabling* to do *good*, to *prepare*, *prevent*, and *aſſiſt*, and *contribute* all that can be *wanting* to us, either to *will*, or do, (as it is not competible with it ſo much as to *incline* any man to do *evil*) and ſo there is a difference in that reſpect betwixt the *good* and the *evil*, yet to do all this *irreſiſtibly*, for a *fatal decree* of *heaven* to contrive every *good* action of my life, ſo as it is *impoſſible* for me not to *will* and *act*, as *God* would have me, this is quite contrary to the *nature* of a *voluntary* agent, a *rational* creature, and conſequently to that *will* and *decree* of *God*, whereby he *predetermined* man to be ſuch, and as *unreconcileable* with *reward* or *crown*, as *puniſhment* is with that which is as much, but no more *neceſſary*.

The diſtinction betwixt the act and the obliquity.

Sect. 28. As for the *diſtinction* betwixt the *act* and the *obliquity*, there is ſome *truth* in it, and *uſe* to be made of it, ſo far as to *free God*, who is *author* of all *man's power* to *act*, from being in any degree the *author* of his acting *obliquely* or *crookedly*, i. e. *ſinfully*.

Sect. 29. For as it is impoſſible for us to *move* either to *good* or *evil*, except he that gave us our firſt *being* and *powers*, continue them *minutely* unto us, ſo he having uſed all *wiſe* and *efficacious* methods to *incline* and *engage* us to make uſe of his *gifts* unto his *ſervice*, and having contributed nothing to our evil *choices*, but his *decree* of *permitting* or not *hindring* them (and if he ſhould *violently hinder*, that would make us no whit leſs *guilty*, he that *would* ſin, if he *could*, is as *guilty* as if he *did*; And without that *permiſſion* of *evil*, our *good choices* would neither be *good*, nor *choices*, and conſequently never be *rewarded* by him) it is moſt apparent that he is no *author* of the *obliquities* of our *wills*, but on the contrary that he doth as much to the *ſtreightning* of them, as without *changing* our *natures* (offering *violence* to our *wills*, which he hath *decreed* to remain *free*) he could *prudently* be imagined to do.

Sect. 30. But this is no way appliable to this matter of *freeing* God from being the *author* of that *ſin*, of which he is acknowledged to *predetermine* the *act*; For 1. though a *free power* of *acting good* or *evil*, be perfectly *diſtinct* and *ſeparable* from *doing evil*, and therefore *God*, that is the *author* of *one*, cannot thence be inferred to be the *author* of the other, yet the *act* of *ſin* is not *ſeparable* from the *obliquity* of that *act*, the *act* of *blaſphemy* from the *obliquity* or *irregularity* of *blaſphemy*, the leaſt evil *thought* or *word* againſt an infinite *good God* being as *crooked* as the *rule* is *ſtreight*, and conſequently he that *predetermines* the *act*, muſt needs *predetermine* the *obliquity*.

Sect. 31. Nay ſecondly, if there were any *advantage* to be made of this *diſtinction* in this matter, it would more truly be affirm'd on the contrary ſide, that *God* is the *author* of the *obliquity*, and *man* of the *act*: For *God* that gives the *rule*, in *tranſgreſſing* of which all *obliquity* conſiſts, doth contribute a great deal though not to the *production* of that *act*, which is *freely* committed againſt that *rule*, yet to the *denominating* it *oblique*, for if there were no *Law*, there would be no *obliquity*; *God* that gives the *Law* that a *Jew* ſhall be *circumciſed*, thereby conſtitutes *uncircumciſion* an *obliquity*, which, had he not given that *Law*, had never been ſuch; But for the *act* (as that differs from the *powers* on one ſide, and the *obliquity* on the other) it is evident that the *man* is the *cauſe* of that, 'tis *man* that *circumciſeth*, or chooſeth to be *circumciſed*, and ſo, that *refuſeth* to receive that *ſign* in the *fleſh*, and the *act* of *killing Abel* was as perfectly *Cain's* act, as the *offering* of his *ſacrifice* was, and ſo in all other *acts*, eſpecially of *ſin*, to which *God* doth not ſo much as *incline*, and the *Devil* can do no more than *perſwade* any man.

Sect. 32. To conclude, the *obliquity* of any *act*, ariſing, by way of *reſultance*, from the *tranſgreſſing* of the *rule* (i. e. doing *contrary* to *God's command*) as *inequality* ariſeth from the *adding* or *ſubſtracting* an *unity* from an *even* number, it neceſſarily follows, that he that firſt *gives* the *law*, and *then predetermines* the *act* of *tranſgreſſing* (the *diſobedience*, the doing *contrary* to) that *Law*, that firſt *forbids* eating of the *tree* of *knowledge*, and then *predetermines Adam's will* to *chooſe*, and *eat* what was *forbidden*, is by his *decree* guilty of the *commiſſion* of the *act*, and by his *Law* the *cauſe* of its being an *obliquity*; And indeed, if the *obliquity*, which renders the *act* a *ſinful act*, be it ſelf *any thing*, it muſt neceſſarily follow, that either *God* doth not *predetermine* all things, or that he *predetermines* the *obliquity*; And *regularity* bearing the ſame *proportion* of *relation* to any *act* of *duty*, as

obliquity

obliquity doth to *ſin*, it cannot be imagined that the *author* of the *ſinful act*, ſhould not be the *author* of the *obliquity*, as well as the *author* of the *pious act* is by the Diſputers acknowledged to be the *author* of the *regularity* of it.

Sect. 33. The *complaint* of the *Gods* in *Homer* will beſt ſhut up this;

Ὦ πόποι, οἷον δὴ νῶϊ θεοὶ βροτοὶ αἰτιόωνται, Odyſſ. a. Vid. Euſtath. in loc. p. 15.
Ἐξ ἡμέων γὰρ φασὶ κάκ' ἔμμεναι, οἱ δὲ καὶ αὐτοὶ
Σφῇσιν ἀτασθαλίῃσιν ὑπὲρ μόρον ἄλγε' ἔχουσιν.

O, how unjuſtly mortal men accuſe and charge the Gods, ſaying that their evils are from them, when the truth is, that they by their own wretchleſs courſes bring miſchiefs upon themſelves, above which their fate, or decree of the Gods can be deem'd to have brought upon them. And accordingly it is one of the *excellent leſſons* of the *Pythagoreans* in their *golden verſes*,

Γνώσῃ δ' ἀνθρώπους αὐθαίρετα πήματ' ἔχοντας,

This thou muſt know, that the evils that men fall under, are brought upon them by their own choices. On which even *Chryſippus*, the *Stoick*, and great *aſſerter* of *fate*, hath thus commented, ὡς τῶν κλαδῶν ἐκδοτοις παρ' αὐτοῖς γινομένων, καὶ καθ' ὁρμὴν αὐτῶν, ἁμαρτανόντων τι καὶ βλαπτομένων, καὶ κατὰ ἀυτῶν διάνοιαν καὶ πρόθεσιν, *Evils, or miſchiefs come to every man from himſelf, it being certain that by their own incitation they both ſin, and ſuffer, and that according to their own mind and purpoſe.* This being ſo far *diſtant* from the *doctrine* of *fatality*, it may well be wondred, how *Chryſippus* that aſſerted that, under the name of εἱμαρμένη and πεπρωμένη, *the chain*, and *the decree*, (and defined it, ſaith * *Gellius*, *ſempiterna quædam, & indeclinabilis ſeries rerum & catena, volvens ſemetipſa ſeſe, & implicans per æternos conſequentiæ ordines, ex quibus apta connexáque eſt, an eternal and unavoidable ſeries and chain of things folding and involving it ſelf within it ſelf by eternal courſes of conſequence, by which it is framed and connected*, Or in his own *dialect*, that it is φυσικὴ σύνταξις τῶν ὅλων ἐξ ἀϊδίου τῶν ἑτέρων τοῖς ἑτέροις ἐπακολουθόντων, *a natural complication of all things from all eternal, one thing following another*, καὶ ἀπαράλυτος ἥσης τοιαύτης συμπλοκῆς, *that complication being ſuch as cannot be changed*) could believe himſelf, or reconcile this *Comment*, or that Verſe, with his *great principles*; And indeed || *Cicero* hath paſt a right *ſentence* of it, *Chryſippus æſtuans laboránſque quonam pacto explicet & fato fieri omnia, & eſſe aliquid in nobis, intricatur------Chryſippus contending and labouring how to reconcile theſe two propoſitions, that all things are done by fate, and yet that ſomething is in our own power, is intangled, and cannot extricate himſelf.* This *Maſter* of the *Stoicks* was preſt, ſaith *Gellius*, with theſe inconvenient *conſequences* of his *doctrine* of *decrees*, that then the *ſins of men were not to be charged on their wills, but to be imputed to a neceſſity and preſſing, which aroſe from fate*, that it *muſt be unjuſt to make laws for the puniſhing of offenders*; To which he had nothing to ſay but this, that though, if you look upon the *firſt cauſe*, all is thus *fatally decreed*, and *chain'd*, yet the *diſpoſitions* of *each man's mind are only ſo far ſubject to fate, as is agreeable to their own properties and qualities*, as, ſaith he, *when a man tumbles a cylinder* or *roller* down an *hill*, 'tis certain that the *man* is the *violent enforcer* of the *firſt motion* of it, but when it is once a *tumbling*, the *quality* and *propriety* of the *thing* it ſelf *continues*, and *conſummates* it. In this witty reſemblance of that *Stoick* theſe *three* things muſt be conſider'd, *Firſt*, that the *Cylinder* (the *inſtance* that he thought fit to pitch on) is an *inanimate*, *liveleſs* trunk, which hath nothing of *choice*, or *will* in it; *Secondly*, that neither the *weight* of the *matter*, of which 'tis made, nor the *round*, *voluble form* of it (which two meeting with a *precipice*, or *ſteep declivity* do *neceſſarily* continue the *motion* of it) are any more *imputable* to that *dead*, *choiceleſs* creature, than the *firſt motion* of it was ſuppoſed to be; and therefore *thirdly*, that this cannot be a fit *reſemblance* to ſhew the *reconcileableneſs* of *fate* with *choice*, or the *reaſonableneſs* of *charging* on mens *wills*, what was *inevitably* produced by their *fate*, or of *puniſhing* them for thoſe *acts*, which they are *neceſſarily* driven to commit: To which purpoſe it may be remembred that neither is the *Cylinder* charged with *ſin*, whether by *God*, or *men*, nor any *punitive* law enacted by either againſt its *rolling* down the *hill*, nor indeed are ſuch *charges*, or ſuch *laws* ever *brought* in or *enacted* againſt any *actions* of any *other* creature, *plant*, or *beaſt*, till you aſcend to *man*, who is ſuppoſed to have a *will*, and not to be under ſuch *inevitable*, *fatal* laws, but to be, as that *excellent* man *Pomponius Atticus* was wont to ſay, the *forger* of his own *fate*, the *framer* of his *fortune*, which yet ſhould be as *improper* to be *applyed* to, or *affirm'd* of a *man*, as of any other *creature*, if all his *actions* were as *irreverſibly predetermined*, as the *deſcent* of *heavy* bodies, or the *aſcending* of *light*, i. e. if *Chryſippus*'s *Cylinder* and the *motion* thereof were a *commodious inſtance*, or *reſemblance* of this matter. But the truth is, the man was *acute*, and *dextrous*, could ſay as much for the *reconciling* of *contradictions*, as another, and though this laſt *age* hath conſidered this *queſtion* very *diligently*, and had the *advantages* of the *writings* of the *former* ages to aſſiſt them, yet he that ſhall impartially make the *compariſon*, will find, that the *ancient Philoſophers* have written more *ſubtilely* in this matter, and are more worth our *reading*, than any of our *modern Schools*, (he that ſhall ſurvey *Hierocles* on the χρυσᾶ ἔπη, *Ammonius* on *Ariſtotles* περὶ ἑρμηνείας, in ſhewing the nature of *contingent* and *neceſſary* propoſitions, and the *Chriſtian Philoſoper Boethius*, lib. 2. *de conſolatione philoſophiæ*, and *Aphrodiſæus* περὶ εἱμαρμ. where he confutes, as *abſurd*, this compariſon of the *Cylinder*, will, I believe, be convinced of the *truth* of what I ſay) and when the *Maſter* of them *Chryſippus* was ſo unable to ſpeak *intelligible* ſence, or *extricate* himſelf in this buſineſs, 'twill be leſs matter of *wonder* to us, that they which have eſpouſed this πρόληψις, ſhould endeavour as *improſperouſly* to reconcile this with other *notions* of *piety*, and to *extricate* themſelves out of a *Labyrinth* not of *fewer*, but *more difficulties* (*God* having moſt clearly revealed to *Chriſtians*, that as he *rewardeth every man according to his works*, ſo he *requireth* of him *according to what he hath* in his *power* to do, *and not* according *to what he hath not*) as *Chryſippus* is by *Cicero* judged to have done.

* *Noct. Att.* l. 6. c. 2.

|| *de Fato*; l. 6. c. 2.

Sect. 34. All which being duly conſidered, and the abſurdities of that *diſtinction* (thus applyed) betwixt the *act* and the *obliquity*, as manifeſt, as thoſe of *Chryſippus*'s expedient, in thoſe ſo many forementioned reſpects, and the *contrary* ſo wide from the truth of *Scripture*, the *attributes* of *God*, and *common notions* of *piety* written in men's *hearts*, and experimented in the *government* of the *World*, and laſtly, ſo *noxious* and *poyſonous* to *good life*, we may certainly conclude with

Prosper, that great *assertor* of *God's Grace*, *Resp. ad* 14. *Object. Vincent. Ad prævaricationem legis, ad neglectum religionis, ad corruptelam disciplinæ, ad desertionem fidei, ad perpetrationem qualiscunque peccati, nulla omnino est Prædestinatio Dei. To the forsaking the Law, to the neglecting Religion, to the corrupting Discipline, to deserting the Faith, to the perpetration of whatsoever sin, there is not at all any predestination of God. Si ergo in sanctitate vivitur------If we live in sanctity, grow in vertue and persevere in good purposes, the gift of God is manifest in all this: Si autem ab his receditur,-------But if we go back from these, if we pass over to vices and sins, here God sends no evil temptation, forsakes not the desertor, before he be forsaken, and very frequently keeps him that would depart from departing, and causeth him to return, though he be departed.* To which may be added that of the *Arausican Council*, which was very careful to assert the *necessity* of *Grace*, and yet * pronounces an *anathema* against those who affirm any to be by *God predetermined* to *sin*.

* *Aliquos ad malum divinâ potestate præordinatos esse non solum non credimus, sed etiam si sint qui tantum malum credere velint, cum omni detestatione in illos anathema dicimus*, Syn. *Arausi.* Can. 25.

CHAP. XVII.

Of the Spirits acting all things within the man.

Sect. 1. WHat hath been said of the *doctrine* of *God's decrees*, *fatally* passed upon our *persons*, or our *actions*, will be farther extended to the *pretensions* of the *Spirit*, and the *opinion*, that of late begins to *diffuse* it self among some, that all that is *designed* or *done* by them, is the *dictate* & *motion* of the *Spirit* in them.

Sect. 2. Of this it is evident, that either that man, which thus *pretends*, never *commits* any *act* prohibited by the *Word* of *God*, and vulgarly called *sin*, after the *minute* of such *pretension* (and then that were a rare *charm* indeed to render him *impeccable*) or that this is the means of *consecrating* every *sin* of his, and so the *opinion* being imbibed by one that lives in *rebellion*, *murther*, *adultery*, *pride*, or *schism*, or any other (one or more) *grossest sins*, the effect must be, that he *believe* every one of these to be *infusions* of the *Spirit* of *God*, and so no more fit to be *resisted* before, nor *repented* for after the *Commission* of them, than the most *eminent acts* of *piety* should be; And when it is thus become *impious* to *resist* any *temptation* of our own *flesh*, which sollicits within us, or of *Satan* that *suggests* and *whispers* within us too, *i.e.* to omit the *acting* of any *sin*, that we are any way *inclined* to, what place can be left for *exhortation* to *Christian life*, as long as I have any *temptation* against it?

Sect. 3. This is a *doctrine* which a man would think should not find *admission* with any considerable sort of men, and therefore it will be less *pertinent* for this *Discourse* to take any larger notice of it; yet for the *preventing* and *intercepting* any farther *growth* of it, where it may unhappily have found any *reception*, It will not be amiss to add, and evidence these *few* things:

Concerning the descent of the Spirit.

Sect. 4. *First*, concerning the *Spirit*, which is thus *pretended* to, That the *Descent* of the *Spirit of God* was principally for three *ends*, 1. to give *Testimony*, that *Christ* was the *Son of God*, sent with *authority* to reveal his *will*, and to *command* our *faith* and *obedience*, and (consequently to this) to give the *world assurance* that the *Apostles* were *sent* by him, and to *sign* the *Commission* of *preaching to all Nations*, to *propagate* what he had taught. Secondly, to *assure all* men, that the *Rules* which *Christ* gave us, are absolutely *necessary* to be observed, to render us *capable* of those *Promises* made, those *benefits* purchased by him. And thirdly, that, we being so *corrupt* by *nature*, so far from *prone*, or *inclinable* in our *Flesh*, to *obey* those *Rules*; the *Graces* of his *holy Spirit*, accompanying the *Revelation*, or *preaching* of his *will* and *word*, should *incline* our *corrupt* hearts to *keep* his *laws*.

Gods method in his Church.

Sect. 5. *Secondly*, that after the *mission* of the *Spirit*, *God* was pleased, for *posterity*, otherwise to express his *care*, and *love* to *mankind*, viz. in *giving*, and *consigning* to them his *written word* for a *Rule*, and *constant* director of *life*, not leaving them to the *duct* of their own *Inclinations*.

Teachers and learners.

Sect. 6. *Thirdly*, That *God* hath made (and continued, through all ages, both of *Jews* and *Christians*) one *sort* of men to *teach*, another to *learn*; Among the *Jews* one to *preserve knowledge* in his *lips*, and with the same to *dispense* it, the other to *enquire*, and *seek the Law at his mouth*, and under the *Gospel*, *Pastors* and *Teachers*, and ἡγούμενοι *Rulers* set over men *for their good*; Which is a *visible prejudice* to the *pretended* guidance of the *Spirit*, For if *that*, by the *voice* within me, be the *standing guide* of all my *actions*, what use of *foreign teachers*, or *guides*, or *necessity* of *obeying* the *Apostle* when he commands me to *obey those that are set over me?*

All that comes out of the heart is not from God.

Sect. 7. *Fourthly*, that every thing that *comes* out of the *heart* of man, is not infused into it, or placed there by *God*. For besides that from thence proceed many *aerial* fictions, and *phasmes*, and *Chimæraes*, created by the *vanity* of our own *hearts*, or *seduction* of *evil Spirits*, and not planted in them by *God* or *nature*, or the duct of *God's Spirit*, *motions* and *emissions* of our *phansie*, and not of our *reason*, of our *sensitive*, not *humane* nature (and to this all the *Idolatry* of the *antient heathens*, and the new-*phansiful divinity* of some present *Christians*, and the whole *Religion* of the *Mahomedans* is visibly imputable) besides this, I say, it is affirmed by the *Apostle*, *Jam.* 3. 15, 17. that there is a *wisdom* (and that must signifie some *Codex* of *directions* for *practice*, some *law* in the *members*, opposite to that in the *mind*) *that cometh not from above*, as well as a *wisdom* that *cometh from above*, and in plain terms, that it is *earthly*, *sensual*, and *devilish*, as that *Law in the members* is said to *lead the man into captivity to the law of sin which is in the members.*

Jam. 3. 15, 17.

Sect.

Sect. 8. So again, ſaith *Chriſt*, *out of the heart proceed all the things that defile a man, evil machinations*, διαλογισμοὶ πονηροὶ, all the moſt *miſchievous deſignments*, by name, *murthers*, *adulteries*, *fornications*, (*inceſtuous* and *unnatural* commiſſions contained under the word πορνεία *fornication*, 1 *Cor.* 5. 1.) *thefts*, *falſe-witneſſes*, *evil ſpeakings*, i. e. (as by thoſe few inſtances is intimated and muſt be ſupplyed by *parity* of reaſon) all the contradictions to the ſeveral branches (and degrees of thoſe branches) of the *divine* or *moral Law*. Mat. 15. 18, 19.

Sect. 9. *Fifthly*, That to impoſe on our ſelves or others by this fallacy, to believe or *pretend* that whatever our own *hearts* incite us to do, what they ſuggeſt, or dictate, is the *Spirit*, or *word*, or *revelation* of the *will* of *God* within us, is the *principle* of all *villany* (the ſame that hath always *acted in the children of diſobedience*) inhaunſed and *improved* with circumſtances of greater *boldneß* and *impudence*, than ever the moſt *abominable heathens* were guilty of, either in their *Oracles* or in their *Myſteries*. *The belief of it a very noxious errour.*

Sect. 10. In their *Oracles*, though their *Idol-prieſts* (who had the *incloſure* of this cheat) gave *reſponſes* out of the *Caverns* of the *earth*, and ſet up the *devil* (by the advantage of his *foreſeeing* ſome things in their *cauſes*, and *conjecturing* at others) above the *omniſcient God* of *heaven*, yet they affixed not the *anſwers* of their *devils* to the *true God*. They worſhipped *Idols*, and diſclaimed any portion in the *true God*, turned all *knowledge* or *profeſſion* of him *out of their hearts*, according to that reaſonable propoſition of St. *Paul*, 2 *Cor.* 6. 14, 15. that there is no poſſible *agreement* to be had betwixt *light* and *darkneß*. But theſe by their *refined* pretenſion, do (in effect, and by way of neceſſary *conſequence*, and direct *interpretation*) turn the *God* of heaven into that *accurſed Spirit*, affix on him (receive and deliver as the *effata* and *oracles* of *God*.) whatſoever the *devil*, or their own *luſt*, or *revenge*, or *pride*, or *ambition*, or *covetouſneß* (ſo many αὐθαίρετοι δαίμονες, *ſpontaneous devils*) can infuſe into them, and out of their *black* hearts, as out of the moſt noyſome *caverns* and *dens* of the earth (holding intercourſe with *Hell*) breath out, and deliver to the world. *Worſe than the fallacy of the heathen Oracles.*

Sect. 11. So again in their *myſteries*, and moſt *ſecret receſſes*, and *adyta* of their *Religion*, their heathen *Prieſts* were wont to betray and lead their ſilly *votaries* into all the moſt horrid *unnatural ſins*, as into a ſpecial part of the *devotions* and *worſhips* required of them by the *Gods*, whom they had undertaken to ſerve; But yet never thought fit to let them out of the *dark*, out of the retirement, but by baniſhing the eyes of men gave witneſs againſt themſelves, accuſed thoſe facts, which were not able to bear the *light* (to which the *Apoſtle* ſeems to refer, *Epheſ.* 5. 13.) and ſo had the excuſe of ſome *baſhfulneß* and *ſelf-accuſation*, and care not to *ſcandalize* other men; whilſt theſe that make their own *luſt*, their own *malice* and *revenge* the *voice* of the *true God*, the *Spirit* within them, are thereby qualified to act the *horrid'ſt* ſins avowedly and *ſhameleſly*, and have no checks left, (no *coldneß*, but where they have no *temptations*) no *diſlikes*, no *ſhame*, no *objections* to any thing, but to *tenderneß*, to *ſcrupuloſity*, to *fear* of offending, to the doing what they do in *bondage*, as they call it, *i. e.* to all the *reliques* or *embers* of *conſcience* remaining in them, and if they can but utterly and finally caſt out this *fear*, they are hereby delivered up really to the *evil ſpirit*, while they moſt pretend to the *guidance* of the *good*. The pretended *Spirit* of *God* within them, by ſuggeſting *ſins*, gives a full *confidence* and *ſecurity* to commit them, and then *Scripture* and *conſcience* and *temper*, and a tolerable degree of good nature, any thing lower than the *utmoſt* evil, is the thing only to be *mortified*, the one piece of criminous *carnality* to be *burnt up*. *Or Idolatrous Myſteries.*

Sect. 12. Thus by turning one *pin* in the *machine*, the whole *ſcene* is ſhifted, and this voice (as of an ἐγγαστρίμυθος) that comes out of our own *bellies*, being miſtaken for the *ſtill* language, in which *God* was once heard, a congregation of *Chriſtians* may be ſoon *inſpired* into a *legion* of *Demoniacks*, and only one (but that a teeming fruitful) *error* be committed all this while, the miſtaking our own *motions* for the *incitation* of the *Spirit* of *God*, which till it be reformed or retracted, it muſt be a *ſhortneß of diſcourſe* to think ſtrange, and an *injuſtice* to charge of any *new* crime, the infallible conſequences of it, and ſuch are all the barefaced *villanies* in the world.

Sect. 13. For as he that is ſo *ſure* and confident of his *particular election*, as to reſolve he can never *fall*, if he *commit* thoſe acts, or live in thoſe *habits*, againſt which the words of *Scripture* are plain, that *they that do them ſhall not inherit eternal life*, muſt neceſſarily reſolve, that what were *drunkenneß* or *adultery* in another, is not ſo in him, and nothing but the removing his *Fundamental* error can reſcue him from the *ſuperſtructive*, be it never ſo *groß*. So to this one grand *miſtake* (the judging of *God's will* by the bent of our own *ſpirits*) all *vitious* enormous *practices* (even to the taking away of all differences between *good* and *evil*) are regularly conſequent, and cannot ſeem ſtrange to *attend* daily, where the other hath taken up the *lodging*.

CHAP. XVIII.

Of the Miſtakes concerning Repentance.

Sect. 1. ONE ſort of *Doctrines* more I cannot but annex here, though I have *elſewhere* already inſiſted on them, and thoſe are the *miſtakes* in the *Doctrine* of *Repentance*.

Sect. 2. *Repentance*, whatever that word ſignifies, (and that is certainly a *ſincere change*, and *renovation* of *mind*, a *converſion* of the *ſinner* to *God* in a *new* life, *repentance from dead works*, *Heb.* 6. 1.) is queſtionleſs it to which, on purpoſe, *Chriſt* came to *call ſinners*, His whole *Embaſſy* from his *Fathers boſome* was *projected* and *deſigned* for this *grand* work, & ſo certainly all the *preachings* *Of Repentance.*

of all the *Apoſtles* were of the ſame making, that the *Goſpel* tells us the *firſt-fruits* were, *Repent*, &c. And therefore it will *concern* us nearly, not to be *miſlead* in this matter; For ſhould we content our ſelves with *ſomewhat* elſe under the *title*, or *diſguiſe* of *Repentance*, which is either *not repentance* at all, or but an *imperfect*, *unſufficient part* of *repentance*, and by *conſequence*, perſwade our ſelves, that by performing of *this*, we ſhall have fully *anſwered Chriſt's call*, done all that he came from heaven to *require* of us,'tis viſible what an *obſtacle* this is to the *rearing* that *ſuperſtructure* which was deſigned to be *erected* on this *foundation*.

Dangerouſneſs of miſtakes in it.

Miſunderſtanding, Rom. 7.

Sect. 3. Now to this head will be referred thoſe that from the *miſunderſtanding* of *Rom.* 7. (not obſerving the cuſtome of that *Apoſtle* μεταχηματίζων εἰς ἑαυτὸν, *figuratively to transfer to himſelf, in the firſt perſon*, what belongs to *others*) have made it *reconcileable* with *regeneration*, or *repentance* (for thoſe two words certainly ſignifie one and the ſame thing in *Scripture*) to be in that ſtate which is *there* deſcribed, i. e. to *do what a man allows* not, but *hates*, v. 15. *the evil which he would not*, v. 19. *to be brought into captivity to the law of ſin, the law in the members, warring againſt the law of the mind*, v. 23. and, upon the ſame account, even *to be carnal, and ſold under ſin*, ver. 14. all which muſt *equally* belong to the *perſon* which is there *repreſented*, of whom *equally* in the *firſt perſon* they are all *affirm'd*.

Sect. 4. That that *chapter* is *really* a *repreſentation* of one, which hath *only* the *knowledge*, not *practice* of his *duty*, and conſequently, to the *ſins*, which he commits, hath the *aggravation* ſuperadded of *committing* them againſt *knowledge*, againſt *conſcience*, againſt *ſight* of the *contrary law*, is manifeſt from the *context*, and hath * elſewhere more ſeaſonably been evidenced. And of this I need not many words to declare, how far it is from being ſo much as *any part* of *Repentance*, any one of the *ingredients* in it (being indeed no more than either the work of *natural conſcience*, or, farther, of the *mind* inſtructed by the *Law* of *Moſes*, but that not of *force* to work the *leaſt obedience* in the man, but *ſuppoſed* in that *text* to be joyn'd with all *cuſtomary diſobedience*, and *captivity* to *ſin*) and conſequently if this be miſtaken, for that, which it is ſo far *removed* from being, (*natural* or *legal knowledge* of duty, *deſpiſed* and *tranſgreſt*, for *ſincere obedience* to all the *commandments* of *God*) and the *former* of theſe by ſo *abſurd*, *irrational* a *conceſſion*, be deemed *ſufficient* to render his eſtate *ſafe*, whoſoever hath *arrived* to this, this muſt needs *annul*, and *caſſate* all the *force* of *all* the *Articles* of the *Creed* (although never ſo *firmly* and *explicitely* believed) toward bringing forth *good* life, i. e. *Repentance*, truly underſtood, this *ſuppoſititious no-repentance* being once contentedly *received*, and eſpouſed in *exchange* for it.

* *Annot. in* Rom. 7.

Dangers of it.

Sect. 5. For who will ever take the *pains* to *maintain* a *painful*, *ungrateful*, perhaps *bloody fight* againſt the *Law of ſin that is in his members* (ὑπωπιάζειν and ἁιχμαλωτίζειν which are the *works* of the *penitent*, or *neglect* of which, the *valianteſt combatant* may prove a *reprobate*, 1 *Cor.* 9. 27.) if ſo much leſs than a συμμαχία or *beating the air*, ver. 26. a bare *diſlike*, or *diſpleaſure* of the *law of the mind*, without ever coming into the *field*, will ſerve the turn to ſecure him of the *crown*.

Wiſhes of repentance.

Sect. 6. So again, they that, like the *popular Prince*, are *unwilling to diſmiſs any man without his requeſt*, and therefore, when they find not a man *penitent*, if they can but obtain of him, to *wiſh* that he *were penitent*, or to *grieve*, that he cannot *aſcend* ſo high as that *wiſh*, are content to accept that *wiſh*, or that *grief* for that *Repentance*, which *alone* is the *condition* required by *Chriſt* to reſcue from *periſhing*, What do theſe again, but *wilfully miſtake* that for *Repentance*, which is not *Repentance*, nay is by them that *affirm* it is, *preſumed* and *ſuppoſed* not to be; For if there had been any thing, that could have *approved* it ſelf to be *Repentance*, they had never *deſcended* to thoſe low *enquiries*, after the *wiſh*, and the *grief*; Nay the *wiſh* they had *Repentance*, is founded in the *preſumption* they have it not, and the *grief* that they have not the *wiſh*, is again a *conceſſion* that they have not ſo much as that; And if *they* may be *capable* of *comfort*, (I mean true ſubſtantial comfort, aſſurance of God's *pardon*, and acceptance, in their preſent eſtate) who are yet ſo far from being *true penitents*, *reform'd*, *new livers*, that the utmoſt they are arrived to toward it, is but an *empty*, ineffectual *wiſh* that they were ſuch, without conſidering the *price*, that muſt be paid, the *pleaſant eſpouſed ſins*, that muſt be *parted* with, if their *wiſh* were granted, (and ſo without any ſincere reſolution of any real change) then what need all that *Chriſtian life*, thoſe *many years* of *ſevere devotion*, and *profitable ſervice* that the *Apoſtles* meant, and all *Miniſters* endeavour to *ſuperſtruct* on this *foundation*?

Sorrow that they do not wiſh.

Deferring Repentance to Death-bed.

Sect. 7. So that frequent *practice* though not *doctrine* of the many, of *ſecure* ſpending in *ſin* the *youth*, and *riper* age, and even all the *remainder* (till the *forerunners* of *death* and *hell* make their *cloſe approaches* to them) and never doubting but the whole *condition* required by *Chriſt*, the *Repentance* he came to *preach*, will in that *laſt ſcene* of their *laſt act*, immediately before the *exit*, be as *opportunely* and *acceptably* performed, as at any *other* point of their *lives*, What do theſe but *evacuate* the whole *force* of the *Chriſtian Faith*, and abſolutely *reſolve* againſt *building* of *Chriſtian life* upon it?

* *Of Death-bed Repentance.*

Sect. 8. The *unreaſonableneſs*, and *preſumption*, the *danger*, and *deſperate inſecurity* of thoſe, that thus *project*, and inſtead of that whole *age* of *vital actions*, which are all *little* enough be they never ſo *liberally* diſpenſed, and never ſo *duly* perform'd, (*vaſtly* diſproportionable to that *eternal Crown*, which we know is adjudged, a *reward* to *every man according to his works*) have not ſo much as a thought or deſign all their lives long (nor till thoſe *laſt fearful ſummons extort* it from them) to advance ſo far as *attrition* and *contrition*, *ſorrow*, and *reſolution* of *amendment*, and then have no means to *ſecure* them of the *truth*, and *ſincerity* of theſe; The *unreaſonableneſs*, I ſay, and *danger* of theſe is * elſewhere *largely* inſiſted on, but never *ſufficiently lamented*, being that which is the *debauching* all parts of the *world*, a *preſumption*, that engages in all *ſin*, and *ruine*, aſcertains the *life* to be wholly *unprofitable*, and hath the luck among all *profeſſions* of *Chriſtians* to have aids and offices diligent to offer it ſome encouragements; The *Romaniſts* have many, formerly named, and their *extream Unction*, adminiſtred as the *dying* mans *viaticum* (which Saint *James* mention'd as the *ceremony* of his *recovery*) may be added to the *Catalogue*; And others of ſeveral perſwaſions have made them other tenders of *kindneſs*, and being unwilling to *diſcourage* ſuch *cunctators*, always keep them up in *good hope*, that if they are *not yet called* (for that is the *ſtyle* to expreſs any *impenitent*, *obdurate* ſinner) they may yet with the *thief* be brought in at the *laſt hour*, and ſo (to omit the *deſperate gulf* they are by theſe *vain*

hopes

hopes most *sadly plunged* in, if God shew not either the like miracle, as the thief met with a Saviour, upon the Cross, which is not to be hoped a second time, or some other mercy proportionable to, and as little to be depended on as that) are *ascertain'd* never to *superstruct* any vital action, on that Divine *foundation*, so fitly *prepared* for it.

Sect. 9. If there be any, that mistake *sorrow* for *sin*, μεταμέλεια, (which it is very ordinary to *find* in those who carry it to *hell* with them, and which continues in that state of *woe*, as *Charity* doth in *heaven*) and confound it with *repentance* μετάνοια, which is never less than a *conversion*, and *change* of *mind*, these by *obtruding* an *unsufficient part* for the *whole*, the *beginning* of a *change* for the *entire* work of *new life*, will fall under the former *guilt* of *obstructing* this *superstructure*; and so, in a word, will all they, that either through *indulgence* to others, or *fondness* to an *sin* in themselves, *substitute* for *Repentance* any thing that is *less*, than a *sincere*, *uniform Resolution of New obedience*, attended with *faithful endeavour*, and καρποὶ ἄξιοι, *meet*, *proportionable*, *worthy fruits* of this *change for ever* after. The *severals* of such *possible*, or *real* mistakes in the *retail*, are not here proper to be insisted on. *Mistake of Sorrow for Repentance.*

CHAP. XIX.

Of the necessaries to the superstructing of good life on this Foundation.

Sect. 1. THere is still a *fourth* branch of *Discourse* behind, which by the *laws* of the designed *method*, must now briefly be consider'd, What things are *necessary* to the *erecting* of this *superstructure* on this *Foundation*, whether in a *particular Christian*, or especially in a *Church*, or *society* of such.

Sect. 2. Where by [*necessary*] I mean not the *supernatural necessaries*, the *preventing*, and *assisting*, and *renewing grace of God*, which we suppose *God* ready to annex to the *Revelation* of his *will*, in the *hearts* of all that with *obedient* humble spirits *receive*, and sincerely *imbrace* it; Nor *Secondly*, in the *Physical* notion of *necessity*, that without which the work cannot *possibly* be done, the building be erected, for in this sence, as was said, it cannot be affirmed of all the *Articles* of the *Creed* that they are thus *absolutely necessary*, i. e. that no man can be imagined to *reform* his life, so as to be acceptable to *God*, but he to whom *every* of those *Articles* hath been intelligibly *revealed*; (For of many *plain*, yet *pious Christians*, 'tis not certain, that that can truly be now affirmed, and of the pious *Jews* before *Christ*'s time, it is not so much as pretended.) *Three kinds of necessaries.*

Sect. 3. But by [*necessary*] I mean that which is *morally necessary* to this *end*, i. e. very *useful* and *helpful* to advance it, and make it most *probable* to be attained, among men of those *tempers*, which we are commonly to look for in the world; Meaning also by the *end* to which these *means* are ordinable, not only the *first act* of *change*, *resolution* of *reforming*, but withall the *continuance* and *perseverance* in such *resolutions*, and the *bringing forth meet fruits of repentance*, and that again, not in a *single* person only, but in a *community* or *multitude* of men. *Morally necessary to this end.*

Sect. 4. And in passing our *judgment* on this kind of *Necessaries*, it will not be modestly nor soberly done, if any of our own *wisdom* intrude or interpose or be willing to make additions to what *Christ* and his *Apostles* have designed, and the *Universal practice* of the *Church* hath successfully used, and *recommended* to us in this kind; And therefore all that we have farther to do, is, to *recollect*, what things there are which are thus brought down unto us. *What the Universal Church of Christ hath thought thus Necessary.*

Sect. 5. And that will appear to be a *methodical successive* observation of these *severals*, as *degrees* and *steps*, *preparative* the one to the other, and all together, thus orderly used, *sufficient* through the *blessing* of *God* (and more probable than any course we could likely have pitched on) to attain the designed *end* successfully.

Sect. 6. *First*, A *solemn admission* of *Proselytes*, all that either, being of *age*, desire that admission for themselves, or that, in *infancy*, are by others presented to that *charity* of the *Church*, with the *desires* of the *parents*, and *intercession* of *sureties*, that they may be thus early admitted by *baptism*, the *Ceremony* of initiating *Proselytes*, of entring *disciples* into the *school* of *Christ*. *1. Baptism.*

Sect. 7. If the persons thus admitted be of *years* of *understanding*, then some competent degree of *instruction* is reasonably to *prepare* for it, which if they be *baptized* in *infancy*, is timely to *attend* it, and *security* to be taken for the *present*, that they shall be brought to the *Church* in due time, where that is *presumed* to be ready for them; And because in an *established Church*, where that *instruction* is secured on all hands, and so is reasonably presumed to attend *baptism*, the *practice* of the *Church* hath always been (transcribed from the *Apostles*) to bring *infant* children to *baptism*, we have all reason to adhere to that *practice*, and to acknowledge with *thankfulness* the several *advantages*, which it contributes, toward the *end* of *redeeming us from all iniquity*, and *purifying a peculiar people* unto *Christ*. *Of Infants.* *Benefits of that;*

Sect. 8. *First*, on *God*'s part, it secures to the Infant a *non-imputation* of *Adam*'s *transgression*, *seals* unto him an assurance of *God*'s not proceeding with him according to the strict *Covenant* first made with man, of a *perfect unsinning obedience*, by which we could have no hope to be *justified*, and on the contrary receives him into a *Covenant* of *Grace*, where there is *pardon* reached out to all (truly *penitent*) *sinners*, and *assistance promised* and *engaged* (and bestowed upon very easie conditions, *humility* and *prayer* and *affiance* in him) and this, in a degree proportionable to what now is required of us, as far as is truly *sufficient*, and can reasonably be desired by a *rational* agent, and as is reconcileable with that *liberty*, which is necessary to be *reserved* to the *will* of *man*, to make him capable of *vertue* and *vice*, and consequently of *reward* and *punishment*; And this is a *needful* expedient *The first.*

pedient to deliver from the *encumbrance* and weight of *fears*, and to beget a *lively* and a *quickning* hope, and ſo 'tis in it ſelf one excellent *principle* of *action*, (which *ſlackneth* for want of *encouragement*, and cannot chooſe but be *inlivened* by ſuch *pregnant* grounds of it) and thus it muſt needs appear to be, whenſoever the *Infant* attains to years and means of *underſtanding* it.

The Second. *Sect.* 9. *Secondly*, It is the entring the *Infant* into the *Church*, where the means of *knowledge* of *duty* dwells, and where it is *early communicated* to all, and ſo to this *Infant* as ſoon as he is capable of receiving it; And the *advantage* hereof is ineſtimable, to be thus *early taken up* and *prepoſſeſſed* by *Chriſt* before any other *Competitor* hath made his claim, or gotten *admiſſion* or hold or *intereſt* in him.

The Third. *Sect.* 10. *Thirdly*, It is the impoſing a *band* and *ſacramental obligation* upon him, an *oath*, a *vow*, which being the *condition*, upon the *conſtant* performance whereof all the *promiſes* of *endleſs* bliſs are made over to him by *God*, it is not poſſible for one that *prizeth* his own good, to wiſh it had not been made, or *deliberately* to *reſcind* or *diſclaim* the ſtanding *obliged* by it; And by this means it lays an *abſolute neceſſity* (the greateſt we have to ſecure all humane affairs) on every one that hath been *baptized*, to undertake the performance of *Chriſt's condition*, i.e. of a *pious* and *Chriſtian life*.

The Fourth. *Sect.* 11. *Fourthly*, It is ſolemnized with the *prayers* and *benedictions* of the *Church*, which are always of great *efficacy* to bring down that which is prayed for, but are eſpecially ſo, when they are annexed to an *Inſtitution* of *Chriſt* (ſuch as *Baptiſm* is known to be) and the *effect* of thoſe *benedictions* being the *preventions*, and *illuminations*, and *aſſiſtances*, and *inſpirations* of *God's* good *Spirit*, the heavenly *auxiliaries*, and *ſecret hand*, by which *God* hath promiſed to *fight* againſt *Amalek*, againſt *ſin for ever*, this together with the former advantages is very inſtrumental toward the *beginning* of this courſe, and ingaging the *Infant* betimes to a conſtant *perſeverance* in it. And accordingly *baptiſm* in the *Scripture*, and the reſt of the particulars which are to attend it, as in ſome reſpect they are to be looked on, as *privileges*, and *advantages* afforded us by *Chriſt* (for ſuch beyond all other things are thoſe that *effectually* induce *reformation*, or *Chriſtian life*) ſo are they moſt frequently conſidered as *bands* and *obligations*, and *ſeals* of the *Chriſtian's Covenant* with *Chriſt*, whereby he ingages his ſoul to a *faithful* performance of his part of the *Covenant*, and cannot now without *Perjury* and *Apoſtaſie* wilfully receed from it.

Catechizing. *Sect.* 12. After *Baptiſm* (when that is in *infancy* received, as now in a *Chriſtian Church* we ſuppoſe it to be) ſucceeds in the next place *Inſtruction* and *inſtitution* in the *nature* and ſeveral branches of that *vow* which was made at the *Font*, and this in ſuch a *ſhort*, *perſpicuous*, *intelligible* manner, and in ſo particular *addreſs* and *application* to every ſingle perſon (which, with the *narrow-mouthed bottle* in *Quintilian*, will not probably be filled with throwing whole *buckets* of water over it (to which *preaching* is moſt fit to be compared) and therefore requires to be taken *ſingle* in the hand, and to have that which is *needful*, *warily* and with *care* infuſed into it) that it is hardly imaginable how a more *provident* courſe ſhould be taken, than is by the *Church* appointed to be uſed, to convince every young perſon of his *obligation*, and to qualifie him judiciouſly and warily to take that *oath* in his *own* perſon, which was by *proxies* formerly taken for him, and what greater band can lie on any to undertake the *duties* of *Chriſtian life*, than the thus ſurveying and *renewing* of that *oath*?

Confirmation. *Sect.* 13. And what is thus prepared for in *Catechizing* is in the third place performed by *Confirmation*, a moſt profitable uſage of the *Church* tranſcribed from the *practice* of the *Apoſtles*, which conſiſts of *two* parts, the *child's* undertaking in his own name every part of the *baptiſmal vow* (having firſt approved himſelf to *underſtand* it) and to that purpoſe, that he may more ſolemnly enter this *obligation*, bringing ſome *God-father* with him, not now (as in *baptiſm*) as his *Procurator* to *undertake* for him, but as a *witneſs* to *teſtifie* his entring this *obligation*, which one thing being *heedfully* and *pioufly* performed, is the greateſt *ingagement* imaginable to the performance of the *matter* of the *vow* (in which all *Chriſtian belief* and *practice* is folded up) conſidering that every act of *preſumptuous* ſin, which ſhall ever be committed againſt that *vow*, brings the guilt of *formal* down-right *perjury* along with it, together with the *puniſhment* that belongs to that great and *criminous* guilt, and the *forfeiture* of his *right* and *claim* to all thoſe *mercies*, which either in *Baptiſm* or *Confirmation* are made over to him by *Chriſt*.

The firſt part thereof.

The ſecond. *Sect.* 14. The *ſecond* part of *Confirmation* is the *prayer* and *benediction* of the *Biſhop*, the *ſucceſſor* of the *Apoſtles* in this office, and that made more ſolemn by the *Ceremony* of *Impoſition* of *hands*, a *cuſtom* indeed of the *Jewiſh parents* in *bleſſing* their *children*, but taken up by the *Apoſtles* themſelves, in ſtead of that *Divine Inſufflation*, which *Chriſt* had uſed to them in *conferring* the *Holy Ghoſt* upon them, *Joh.* 20. 22. as an *outward ſign* of the ſame, as for *holy Orders*, *Act.* 6. 6. ſo for *Confirmation* of *believers* after *baptiſm*, *Act.* 8. 18. And the matter of this *benediction*, and *petition*, being the *ſtrength* of *Chriſt*, the *daily increaſe* of the *manifold gifts* of *grace*, the *Spirit* of *wiſdom*, *underſtanding*, *counſel* and *ghoſtly ſtrength*, of *knowledge* and true *godlineſs* and *holy fear*, as the beſtowing of theſe upon the *child* is both the *ſtrengthning* and *ingaging* him to all *piety*, ſo the *Biſhop's prayer* being thus, by vertue of his *office*, offered up, and having the *ſuffrages* of the whole *congregation* to joyn with it, and being commenced to *God* for that *boon* (the *Spirit*) which he hath promiſed to grant to our *importunity*, it may moſt *reaſonably* be preſumed to be of *force* and *efficacy* with *God* to bring down that *grace* which may inable to *will* and to *do*, on *all* that come duly *qualified* to receive it.

Sect. 15. To which I may add, that this being deſigned by the *Church* to *certifie* thoſe that are thus *confirmed* of *God's favour* and *gracious goodneſs* toward them, it hath all the *advantages* that either *hope* of *acceptance* and *reward*, or a *grateful* ſenſe of mercies received can add to it, to *engage* and *oblige* us to a conſtant *obedience* to him.

The Lord's Supper. *In five conſiderations.* *Sect.* 16. *Fourthly*, Thoſe which are thus *confirmed*, are thereby ſuppoſed to be fit for *admiſſion* to that other *ſacrament* of the *body* and *blood* of *Chriſt*, inſtituted in the *cloſe* of his *laſt ſupper*: And that, whether it be conſidered, 1. as an *inſtitution* of *Chriſt* for the ſolemn *commemorating* of his *death*; or 2. as a *ſacrifice Euchariſtical* performed by the *Chriſtian* to *God*; or 3. as the *koinonia communication* of the *Body* and *blood* of *Chriſt*, the means of conveying all the benefits of the *crucified Saviour* unto all that come fitly *prepared*, and *qualified* for them; or whether, 4. as a *federal rite* betwixt the *ſoul* and *Chriſt*, *eating* and *drinking* at his *table*, and thereby engaging our *obedience* to him;

or

or *laſtly*, as an *emblem* of the moſt perfect *divine charity* to be obſerved among all *Chriſtians*; In all and every of theſe reſpects, I ſay, it is doubtleſs an inſtrument of great *vertue*, that hath a peculiar *propriety* to engage the receiver to *perſevere* in all *piety*. And that yet farther improved by the frequent *iteration*, and *repetition* of that *ſacrament*.

Sect. 17. 1. As it is the *commemorating* the *death* of *Chriſt*, ſo it is the *profeſſing* our ſelves the *diſciples* of the *crucified Saviour*, and that ingageth us to *take up his Croſs and follow him*, and not to fall off from him for any *temptations*, or *terrors* of *death* it ſelf, but to *reſiſt* to *blood* (as *Chriſt* did) in our *ſpiritual ἀγῶνες*, our *Olympicks* or *combates* againſt *ſin*. *The firſt.*

Sect. 18. *Secondly*, As it is the *Euchariſtical Chriſtian ſacrifice*, ſo it is formally the *practiſing* of ſeveral acts of *Chriſtian vertue*, 1. of *prayer*, of *thanksgiving*, of all kind of *piety* towards *God*; 2. of *charity* to our *brethren*, both that *ſpiritual*, of *interceding for all men, for Kings*, &c. 1 *Tim.* 2. 1. and *corporal*, in the *offertory*, for the *relief* of thoſe that want; and 3. the *offering up* and ſo *conſecrating* our ſelves, our *ſouls* and *bodies* to be a *holy*, *lively*, *acceptable ſacrifice* to *God*, the *devoting* our ſelves to his *ſervice* all our days; And this laſt a *large comprehenſive* act of *piety*, which contains all *particular branches* under it, and is again the *repeating* of the *baptiſmal vow*, and the yet *cloſer* binding of this *engagement* on us. *The ſecond.*

Sect. 19. *Thirdly*, As it is by *God deſigned*, and, as an *inſtitution* of his, *bleſſed* and *conſecrated* by him into a *ſacrament*, a *holy rite*, a *means* of *conveying* and communicating to the worthy receiver the *benefits* of the *body* and *blood* of *Chriſt*, that *pardon* of *ſin* and *ſufficience* of *ſtrength* and *grace*, which were *purchaſed* by his *death* and *typified* and *conſigned* to us by the *ſacramental elements*, ſo 'tis again the ridding us of all our *diſcouraging fears*, and the *animating* and *obliging* of us to make *uſe* of that *grace*, which will carry us (if we do not wilfully *betray* our *ſuccours*) *victoriouſly* through all *difficulties*. *The third.*

Sect. 20. *Fourthly*, As it is a *federal rite* betwixt *God* and *us* (as *eating* and *drinking* both among the *Jews* and *heathens* was wont to be) ſo 'tis on our part the *ſolemn undertaking* of the *condition* required of us to make us capable of the *benefit* of *God*'s new *Evangelical Covenant*, and that is *ſincere* performance of all *duties* preſcribed the *Chriſtian* by *Chriſt*, And he that doth no longer expect good from *God* than he *performs* that *condition*, is *ipſo facto* deveſted of all thoſe *fallacious flattering hopes*, which pretended to make *purifying* unneceſſary, and muſt now either live *purely* and *piouſly*, or elſe *diſclaim* ever *ſeeing* of *God*. *The fourth.*

Sect. 21. *Laſtly*, As this *ſupper* of the *Lord* is a *token* and *engagement* of *charity* among the *diſciples* of *Chriſt*, ſo it is the ſupplanting of all the moſt *Diabolical ſins*, the *filthineſs* of the *ſpirit*, the *hatred*, *variance*, *emulation*, *ſtrife*, *revenge*, *faction*, *ſchiſm*, that have been the *tearing* and *rending* of the *Church* of *God* (oft-times upon pretence of the greateſt *piety*) but were by *Chriſt*, of all other things, moſt paſſionately diſclaimed, and caſt out of his *Temple*; And if by the admonitions, which this *Emblem* is ready to afford us, we can think our ſelves obliged to return to that *charity* and *peaceable-mindedneſs*, which *Chriſt* ſo frequently and vehemently recommends to us, we have his own *promiſe* that the *whole body* ſhall be *full of light*, *Matth.* 6. that all other *Chriſtian vertues* will by way of *concomitance* or *annexation*, *accompany* or *attend* them in our *hearts*.

Sect. 22. And the ſeveral happy *influences* of all and each theſe *conſiderations*, eſpecially when they are ſuperadded to the *three* former grand inſtruments, and frequently, every *month* at leaſt, and every *great Feſtivity*, called in to *reinforce* our *watch*, to remand us to our *ſcrutiny* (the *examination* and *ſearch* of our *hearts* and *purging* out all *impurity*, that hath been contracted in thoſe intervals) and to *renew* our *vows* of *temper* and *vigilance*, may very reaſonably be allowed to have ſome conſiderable *vertue* and *efficacy* in them, to advance that work, for which *Chriſt* came out from the *boſome* of his *Father*, to *ſuperſtruct* the *practice* of all *vertue*, where the *Faith* of *Chriſt* is once *planted*. *The frequency of receiving it.*

Sect. 23. After theſe *four*, which are thus *ſubordinate* and *preparative* the one to the other, the *later* ſtill bringing with it an addition of *weight* to the *former*, *Two* more there are which are ſeveral from, and yet being of *continual uſe*, are interweaved and mixt with every of theſe, and having their *diſtinct energie* proper to themſelves, when they are in *conjunction* with the former, or added to them, they muſt needs accumulate and ſuperadd a conſiderable weight unto them.

Sect. 24. The *firſt* is the *uſe* of *Liturgie*, the *ſecond* the *word* of *exhortation* among the *Jews*, and in the *Apoſtles* times, and proportionable to that the *ſermons* or *homilies* of the *Church*. *The uſe of Liturgie.*

Sect. 25. The *Liturgie* as it contains the whole *daily office*, conſiſting of *Confeſſion*, *prayers*, *Pſalms*, *hymns*, *reading* of the *ſcripture* of both *Teſtaments*, *Creeds*, *ſupplications*, *interceſſions*, *thankſgivings*, injunctions of *Geſtures* and of *Ceremonies*, and of *Holy-days*, is both the exerciſe of *many* parts of *Piety*, and the *conſervatory* of the *Foundation*, on which all *Piety* together is regularly *built*, and a means of *heightning devotion* and infuſing *zeal* into it; And the *diligent*, *worthy*, *continual* (inſtead of the *negligent*, *formal*, *rarer*) uſe of it, and the *unanimous* accord of whole *ſocieties* and *multitudes* herein, would certainly be very *efficacious* advancers of all *Chriſtian vertue*, of *piety*, of *charity*, of *purity*, over the world, of the *two* former *directly*, and of the later by way of *diverſion*, the *frequent* performance of ſuch *offices*, *obſtructing* and ſealing up the *fountains* of *impurity*, and intercepting that *leiſure*, which is neceſſary to the entertaining the beginnings of it. *The uſe of Liturgie.*

Sect. 26. So for *Preaching* or *exhorting* the *People* by way of *Homily*, it appears to have been received from the *Jewiſh* by the *Chriſtian Church*, and by the phraſe, by which it is expreſſed in the *Acts* [*a word of exhortation to the people*] it appears to have been generally imployed in *reprehenſion* of *vices* and *exhortation* to *vertuous living*. And if we ſurvey the *Homilies* of the *Antient Church* (ſuch are thoſe of St. *Chryſoſtome* moſt eminently) we ſhall diſcern that as upon *Feſtival days*, the *ſubject* of the *Homily* was conſtantly the buſineſs of the *Day*, the clearing the *myſtery*, the *incarnation* of *Chriſt*, &c. and the recommending the *actions* or *ſufferings* of the *Saints*, and raiſing mens hearts to acknowledge the *goodneſs* of *God* in ſetting up ſuch *exemplary* patterns and *guides* before us, So upon *other* days, after ſome ſhort *literal* explication of ſome place of *ſcripture*, the cuſtome was not to raiſe *doctrinal* points, according to every *Preachers* judgment or phanſie, but preſently to fall off to *exhortation* to, *temperance*, *continence*, *patience*, and the like *Chriſtian vertues*, which either the *Of Preaching.*

propriety

propriety of the *Text*, or the *wants* and *ſins* of the *auditory*, or the *times* ſuggeſted to them. And this ſo far from being a *fault* in their *method* of *preaching*, that it was an *eminent exemplary* piece of *Chriſtian prudence*, obſervable and *imitable* in them, as a means of keeping *falſe* or *unneceſſary definitions* out of the *Church*, which tend to the increaſe of *diſputes* and *contentions*, and whilſt they do ſo, are not to the *edification* and *benefit*, but to the *deſtruction* and *miſchief* of the hearers.

Sect. 27. Of this *uſage* of the *Church* it is moſt viſible, if it be but by the *ill* uſes which are made of it many times in *ſtirring* up *ſeditions*, *rebellions*, *murthers*, *hatreds*, *animoſities*, *calumnies*, *revilings of ſuperiors*, &c. in diſſeminating of *hereſies*, infuſing of *prejudices*, &c. what advantage may be had toward the advancement of all parts of *Chriſtian life* by a due performance of it, 'Tis very much in the power of a *popular Orator* to repreſent *vices* in ſo *formidable*, yet juſt appearances, and to ſet out each *vertue* in ſo *amiable* a *form*, and to *apply* this ſo *particularly* to thoſe that are concerned to be thus wrought on, that the *Covetous* perſon ſhall flie from, and ſcatter (moſt *liberally*) his *beloved Idol-wealth*, the *rageful* perſon ſhall find a *calm*, the *luſtful* a *coldneſs* inſenſibly diffuſed upon his breaſt, and the *auditor's phanſie* and *ſenſitive affections* being called in to joyn with his *reaſon* and the *Spirit* of *God*, it will by the *bleſſing* of that *Spirit* be in the power of *meditation*, to *radicate* theſe *ſeeds*, to *fix* this *tranſient gleam* of *light* and *warmth*, to *confirm inclinations* and *reſolutions* of *Good* (received in at the *ear*) and give them a *durable* conſiſtence in the *ſoul*.

Viſitation of the Sick.

Sect. 28. Next to this is the *ſpiritual* perſons being called for (and obeying the ſummons) to *viſit* the *ſick*, *Jam.* 5. 14. to aſſiſt him in the great work of diſcuſſing and examining his *conſcience*; of making his ſearch as particular as it can, whether it be any *ſin* either *unreformed*, or unſufficiently *mortified*, which may have laid him under *God*'s preſent diſpleaſure, and brought that *diſeaſe*, as a *piece* of diſcipline, upon him. In this condition the *rod* of *God* hath a *voice* to be heard, and he whoſe *office* it is in publick to explain the *oracles* of *God* for the uſe of the *Church*, and to apply them to each man's wants, is now to preach on this *new text*, and expound to the *ſick* man (as far as by the *cloſeſt inſpection* he can judge) the particular meaning of the *voice*, the *interpretation* of *God*'s meſſage to him, And if he be not able, like *Daniel* to interpret *Nebuchadnezzar's dream*, or *Belſhazzar's hand-writing* on the *wall*, which was the work of a *Prophet* extraordinarily *inſpired*, yet he may without the *ſpirit* of *divination*, diſcern that *affinity* and *dependence* betwixt the man's *unreformed* ſins, and *God*'s hand of *puniſhment*, which may be ſufficient ground of ſuperſtructing *Daniel's exhortation* of *breaking off his ſins by repentance*, *and ſhewing mercy to the poor*, by *humiliation*, *ſincere reſolution* and *vow* of *new life*, and by *meet fruits* of ſuch *reformation*, the higheſt works of *charity* and *piety*, that the patient is capable of. And beſides that this method may receive ſome force (and probably prove *ſucceſsful*) by aſſiſtance of thoſe *impreſſions*, that the deſire of *recovering* the former health may have upon the patient (when he conſiders the *pardon* of *ſins*, which ordinarily introduced *Chriſt's corporal cures*, and prudently judgeth how improbable it is, that *God*, which for any *ſin* committed hath inflicted this *diſeaſe*, ſhould *remove* it before *reformation*, or if he doth, muſt do it as an act of higher *wrath* and *puniſhment*) Beſides this, I ſay the time of *ſickneſs*, or any other *affliction*, is like the *cool* of the *day* to *Adam*, a *ſeaſon* of peculiar *propriety* for the *voice* of *God* to be *heard* in the mouth of his *meſſengers*, and ſo may, by the *aſſiſtance* of united *prayers* for *God*'s bleſſing on his own *inſtruments*, be improved into a very *advantageous opportunity* of *begetting* or *increaſing* ſpiritual *life* in the *ſoul*, and cannot without great guilt of *unkindneſs* and *treachery* to that moſt *precious* part be *neglected* or *omitted* by us.

Spiritual Conference.

Sect. 29. And the *analogie* holds, though not in the ſame *degree*, yet in the *proportion*, to every other *ſeaſon* or *perſon*, who is under the *power* of any *unreformed* ſin, or is *doubtful* of the *ſincerity* of the *kind*, or *ſufficience* of the *degree* of his *change*, and is not ſo *fit* or *competent* a *judge* of his *own* eſtate (if upon no other ſcore but becauſe his *own*) as any other *fellow Chriſtian* of no deeper *judgment* than himſelf, or as the *ſpiritual* perſon, whoſe *Office* it is to *watch* for his *ſoul*, and is probably furniſhed with more *skill*, *fidelity* and *zeal* toward the doing of it, may be deemed to be. And in this caſe the uſe of *ſpiritual conference* (which is at all times very *profitable*, yea and *pleaſant* to every *diligent humble Chriſtian*) is unimaginable and unſpeakable, eſpecially if it be *free* and *unreſtrained*, having all the *advantages* of the *divineſt friendſhip*, and withall the *contentments* and *ſatisfactions* of it (which are exceedingly great, and agreeable to *rational* ingenuous natures) and bearing an image and lively reſemblance of that *converſation* which is among *Angels* and *beatified Saints*, a *communication* and *conjunction* of *ſouls*, deſigned to our higheſt *intereſts* and *concernments*, the *countermining* and *eradicating* of *ſin*, *mortifying* this or that *paſſion*, *rage*, or other ſenſual *deſire*, and *contending* for the *higheſt exaltation* and *improvement* of our *natures*, all *growth in grace*, *and the* practical *knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt*.

Sect. 30. Many inhaunſments of this *ſpiritual* uſeful, though more *private exerciſe*, might be farther noted, and *rules* for the more *advantageous practice* of it, eſpecially that there were ſome *eminent* perſons, of known *abilities*, *experience*, *judgment*, *gravity*, *fidelity*, *zeal* to all *Chriſtian vertue* and the *good* of *ſouls* ſet apart to this one *office* of *ſpiritual* conference, in every *Province*, and all men *rationally* convinced of the great *benefits* that might be reaped by a frequent *reſort* to them in all poſſible times of *need*, and of the no *kind* of *detriment* or *diſadvantage*, that they can ſuffer by it.

The power of the Keys.

Sect. 31. But beyond all theſe there is another very *efficacious method* ſtill behind, of which the *Apoſtle* ſaith, that it was not *carnal* or *weak*, but *mighty to God*, or *very powerful*, for the *bringing down* of *ſtrong holds*, for the *ſubduing* of the moſt *obſtinate*, *contumacious ſinner*, and bringing him into the *obedience* of the *faith* of *Chriſt*, and that is the *power* and *exerciſe* of the *Keys* committed to the *Apoſtles* and their *ſucceſſors* by *Chriſt*, the *weapons of their warfare*, as Saint *Paul* calls them, the means of diſcharging their *office* to the *good* of *ſouls*.

Sect. 32. For when any *baptized*, *inſtructed*, *confirmed*, *communicated Chriſtian*, which hath participated of the *Liturgie* and *Sermons* of the *Church*, ſhall in deſpight of all theſe *obligations* (very *competent* and *ſufficient* to have *reſtrain'd* him) break out into any *known wilful ſcandalous* ſin, this courſe is then ready at hand, to be ſent as an *officer* to *arreſt* and *reduce* him; Firſt the *admonitions*,

fraternal

fraternal or *paternal*, of his *fellow Christians*, or of the *Governors* of the *Church*, then more *publick reprehensions* and *increpations*, and upon the *unsuccessfulness* of all these milder *medicaments*, the use of that stronger *Physick*, the *Censures* of the *Church*, either πρὸς ὥραν for a *determinate*, shorter *space*, or else *indefinitely*, *usque ad reformationem*, until he *reform* and *return*, and then when he doth so, the *admitting* him to *penance*, to *approve* the *sincerity* of his *change* by *meet fruits* of *repentance*, and then, and not till then, allowing him the *benefit* of *absolution*.

Sect. 33. The *efficacy* and *usefulness* of this last *method* hath elsewhere been shewn at large (in a *Tract* on that *subject*) especially upon the score of *shame*, when he that will live the life of a *heathen*, goes on *unreformed* in any *open* sin, shall not be allowed the *honour* of a *Christian name*, of an ordinary good *reputation* among men, but be *banished* and *interdicted* the enjoyment of those *sacred privileges*, which the meanest of *Christ's flock* is allowed by him. What these *losses* are, is sufficiently known, and set off by the *Apostles* style, expressing them by καθαίρεσις and ἀπώλεια, *destruction* and *excision*, and the like; As for that other of *shame*, the *efficacy* that belongs to it, may be discerned by that *antient Apophthegm* of * *Cleobulus*, the *fifth* of the *Sages* of *Greece*, Μάλιστα σωφροσύνῃ δῆμον, ὅταν ὁ φόβος μᾶλλον οἱ πολίζωνομενοι δεδοίκασιν, ἢ ὁ νόμος, *that that people are composed to the greatest sobriety, among whom the Citizens stand in more fear of disprаise, than of law*; supposing that state to be best *qualified*, where *vertue*, and every part of good living, which *laws* are wont to prescribe, hath acquired so great a *credit*, and *reputation* among all, that without *fear* of *punishment* from *laws*, or *Magistrates*, the very dread of *shame* and *disgrace* shall be able to contain all men within the *bounds* of *exact* living, and awe them from *admitting* any thing which is *foul*, or *sinful*. To which purpose also is that of ‖ *Hippodamus* the *Pythagorean*, that there be *three causes of vertue* (φόβος, ἀπιθυμία, αἰδὼς) and *shame* is the last of them, of which, saith he, (τὰ ἤθεα δυνατὰ ἐστὶ ἐμπαραστενάζειν, &c.) *good customs are able to infuse a dread into all men, that are* καλῶς ἠσκημένοις *well cultivated*, and make them αἰδεῖσθαι τὰ αἰσχρὰ πράσσειν, *to have a reverence*, or *pudicitious*, chaste *fear of doing any thing which is ill*. And according to this *prudential* notion of these *wise men* of the world, is this piece of *Christian discipline* instituted by our *Saviour*, to deprive *vice* of its greatest temptation, the *praise* of *men*, to exalt and set up *vertue* the only *creditable* thing, and brand sin as infamous; And if this of *shame* superadded to the former of *loss* (and both being met together, as the sinners portion here, perfectly *prefiguring* the *two* saddest ingredients in *hell*, *deprivation* of the *blissful vision*, and *confusion* of *face*) cannot prove *efficacious* and *successful* to the mortifying of *unprofitable* vice, the *Church* doth then give over the *patient* as *desperate*; pretends not to any farther *methods* of working on such *obdurate* sinners.

* *Stobæus*, *ser.* 41. p. 268.

‖ *Li. de Repubi.*

Sect. 34. Nor indeed is it *reasonable* it should, when beside the *Foundation* (consisting of so many *stones*, each of them *elect* and *precious*, *chosen* by the *wisdom* of *heaven* for this admirable work of *reforming* the most obdurate *Jew* or *heathen*) this *series* and *succession* of so many *powerful methods* being farther prescribed by *God* and administred by the *Church*, have found so discouraging a reception, that nothing but the violence of *storming* or *battery* (the course which *God* is forced to take for the *destroying*, but cannot without changing the course of *nature*, for the *converting* of *sinners*) can hope or pretend to prove *successful* on them.

This the last Ecclesiastical means.

Sect. 35. What hath been said of the *wise* disposition of *God* in *preparing* and *instituting* this *series* of *necessaries* for the effecting this great work, the *reformation* of mens lives (the latter annext to the former, each to add *weight* and *authority*, and to vindicate the *contempts* of the former) might more largely be insisted on yet, on a farther design, to give us a just value of that sacred *office*, which *Christ* fixed in the *Church* in his *Apostles* and the *Bishops* their *successors*, and honoured it and them in this especially, that he hath put these *weapons* into their hands, *intrusted* to, and invested in them the *Power* of *dispensing* all these, and by that means rendred them *necessary* to the *planting* and *supporting* a *Church* of vital *Christians*, to the maintaining of *pious* practice in any *community* of *Professors*. But this would soon swell this discourse beyond the limits designed to it.

The necessity of Governors in the Church.

Sect. 36. All that is behind will be by way of *Comment* on that part of the *Church* of *England's* *charity*, which hath constantly called to *God*, that he will *inspire continually the Universal Church with the Spirit of truth*, *unity*, *and concord*, *and grant that all they that do confess his holy name*, *may agree in the truth of his holy word*, *and live in unity and godly love*.

The Conclusion.

A Prayer.

A Prayer. O Moſt gracious Lord God, the Creator of all things, but of Men and all Mankind a tender compaſſionate Father in Jeſus Chriſt, thou that haſt enlarged thy deſigns and purpoſes of grace and mercy, as the bowels and blood-ſhedding of thy Son, with an earneſt deſire that every weak or ſinful man ſhould partake of that abyſs, that infinite treaſure of thy bounty; Thou that haſt bequeathed to us that Legacy and example of a ſacred inviolate Peace, a large diffuſive charity, we meekly beſeech thee to overſhadow with thy heavenly grace the ſouls of all men over all the world, O Lord, thou lover of ſouls, to bring home to the acknowledgment and embraces of thy Son all that are yet ſtrangers to that profeſſion, and in whatſoever any of us, who have already received that mercy from thee, may be any way uſeful or inſtrumental to that ſo glorious end, to direct and incline our hearts toward it, to work in us all an holy zeal to thy name, and tender bowels to all thoſe whoſe eternity is concerned in it. O give us a true ſerious full comprehenſion and value of that one great intereſt of others, as well as our ſelves, ſhew us the meaneſt of us, ſome way to contribute toward it, if it be but our daily affectionate prayers for the enlarging of thy Kingdom, and the care of approving all our actions ſo, as may moſt effectually attract all to this profeſſion. And for all thoſe that have already that glorious name of thy Son called upon them, bleſſed Lord, that they may at length, according to the many engagements of their profeſſion, depart from iniquity, that that holy City, that new Jeruſalem may at length according to thy promiſe deſcend from heaven, prepared as a Bride adorned for the husband Chriſt, that that tabernacle of God with men may be illuſtriouſly viſible among us, that we may be a peculiar people, and thou our God inhabiting in power among us, that we which have ſo long profeſſed thee, and been inſtructed by thee, may no longer content our ſelves with that form of knowledge, which ſo often engenders ſtrife, contentions, animoſities, ſeparating, and condemning one another; and that moſt unchriſtian deteſtable guilt of blood, but endeavour and earneſtly contend for the uniform effectual practice of all the precepts of thy Son, the fruits and power of all Godlineſs, that all the Princes and People of Chriſtendom, the Paſtors and the Sheep of thy Fold may at length in ſome degree walk worthy of that light and that warmth, that knowledge and thoſe graces, that the ſun of righteouſneſs with healing in his wings hath ſo long poured out upon us. Lord purge and powerfully work out of all hearts that profaneneſs and Atheiſticalneſs, thoſe ſacrilegious thirſts and enormous violations of all that is holy, thoſe unpeaceable, rebellious, mutinous, and withal tyrannizing cruel ſpirits, thoſe prides and haughtineſſes, judging and condemning, defaming and deſpiſing of others, thoſe unlimited ambitions and covetings, joyned with the invaſion and violation of others rights, thoſe moſt reproachful exceſſes and abominable impurities, which to the ſhame of our unreformed obdurate hearts, do ſtill remain unmortified, unſubdued among us, but above all, thoſe infamous hypocriſies of ſuborning Religion to be the engine of advancing our ſecular deſigns, or the diſguiſe to conceal the fouleſt intentions, of bringing down that moſt ſacred name whereby we ſhould be ſaved, to be the vileſt inſtrument of all carnality; and by the power of thy convincing Spirit, Lord humble and ſubdue all that exalts it ſelf againſt the obedience of *Chriſt*. And when thou haſt caſt out ſo many evil ſpirits, be pleaſed thy ſelf to poſſeſs and inrich our ſouls, to plant and root and confirm and ſecure in us all thoſe precious fruits of piety, and faith, and obedience, and zeal towards thee; of purity and meekneſs, and ſimplicity, and contentedneſs, and ſobriety, in our ſelves; of juſtice, and charity, and peaceableneſs, and bowels of mercy, and compaſſion toward all others; that having ſeriouſly, and induſtriouſly, as our holy vocation ingages us, uſed all diligence to add unto our faith, vertue; and to vertue, patience, and perſeverance in all Chriſtian practice, we may adorn that profeſſion, which we have ſo long depraved, and having had our fruit unto holineſs, we may obtain our end everlaſting life, through Jeſus Chriſt our Lord. *Amen.*

OF

SCHISME.

A

DEFENCE

OF

The Church of England,

Againſt the

EXCEPTIONS

OF

The Romaniſts.

The Contents.

CHAP. I. *An Introduction, the danger, and ſin of Schiſm.*

CHAP. II. *What Schiſm is, together with ſome general conſiderations thereon.*

CHAP. III. *The ſeveral ſorts of Schiſm.*

CHAP. IV. *The pretended evidences of the Romaniſt againſt the Church of England examined, and firſt that from the Biſhop of Romes Supremacy by Chriſt's donation to St. Peter.*

CHAP. V. *The Evidences from the Biſhop of Romes ſucceeding St. Peter examined.*

CHAP. VI. *Their ſecond Plea from the Biſhop of Rome having planted Chriſtianity among us.*

CHAP. VII. *Their third Evidence from caſting off Obedience to the Biſhop of Rome at the Reformation.*

CHAP. VIII. *Of the ſecond ſort of Schiſm, as that is an offence againſt mutual Charity, This divided into three ſpecies, and the firſt here examined.*

CHAP. IX. *The ſecond ſpecies of this Schiſm examined, as it is an offence againſt external peace, or Communion Eccleſiaſtical.*

CHAP. X. *The third ſpecies of this Schiſm, as an offence againſt that Charity due from every Chriſtian to every Chriſtian, examined.*

CHAP. XI. *Concerning the preſent Perſecution of the Church of England, and the advantages ſought from thence.*

OF

OF
SCHISME.

A *Defence* of the *Church* of *England*, againſt the *Objections* of the *Romaniſt*.

CHAP. I.

An Introduction, the danger, and ſin of Schiſm.

Sect. 1. TWO *wiſhes* rather than *hopes* there are, wherein all *Chriſtians* are very much concerned; *Firſt*, That all that have given up their names to that *holy profeſſion*, would ſincerely betake themſelves to the diſcharge of all thoſe *duties* (as well more *common*, one towards another, as more *particular*, of each ſingle man toward *God*, and toward *himſelf*) which *Chriſt* came on purpoſe to *plant* in, or reduce into the world: The *Second*, That the *Faith* of *Chriſt* might gain an *amicable*, *univerſal* reception in the hearts of all men over the whole world, and that all *mankind* (by an *uniform* obedience to thoſe divine *precepts* which are moſt *agreeable* to our *rational*, i. e. humane nature, and which are able to *advance* us to the higheſt pitch of *moral excellency* and *dignity*, that any created ſubſtance is capable of) might attain the great *end* of our *creation*, a *paradiſe*, or *bliſsfull* being here in this world, onely with the mixture of ſome *allays* to that bliſs (and thoſe neceſſary both to the *exerciſe* of ſome moſt eminent *vertues*, and ſuch as the *Angels* are not, for want of paſſible bodies, capable of, and alſo to the *inhaunſing* of our *crown*) and then a ſtate of *infinite* reward, and *uncompounded* felicity hereafter.

Two concernments of all Chriſtians. Practice of Chriſtianity. Propagating of it.

Sect. 2. That the *latter* of theſe may in *God*'s good time be effectually attempted by all *Chriſtian Kings*, and *Biſhops*, and advance more *ſucceſsfully*, than of late it hath done, ought to be the *endeavour* of all thoſe, whoſe *eminency* in the world hath given them *capacities*, or *qualifications* to contribute ſome conſiderable degree of *aſſiſtence* to ſo *glorious* a work. And for others, whoſe *inferiority* of condition or ſphere of motion, and the *improbability*, conſequent to that, of advancing ſo magnificent a deſign, is their juſt *excuſe* for not entertaining any ſuch *hopeleſs* thoughts, it is yet their certain duty by conſtant, fervent *prayers* to ſolicite the *good hand of God*, who alone can accompliſh ſo divine a work, and by the diligent ſtrict obſervance of all *Chriſt's precepts* to *exemplifie* to all others the power, and real *energie* of the *faith* of *Chriſt*, where it is admitted into the heart, thereby to *attract* all others to the *imbracing* of that, which hath ſuch admirable *vertues* in it.

What is to be done toward the latter.

Sect. 3. As for the *former*, That is (in proportion to his condition) the known duty of every *ſingle Chriſtian*, much more of every *congregation*, and *community* of ſuch; who are therefore *aſſociated* into *one* body, that each ſupplying the *defects*, and infirmities of others, they may by ſo *advantageous* an inſtrument, as *union* of forces is, be *enabled* to doe what without it they are juſtly ſuppoſable to *want* means, or *ſtrength* to doe, and ſo are deprived of all excuſe, if they be found culpable.

The chief branches of the former, conſidered in ſociety.

Sect. 4. In this kind, 1. The duty of *Charity*, and *peace* to *all*: 2. of ready, and filial *obedience* of thoſe under authority to their lawfull authorized *ſuperiours*: and 3. of *charitative paternal* exerciſe of their power, in all thoſe that are inveſted with it by *Chriſt*, may be juſtly looked on as vertues of the *firſt magnitude*, which have the moſt lively *characters*, and impreſſes of the *Law-giver*, *Chriſt's image*, and *ſuperſcription* upon them, and accordingly deſerve the *firſt fruits* of our care and diligence that they be moſt diligently *conſerved*, where they are, and induſtriouſly *reduced*, where by the *malignity*, or infelicity of the times, they are *torn*, or *eſcaped* from us.

Charity. Obedience. Paternal exerciſe of Eccleſiaſtical power.

Sect. 5. For that *malices*, and *rancours*, and *animoſities* among *ſingle Chriſtians*, but eſpecially *ſeditious*, *mutinous* ſpirits; that *diviſions*, and *ſchiſms*, and *ruptures*, and preparative thereto, *cauſeleſs anathematizing*, and *tyrannizing* over the *faith* of *Chriſt's flock*, are moſt ſcandalouſly *contrary* to *Chriſt*'s platform, to the *prophecy* of the *plough-ſhares*, and *pruning-hooks*, the happy exchange for the *ſanguinary*, *hoſtile* inſtruments, is a truth ſo eminently and ſignally viſible in the *practice*, and *doctrine* of *Chriſt*, and his *Apoſtles*, that it cannot be doubted, or queſtioned on either ſide. And agreeably, there is no one vice, which hath fallen under ſo much of the *diſpleaſure*, and *correption*, and ſevereſt diſcipline of the *holy Fathers* of the *Ancient Church*, as this of *Schiſm*, and the *ingredients* and *preparatives* to it, have done.

The contrariety of Schiſm to the Doctrine of Chriſt.

The Fathers Cenſures of it.

Sect. 6. It is but a *ſmall* part of the *character* thereof, that from Saint *Paul*, and Saint *Jude* they tell us, that it is a ſpecial piece of (a) carnality; an (b) excommunicating and condemning, i. e. *voluntary* inflicting of that *puniſhment* on ones *ſelf*, which the *Governours* of the *Church* uſe to inflict on the moſt *ſcandalous* ſinners; that (c) they that ſo *divide* on their *own preſumption*, may not at their *own will return to the Church*, and *communicate* again with the *Biſhop*, and his *Chriſtian* people; that (d) it is *contrary* to the *faith*, (e) even when it hath not, in reſpect of *doctrinal* points, any hereſie joyned with it; (f) *Contrary* to *charity*, yea to all the (g) advantages that belong to a member of the *Church*, the (h) benefits of *prayers* and *ſacraments*; that it is (i) as bad as *hereſie*; that (k) there was never any *hereſie* in the *Church*, which was not *founded* in it; and (l) that it is conſtantly forced, in its own defence, to conclude in ſome *hereſie* or other; (all of which being put together will be ſufficient to keep men from being in *love* with the *guilt*, or *company* of *ſchiſmaticks*:) but it is farther branded with theſe *ſuperadditions* of *terrour*, that (m) there is ſcarce *any* crime ſo great as *ſchiſm*, not (n) *idolatry*, (o) *ſacrilege*, *parricide*; that it hath been under peculiar marks of *God's indignation*, in the ſtory of the *Jewiſh Church*, as in the (p) caſe of the *ten Tribes*, and of the (q) *Samaritans*, who are ranked with the *Gentiles*, *Matth.* 10. 5. (r) and ſo in the *ſtory* of *Core*, &c. that it is the (ſ) *Antichriſtianiſm* mentioned by Saint *John*, the (t) *worſhipping* or *ſerving the Devil*, and, in a word, ſo great a crime, that it is not (u) *expiable* by *Martyrdom* to him that *continues* in, and hath not *repented*, and returned from it.

(a) 1 Cor. 3. 4. Jude 19. See *Fulgentius ad Mon. l.* 2.

(b) *Quiſquis in Eccleſia gratiam conſecutus, ab Eccleſia exierit, reus ſibi futurus eſt, i. e. ipſe ſibi quod pereat imputaturus; Quod Apoſtolus explanat, docens hæreticum vitandum eſſe, ut à ſemetipſo damnatum.* Cypr. Ep. 76. *Pœnas quas meruerant pependerunt, ut à nobis non ejecti ultro ſe ejicerent, de Eccleſia ſponte ſe pellerent.* Ep. 40. *Quomodo ic à tot gregibus ſcidiſti? Exſcidiſti enim teipſum.* Firmilian. ad Cypr. Ep. 75.

(c) *Sciat ſe poſtea ad Eccleſiam redire, & cum Epiſcopis & plebe Chriſti communicare non poſſe.* Ep. 40. *Averſandus eſt talis atque fugiendus quiſquis fuerit ab Eccleſia ſeparatus.* Ibid. de Unit. Eccleſ.

(d) *Hanc Eccleſiæ unitatem qui non tenet, tenere ſe fidem credit?* Cypr. de Unit. Eccleſ. *Dum conventicula ſibi diverſa conſtituunt, veritatis caput atque originem reliquerunt.* Ibid. *Fidem deſtruit, pro Fide perfidus.* Ibid.

(e) *Schiſma non faciendum, etiamſi in una fide & eadem traditione permaneat qui recedit.* Cypr. Teſtim. l. 3. c. 86.

(f) *Quam verò dilectionem cuſtodit & cogitat, qui diſcordiæ furore veſanus Eccleſiam ſcindit, pacem turbat, charitatem diſſipat.* Cypr. de Unit. Eccleſ. *Arma illa contra Eccleſiam portat.* Ibid.

(g) *Quiſquis ab Eccleſia ſegregatus adultera jungitur, à promiſſis Eccleſiæ ſeparatur.* Cypr. de Unit. Eccleſ. *Habere jam non poteſt Deum patrem, qui Eccleſiam non habet matrem.* Ibid. *Quomodo poteſt ei cum aliquo convenire, cui cum corpore ipſius Eccleſiæ, & cum veſtra Fraternitate non convenit? Quomodo poſſunt duo aut tres in nomine Chriſti colligi, quos conſtat à Chriſto & ab ejus Evangelio ſeparari?* Ibid. *Extra Eccleſiam conſiſtens, & contra pacem & dilectionem Chriſti faciens, inter adverſarios——computetur.* Ep. 76.

(h) Ignat. Ep. ad Eph. *Audet precem alteram illiciris vocibus facere, Dominicæ hoſtiæ veritatem per falſa ſacrificia profanare?* Cypr. de Unit. Eccl. *Unum manifeſtum eſt apud omnes Spiritûs Sancti gratiam non eſſe, nec eorum ſacrificiis poſſe Deo placere, neque ſpiritualis gratiæ ſanctificationem ſacrificiis eorum tribui, qui offerunt ab Eccleſiaſtici corporis unitate diſjuncti, ſolius enim Eccleſiæ Deus delectatur ſacrificiis, quod ſacrificium Deo facit unitas ſpiritualis, ubi pacis tenacitas fraternam ſervat in charitate concordiam.* Fulgent. ad Monim. l. 2.

(i) Chryſ. in Ep. ad Eph. Edit. Savil. p. 823.

(k) *Quis unquam hæreſes inſtituit, niſi qui ſe prius ab Eccleſiæ Catholicæ univerſitate, & antiquitatis conſenſione diſcreverit?* Vincent. c. 34.

(l) *Nullum ſchiſma non ſibi aliquam fingit hæreſim, ut relictâ ab Eccleſia receſſiſſe videatur.* Hieron. ad Tit. c. 3.

(m) *Non eſſe quicquam gravius ſacrilegio ſchiſmatis.* Aug. contra Parmen. l. 2. 2. *Ingens flagitium ſchiſmatis Traditioni junxerunt.* Optat. p. 23. Edit. Caſaub.

(n) Dionyſ. ap. Euſeb. l. 6. c. 42. *Pejus hoc crimen eſt quàm quod admiſiſſe lapſi videtur.* Cypr. de Unit. Eccl.

(o) *Vide* Optatum l. 1. p. 25. *Quod in ſacrilegos & parricidam non fecerat, in ſchiſmaticis fecit.*

(p) *Quàm ſine ſpe ſint, & perditionem ſibi maximam de indignatione Dei acquirant, qui ſchiſma faciunt, declarat in libro Reg. ſcriptura, ubi à tribu Juda & Benjamin decem tribus ſciſſæ ſunt, & indignatus eſt, inquit, Dominus in omne ſemen Iſrael.* Cypr. Ep. 76.

(q) *Addendo autem, civitatem Samaritanorum debere omitti, ubi erant ſchiſmatici, oſtendit ſchiſmaticos Gentilibus adæquari.* Ibid.

(r) *Exemplo Core, Dathan, &c. oſtenditur & probatur obnoxios omnes & culpæ & pœnæ futuros, qui ſe ſchiſmaticis irreligioſâ temeritate miſcuerunt.* Ibid. *Deus quod in ſacrilegos & parricidam non fecerat, [Cain & Nineve] in ſchiſmaticos fecit, Core, &c.* Optat. l. 1. p. 25.

(ſ) *Novatianus nec debet nec poteſt excipi, quo minus ipſe extra Eccleſiam conſiſtens, inter Antichriſtos computetur.* Ibid. *Apparet Antichriſtos omnes eſſe quos conſtet à charitate atque ab unitate Eccleſiæ receſſiſſe.* Ibid. *Videndum quis foras exierit, quis altare contra altare erexerit, quis jaceat ſub ſententia Johannis Apoſtoli, qui dixit multos Antichriſtos foras exituros.* Optat. p. 1. l. 18. *Ab Eccleſia ſeparatus, hæreticus eſt, & Antichriſtus.* Proſper de Prom. & Prædict. implend. c. 5.

(t) Ignat. Ep. ad Smyrnenſ.

(u) *Tales etſi occiſi in confeſſione nominis fuerint, macula iſta nec ſanguine abluitur, inexpiabilis & gravis culpa diſcordiæ nec paſſione purgatur.* Cypr. de Unit. Eccl.

No excuſe for it.

Sect. 7. Much more of this ſubject is every where to be met with in the *Ancient* monuments, and nothing of *alleviation* to be had for any, who have not the (x) *excuſe* of *involuntary ſeduction*, of *errour*, or *ſimplicity* to plead for them, and the ſureſt way to doe that effectually, to *qualifie* them for that plea, is to *forſake* their courſe, to *get out* of ſo *dangerous* a ſnare.

(x) *Cæteri tantùm vel ſimplicitate capti, vel errore inducti, vel aliquâ fallentis aſtutiæ calliditate decepti, à fallaciæ laqueis vos ſolvite.* Cypr. de Unit. Eccl.

(y) *Judicabit ſpiritualis & eos qui ſchiſma operantur, qui propter modicas & quaſlibet cauſas, magnum & glorioſum corpus Chriſti conſcindunt, & dividunt, verè liquantes culicem, & camelum diglutientes.* Irenæus l. 4. c. 62.

Sect. 8. Nay 'tis farther obſervable, how unſafe it hath been deemed by theſe, for (y) *light*, and *inconſiderable* cauſes to break this *unity*, it being in their opinion *very* (z) *hard*, if not *impoſſible* to receive an *injury*, or *provocation* from the *Governours* of the *Church*, as may make a *rupture*, or ſeparation *excuſable*. And for the *Univerſal*, or truly *Catholick Church* of *Chriſt*, it is not, in (a) Saint *Auguſtin's* opinion, *poſſible* that there ſhould be any juſt cauſe for any to *ſeparate* from it, nor conſequently, *Apology* to be made for thoſe, that on any, whether true, or pretended cauſe whatſoever, have *really* incurred this guilt.

(z) *Nulla ab eis tanta poteſt fieri correptio, quanta eſt ſchiſmatis pernicies.* Irenæus l. 4. c. 62. Dionyſ. Alex. Ep. ad Novat. ap. Euſeb. l. 5. c. 28.

(a) *Si poſſunt aliqui (quod fieri non poteſt) habere cauſam juſtam quo communionem ſeparent à communione Orbis terrarum.* Aug. Ep. 48.

Sect. 9. From theſe *premiſſes* thus acknowledged and undeniable, the *concluſion* follows *irrefragably*, that it is not the examination of the *occaſion*, or *cauſe*, or *motive* of any man's *ſchiſm*, that is worth the producing or heeding in this matter; The one thing that is of *force*, and moment, and, by conſequent, pertinent to be enquired into, is the *truth* of the matter of *fact*, whether this charge be ſufficiently *proved* or confeſſed, *i. e.* whether he that is thus *accuſed*, ſtands really guilty of *ſeparation* from the *Church* of *Chriſt*; And this will be a means of *ſhortning* our method, and giving very *moderate* bounds to our enſuing diſcourſe, which will now be regularly finiſhed by making theſe *two inquiries*.

Sect. 10.

Sect. 10. 1. What *Schiſm* is, and how it may be moſt fitly *branched*.
Sect. 11. 2. What *Evidences* are producible againſt the *Church of England*, whereby it may be thought liable to this *guilt*, and withall how it may be cleared from all force of theſe evidences.
Sect. 12. Which when we have done, we ſhall not from the office of *Advocates* proceed to that of the *Accuſer*, or *Judge*, but leave all others, that are under the ſame charge, to their *proper tribunal*, to ſtand or fall, as they ſhall appear able, or not able, upon *firm* grounds, to *maintain*, and *vindicate* their *innocence*.

The parts of the enſuing Tract.

CHAP. II.

What Schiſm is, together with ſome general conſiderations thereon.

Sect. 1. OUR *firſt enquiry* muſt be *what Schiſm* is, in the ſtrict and *proper* notion (as *(a)* diſtinguiſhed from *Hereſie*, the *(b)* introducing of ſome *falſe doctrine* into the *Church*.) And herein there will be no difficulty, the *Origination*, and *univerſal uſe* of the word, *according* and *conſenting* exactly, to give us the importance of it.

(a) *Non attendiſti inter ſchiſmaticos & hæreticos quàm ſit magna diſtantia.* Optat. l. 1. p. 13.

(b) *Inter hæreſim & ſchiſma hoc intereſſe arbitramur, quòd hæreſis perverſum dogma habeat, ſchiſma propter Epiſcopalem diſſenſionem ab Eccleſia pariter ſeparet.* Hieron. ad Tit. c. 3.

Sect. 2. In the *origination* of it from σχίζω, *ſcindi*, it ſignifies literally *ſciſſure*, or *diviſion*, which being a *figurative*, and withall a *relative* word, referring to ſome *body*, which is thus *cut* or *divided*, but that no *natural*, but *political body*, the *Church*, or *Congregation* of *Chriſtians*, the *literal* notation of the word in the *Eccleſiaſtical* uſe, will be ἡ ἑνότητος διαίρεσις, *a diviſion* in or *from the Unity of the Church of Chriſt*. Onely the *form* and *termination* of the word muſt be farther noted, which being not σχίσις from the *active* σχίζω, but σχίσμα from the *paſſive* σχίζομαι, the uſe of ſuch *paſſives* is obſervable, being of the nature (and for want of *conjugations*, deſigned to ſupply the place) of the *Hebrew Hithpael*, and ſo noting *reciprocal action* or *paſſion*, where the *paſſion* is *from*, and *on himſelf*, and is moſt fully expreſſed by the *Latine Neutrals*, which partake both of *active* and *paſſive*, but are ſtrictly neither of them. This might be largely exemplified in the uſe of other words, but the *advantage* of the *obſervation* will not be proportionable to the length of ſuch a *diverſion*, being no more than this, that the diſtinct notion of the word [*Schiſm*] is a *voluntary* dividing, or, in the *neutral* expreſſion, which the *Fathers* familiarly uſe, a *ſeparating*, or *receding* of any member from the *unity* of the *body*, i. e. the *Church* of *Chriſt*, and ſo that the *ſchiſmatick* is he that * *divides himſelf* from the *Church of God*, not that is *cut off*, or *ſeparated*, he that *(c) goes out*, or *(d) withdraws*, or *recedes* of his own accord, not he that *is caſt out* by the *Governours* of the *Church*. For whatever *blame*, and vengeance may juſtly light on ſuch, who are by the *righteous*, and *charitative Cenſures* of the *Church*, *cut off* from *communion*, in caſe they do not by *humiliation*, *confeſſion* and *reformation*, and *meet fruits* of *repentance*, prepare and qualifie themſelves for *readmiſſion* to that *Communion*, yet certainly this puniſhment of *Excommunication* is very diſparate and diſtant from the *crime* of *ſchiſm*, the *Judge*, i. e. *Biſhop* or *Governour* of the *Church*, being the onely *actour* in the one, (and that *ex officio*, an act of *duty* in him, when duly executed) but in the other, the *offender*, or guilty perſon, who is therefore ſaid to *(e) accuſe*, to *caſt*, to *(f) condemn himſelf*, throwing himſelf, by his *voluntary receſſion* from the *Church*, into that very condition, into which the *adulterer*, and *obſtinate* offender is caſt by the *Cenſures* of it.

The Original of the word *Schiſm*.

Reciprocal paſſion noted by the word.

Schiſm a voluntary receſſion.
* ἀποδιορίζοντες ἑαυτούς, Jude 19.
Excommunication no Schiſm.
(c) ἐξ ἡμῶν ἐξῆλθαν, 1 John 2. 19.
(d) ἐὰν ὑποστείληται, Heb. 10. 38.
(e) ἑαυτὸν ἀποπέσηται. Concil. Laod. Can. 40.

(f) *Propriæ conſcientiæ videtur eſſe damnatio, cùm quiſpiam ſuo arbitrio ab Eccleſia receſſerit.* Hieron. Αὐτὸς καθ' ἑαυτὸν ὁ καταδικὴς ἑαυτῷ ἐπιφωνήσει κρίσιν. Cod. Can. Afric. Can. 22.

Sect. 3. This is ſo evident a truth, that this *puniſhment*, and ſo *judicial* act, of the *Governour*, cannot be the *guilt* of him that is *puniſhed*, and though it be ſuppoſed to be founded in ſome *offence*, is not yet in any propriety of ſpeech the *offence* it ſelf, much leſs the *ſin* of *ſchiſm*, eſpecially when he is *puniſhed* for *hereſie*, or ſome other crime, and not for *ſchiſm*, that I need not farther inſiſt on it. Onely, as beſide the formal καθαίρεσις, there is alſo an *interpretative excommunication*, when he that is not under the *Cenſures* of the *Church*, is yet refuſed *admiſſion*, or reception unto it, unleſs he will ſubmit to ſuch and ſuch *conditions*, indiſpenſably propoſed to him, and becauſe both in the one, and the other, in the *formal*, and in the *interpretative excommunication*, the *Governours*, being men, may poſſibly *err*, and conſequently *cenſure*, and *excommunicate* the *innocent*, and in like manner propoſe thoſe *conditions* of *communion* which are not *lawfull* for that man to ſubmit unto, ſo it is poſſible in both caſes, that the perſon excluded may be abſolutely *innocent*, free not onely from that of *ſchiſm*, but from all other guilt, ſo that he which is *excommunicated* may not be obliged to regain the *peace*, nor he that is barred out, to force his *paſſage* into the *communion* of the *Church*, and ſo both ſorts of theſe, continuing out of the *actual communion*, neither the one nor the other be guilty of *ſchiſm* in the leaſt degree by ſo continuing.

Interpretative Excommunication.

Continuance out of actual Communion, without Schiſm.

Sect. 4. He that is *excommunicated unjuſtly*, cannot be rendred *criminous* by that *misfortune*, nor concluded *culpable* by that argument, upon which he is ſuppoſed *innocent*. Our *Saviour* hath pronounced of the *anathema's* of the *Jews*, of their bittereſt *execrations*, their πᾶν πονηρὸν ῥῆμα, their *ſharpeſt cenſures* nay the ἀποσυναγωγία, caſting *men out of the Synagogue*, *falſely* or *unjuſtly*, that it is to be looked on as a moſt *auſpicious* token, a matter of the greateſt *rejoicing* to them which fell under it, one of the principal *ingredients*

Unjuſt excommunication hurts no man.

dients in, and *forerunners* of their bliſs; (and accordingly the *Apoſtles* when they were thus *caſt out*, and *contumeliouſly* uſed, *went out of the Temple rejoicing that they were thought worthy to ſuffer ſhame for Chriſt's name.*) To which purpoſe is that of *Photius Patriarch* of *Conſtantinople* to *Michael Metropolitan* of *Mitylene*, *Ep.* 116. Ὥσπερ τοὺ τὴν διαβόητα μαθητὰς τὸ μισοχρίστον ἐκεῖνο Ἰουδαίων συνέδριον ἀποσυναγώγους ποιήσαντες, ἐκείνους μᾶλλον τῷ διδασκάλῳ καὶ δεσπότῃ προσηνέωσαν, ἑαυτοὺ δὲ τέλεον τῆς θείας μυσταγωγίας καὶ τῶν ἁγίων βασιλείας ἀλλοτριώσαν, ὅπου καὶ νῦν, &c. *The excommunication of the Jewiſh Sanhedrim ſent out againſt Chriſt's diſciples brought them ſo much nearer to their Lord and Maſter, and alien'd the Jews themſelves, removed them ſo much farther from the kingdom of heaven, and ſo doth all unjuſt excommunication now unite us to the Apoſtles by this conformity with and participation of their ſufferings.* And I ſuppoſe the *arguments*, and *teſtimonies* produced by the *Chancellour* of *Paris* are (and, when they were firſt publiſhed, were ſo deemed by thoſe of the *Romiſh* communion) unanſwerable to this matter; And accordingly that of *Thomas de Curſelis* in the *Council* of *Baſil*, that it *was* [a] *ſaid by Chriſt to the Pope, Whatſoever thou ſhalt bind on earth ſhall be bound, not whatſoever thou ſhalt affirm to be bound,*] hath with it the evidence of undeniable truth, equally applicable to him and all *Biſhops* in that and in all future ages.

[a] *Papæ à Chriſto dictum, Quicquid ligaveris ſuper terram, erit ligatum, non quicquid dixeris eſſe ligatum.* Jacob. Angularis in Ep. ad Weſſelum ap. Goldaſt. l. 1. p. 575.

Which holds in the Interpretative Excommunication.

Sect. 5. And then certainly what hath thus been ſaid of the *Formal*, will with the ſame evidence be extended alſo to the *Interpretative excommunication*, whenſoever the *conditions* of the *communion* contain in them any *ſin*, and ſo become as the former *cenſures* were ſuppoſed to be; For in that caſe certainly it is no act of *Schiſm* from any *Church*, for any *member* to be, or to continue thus *excluded* from it. For how *deſirable* and valuable ſoever an *intire*, *inviolate peace* with *all Chriſtians*, with *all men*, (together with the approbation of our willing, chearfull *obedience*, and *ſubmiſſion* of our *judgments* and *practices*, to our *ſuperiours*) muſt for ever be deemed by all true *diſciples* of *Chriſt*, Yet muſt not the *purchaſe* of this *treaſure* be attempted by the admiſſion of any *ſin*, any more than the *glory of God* might be projected by the *Apoſtle's lie*. The leaſt tranſgreſſion of *God's Law* muſt not be adventured on upon any the moſt *Chriſtian deſign*, or conſideration; The *peaceable* living with *all men*, which is ſo often exhorted to, and inculcated, is yet no farther recommended, than εἰ δυνατὸν and ὅσον ἐφ' ὑμῖν, *if it be poſſible*, and *as much as in us lies*, and that, we know, muſt be interpreted of a *moral* and *legal poſſibility*, by which we are pronounced *able* to doe that (and no more) which we can doe *lawfully*: and ſo when the *Apoſtle* 1 *Theſſ.* 4. 11. exhorts to the moſt *earneſt purſuit* of this *bliſsfull* ſtate, (this *eaſe*, and *reſt*, and *quiet* from the *labours*, and *toils* and *hell* of the *factious*, turbulent ſpirit) it is in a ſtyle, which ſuppoſes this *reſerve*, we muſt, ſaith he, φιλοτιμεῖσθαι ἡσυχάζειν, *have an ambition*, and *emulation*, and *contention to live peaceably*, *and quietly*, obliging us to uſe all means that would be *allowed* to the *ambitious* perſon in his *warmeſt* purſuit, *i. e.* the *utmoſt lawfull*, but not the *loweſt unlawfull* means.

Mr. *Knots* conceſſion in this matter. *c.* 7. *p.* 471, 472.

Sect. 6. In which matter it is remarkable what courſe hath been taken by the *late authour of Infidelity unmasked, in his diſcourſe of the Schiſm of Proteſtants*, where having acknowledged how perfectly *unlawfull* it is to *diſſemble*, *equivocate*, or *lie* in the matters of *faith*——and withall urging from all *antiquity*, that to forſake the *external communion* of *God's viſible Church* is the *ſin* of *ſchiſm*, he makes a ſhift to *conclude* (as a natural conſequence) from hence, that therefore the *Church* (I ſuppoſe he means, of *Rome*) *is infallible*, and not *ſubject to errour*, becauſe otherwiſe men might *forſake her communion*——where though the *conſequence* be very ſtrange, that we may forſake the *Churches communion*, in caſe ſhe be *fallible* or *ſubject* to *errour*, (for this ſuppoſes it *lawfull*, 1. to *forſake* the *communion* of any *erroneous Church*, which is much more than we would deſire to be granted us, and 2. to *forſake* all that are *fallible*, though they be not *actually* in *errour*, which is in effect to forſake the *communion* of all but *Saints*, and *Angels*, and *God* in *heaven*, for they onely have the *privilege* of *impeccable* and *infallible*) yet it abſolutely acknowledges that it would be *lawfull* to *ſeparate* from, and *forſake* the (even *univerſal*) *Church of Chriſt*, in caſe, or on ſuppoſition that we could not be permitted to *communicate* with it, without *lying*, and *diſſembling*, and *equivocating* in matters of *faith*, which he there acknowledges to be the *denying God on earth*.

Severe conditions of ſome Churches Communion.

Sect. 7. Now (to return to our preſent conſideration) of this there is no queſtion, but that, as it is ſaid to be cuſtomary among the *Kings* of the *Hunnes* (as ſoon as they have any *children*, and ſo no *need* of their *brethrens* aſſiſtence) to baniſh all their *brethren* out of their *dominions*, and not to admit them again without *putting out their eyes*, (ἐκ ἔτι ἄλλως ἢ ὅτι τὰ χῶρας διατεῖλαι αὐτοῖς ξυγχωρεῖν, ἀλλ' ἢ τὰς ὄψεις ἐκκαυθῆναι, ſaith *Cinnamus*, *Hiſt. l.* 1.) ſo it is *poſſible* (I wiſh it were not juſtly *ſuppoſable*) for a *particular Church* ſo to *fence*, and *limit*, to *guard*, and *reſtrain* their *communion*, to require ſuch ſevere *conditions* of all whom they will *admit*, or tolerate within their *Church*, that ſome men cannot without *putting out* their *eyes*, or wilfull *acknowledgment* of *untruths*, others without *committing ſin* againſt *conſcience*, undergo the *conditions* thus required, nor conſequently be *admitted* to *communion* with it. As in caſe any unſound or *untrue* poſition be entred into the *Confeſſion*, or *Catechiſm* of any *Church*, and all the members of that *communion* be *explicitely* required to *believe*, and acknowledge the *truth* of every branch of that *Confeſſion*, and ſo that *confeſſion* be really the *condition*, and accordingly in the reputation of men eſteemed the *teſſera* or *ſymbol* of that *communion*, then he that ſhall enter this *communion* thus conditionated, muſt certainly either *actualy ſubſcribe*, or (which, as to the *ſcandal* of the action, is *equivalent*) be reaſonably *ſuppoſed* to acknowledge that *untruth*; and if in ſome perſons *blameleſs ignorance* may be ſuppoſed ſufficient for the *excuſing*, or alleviating that fault, yet 1. he that hath *means* of *diſcovering* that *untruth*, and criminouſly neglects to make uſe of thoſe *means*, and 2. he that *hath* diſcovered the truth, and yet *profeſſeth* himſelf to believe the *contrary*, will not be thus *excuſable*; And it is not here ſufficient to object the ſuppoſable *levity* of the *errour*, or intellectual falſity, For how *light*, and inconſiderable (and *extrinſecal* to the *foundation*) ſoever the *errour* be ſuppoſed to be, yet if there be *obſtinacy* in continuing in it againſt *light* and *conviction*, or if there be *falſeneſs* in *profeſſing*, or ſubſcribing, contrary to *preſent* perſwaſions, or *ſcandal* and ill example, *temptation* and ſnare to others, in *ſeeming* to doe ſo; theſe certainly are *ſins*, and neither *light* nor *inconſiderable*, nor *reconcileable* with that fabrick of *Chriſtian* practice, which ought to be *ſuperſtructed* on that *foundation*.

Make Communion with them impoſſible. Such are preſcribing ſubſcription of errours.

Sect. 8.

Sect. 8. Nay, if the *errours* be really on the other ſide, if the *doctrines* ſo propoſed, as the *condition* of the *communion* of any *Church*, be indeed agreeable to *truth*, but yet be really apprehended by him, to whom they are thus propoſed, to be *falſe*, and *diſagreeable*, it will even in that caſe be hard to affirm that that man may *lawfully* thus *ſubſcribe*, contrary to his preſent *perſwaſions*; For though it be certain, that he that thus *errs*, be obliged to uſe all probable means to *reform*, and depoſite his errour, and, as long as he remains in it, is ſo far *guilty* of *ſin*, as he wants the *excuſe* of *invincible ignorance*, and being obliged to *charity* and *peace*, as far *as it is poſſible*, *and in him lies*, he cannot be freed from *offending* againſt that *obligation*, if he do not *communicate* with thoſe, the *condition* of whoſe *communion* contains nothing really *erroneous*, or ſinfull; and ſo though ſuch a man, on that ſide, be, or may be in ſeveral reſpects *criminous*, yet it is as evident on the other ſide, that he that *profeſſes* to *believe*, what he *really* doth *not* believe, that *ſubſcribes* with his *hand*, what he *rejects* in his *heart*, or that doeth that which is under the *ſcandal* of doing ſo, is far from being *guiltleſs*, he certainly *offends* againſt the *precept* of *ſincerity* and *veracity* (yea and of *charity* to his *brethren*, in reſpect of the *ſcandal*) hath added *hypocriſie* to his *errour*, and ſo which way ſoever he turns, he is ſure to *ſin* (the *worſt* and moſt *unhappy* kind of ſtrait) he remains in *errour*, and *ſchiſm* on the one ſide, and by flying from that, he advances to *lying* and *hypocriſie* on the other, and the deſire of *avoiding* one of theſe, cannot *juſtifie* the other. or Profeſſion againſt Conſcience.

Sect. 9. This I ſay, in caſe the *errour* be really on the *man's*, not on the *Churches* ſide; But if (as in the caſe propoſed) the *errours* be ſuppoſed to be wholly on the *Churches* ſide, and withall *indiſpenſably* required to be *ſubſcribed* by all, and ſo the *conditions* of that *communion* being exacted of him, who cannot without ſin undertake them, be to him *really*, and *unexcuſably unlawfull*, then certainly to that man in that caſe it is no *crime* not to *communicate* (when he is thus *excluded* from *communicating*) with that *Church*, but a *crime*, and a great one, thus (by *teſtifying* againſt the *truth* and his own *conſcience*) to qualifie himſelf for that *communion*. The admiſſion of ſuch guilts as theſe, *hypocriſie*, and *lying* againſt *conſcience*, and due grounds of *conviction*, is too high a *price* to be paid even for *peace*, or *communion* it ſelf.

Sect. 10. A *meek* ſon of the *Church* of *Chriſt* will certainly be content to *ſacrifice* a great deal for the making of this *purchaſe*, and when the *fundamentals* of the *Faith*, and *ſuperſtructures* of *Chriſtian practice* are not concerned in the *conceſſions*, he will chearfully expreſs his readineſs to *ſubmit*, or *depoſite* his *own* judgment in *reverence* and *deference* to his *ſuperiours* in the *Church* where his *lot* is fallen. But when this proves *inſufficient*, when *peace* with the *brethren* on *earth* will not be had at a cheaper rate than this of a *voluntary* offending againſt *our father* which is *in heaven*; in this caſe, the *Chriſtian* muſt be content to live without it, and though he would rejoice to *ſell all that he hath* to *purchaſe* that *jewel*, yet his *conſcience*, the *health* and *peace* of that (which is *interrupted* by every *wilfull ſin*) is a commodity, that muſt not be *parted* with, whatſoever the *acquiſition* be, which is in his view and thus offers it ſelf in *exchange* for it.

Sect. 11. The *evidence* of which is, I conceive, ſo *demonſtrative* and irreſiſtible, that it will be juſtly *extended* much farther than the preſent caſe of the *Church* of *England* gives me any temptation to extend it; For in caſe our *Anceſtours* had *unjuſtly* and *criminouſly* made a *ſeparation* from the *Church* of *Rome* (which it ſhall anon appear that they have not) and we their *ſucceſſours* in that *ſchiſm* ſhould unfeignedly *confeſs*, and *repent*, and deſire to *reform* that *ſin*, and uprightly diſcharge our *conſcience* in neglecting no means, that *patience*, *humility*, *charity* could ſuggeſt to us in order to obtaining our *reconciliation*, yet if that cannot be obtained by all theſe *ſubmiſſions* without that harder *condition* of *renouncing*, or *profeſſing*, or ſeeming (in *common reputation* of men) to renounce any part of *Divine truth*, or *Chriſtian practice*, which we verily believe to be the *truth*, and our duty, it would not be our *guilt*, but onely our *unhappineſs*, that we were thus *forced* to continue in that *ſeparation*. The *reaſon* is evident from the former grounds, we muſt not ſin, that we may *give glory to God* (ſuch is *confeſſion*, and *fruits* of *repentance*, *Joſ.* 7. 19.) a *penitent thief* muſt not *lie*, to enable himſelf to make *reſtitution*, nor the *contrite ſchiſmatick* commit any *new ſin* (ſuch certainly is *hypocriſie*, *lying*, *profeſſing* contrary to *preſent* perſwaſion) to complete his *repentance* for the *old*. Application to the Church of *Rome*; in relation to the preſent Church of *England*.

Sect. 12. If this laſt be conceived (as it is not the preſent caſe of the *Church* of *England*, ſo) to be an *impoſſible*, *unſuppoſable* caſe, not onely upon the *Romaniſts* grounds, who I preſume will not acknowledge any ſuch *hard condition* (as is the *profeſſion* of an *untruth*) to be required to any man's *reconciliation*, and readmiſſion to their *communion*, but upon this other ſcore, becauſe if any *falſe profeſſion* be now required to our *readmiſſion*, the ſame was formerly required to our continuance in their *communion*, and conſequently our *Anceſtours* departure then could not be ſuppoſed (as in this laſt *fiction* of caſe it is) a *ſchiſmatical* departure: I ſhall not need to give any more diſtinct *anſwer* to this, than 1. That we that acknowledge not the *Church* of *Rome* to be *infallible*, may be allowed to make a *ſuppoſition*, which is founded in the *poſſibility* of her inſerting ſome *errour* in her *Confeſſions*, and making the explicite acknowledgment of that the peremptory indiſpenſable *condition* of her *communion*; 2. That it is *poſſible* alſo (though not by us pretended) that ſhe ſhould ſince that ſuppoſed *departure* of our *Anceſtours*, introduce ſome *new doctrines*, and conſequently ſome *new errours*, and thoſe now be ſuppoſable to lie in the *way* to our return, though they had no part (before their *birth*) in *driving* us from them; 3. That that may be by the *Church* of *Rome* permitted, and *allowed* to thoſe that have always *remained* in their *communion*, which to them that have *departed*, and either in their *perſons*, or poſterity, deſire to *return* to it, will not be permitted by them; It being more ordinary to indulge *liberties* to *ſons*, that have always *continued* in the *family*, than to grant them to *offenders*, and ſuppliants, that expect *favours*, and *graces*, and *reſtauration* to *privileges*; 4. That thoſe which have had their *education* out of the *Communion* of the *Church* of *Rome*, may very poſſibly and probably come to *diſcern* that, which in that *communion* would never have been (for want of *repreſentation*) diſcerned by them, and conſequently may obſerve ſome *errours* in her *doctrine* or *practice*, which their *Anceſtours* at their very *departure* from them had not diſcerned, and then though thoſe *errours* *ſubſcribed* to by them, had the *Lenitive*, or *Antidote* of *blameleſs ignorance*, yet becauſe thoſe that now really diſcern that *truth*, which their *Anceſtours* diſcerned not, cannot lawfully profeſs *not* to *diſcern* it, or *profeſs* againſt *conſcience* to *believe* what they do *not* believe, it is therefore neceſſarily conſequent, that the *return* of ſuch to the *peace* of the *Roman Church* may by this means be rendred *impoſſible* though *their Anceſtours* continuance there, lying under no ſuch *prejudice*, their *ſeparation* were acknowledged *unlawfull*.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

The ſeveral ſorts of Schiſm.

Sect. 1. THus much hath been neceſſarily *premiſed* for the true notion of *Schiſm*, taken from the *origination* of the word, as that includes, in the *neuter* ſenſe, a *receſſion*, or *departure*; in the *reciprocal*, a *ſeparating*, or dividing *himſelf*.

Sect. 2. It is now time to proceed and inquire how many *ſorts* there are of this *ſchiſm* in the *Eccleſiaſtical* ſenſe, or by how many ways the *guilt* of this *ſin* of the *fleſh* may be contracted.

Unity Eccleſiaſtical wherein it conſiſts.

Sect. 3. In which inquiry it will be firſt neceſſary to conſider, wherein *Eccleſiaſtical unity* conſiſts, *viz.* in the *preſerving* all thoſe *relations*, wherein each *member* of the *whole Church* of *Chriſt* is concerned one towards another: Theſe *relations* are either of *ſubordination* (*paternal* on one ſide, and *filial* on the other,) or of *equality* (*fraternal.*) The *unity* of thoſe members that are *ſubordinate* one to the other, conſiſts in the conſtant due *ſubjection*, and *obedience* of all *inferiours* to all their *lawfull ſuperiours*, and in due exerciſe of *authority* in the *ſuperiours* toward all committed to their charge: And the unity of the *fellow brethren*, in the performance of all *mutual* duties of *juſtice* and *charity* toward one another.

Unity of Members ſubordinate.

Of fellow brethren.

Sect. 4. Of the *former* ſort is the πείθεσθε ἡγουμένοις, *obedience to the Rulers of the Church*, *Heb.* 13. 17. and back again the ποιμάνατε, due *feeding*, i. e. *governing the flock of God* among them, 1 *Pet.* 5. 2. And becauſe there be (under the *King* or *Emperour*, or *ſupreme power*, to whom *all* are *ſubject* in any his *dominions*) many poſſible *links* in that *ſubordination*, *Patriarchs*, *Metropolitans*, *Biſhops*, *Presbyters*, *Deacons*, and the *brethren*, or *congregation*, the *unity* muſt be made up of the due *ſubordination*, and *Chriſtian*, i. e. *charitative* exerciſe of *power* in *all* theſe.

The later.

Sect. 5. Of the *later* ſort there are as many *branches*, as there are varieties of *equalities*. The *brethren* or *believers* in every *congregation*, i. e. all beſide the *Governours* of the *Church* (however *unequal* in other reſpects) are in this reſpect *equalized*, and comprehended all under the one title of νεώτεροι the *younger*, 1 *Pet.* 5. 5. And this whether we reſpect all other *fellow-members* of the *ſame*, or whether of any *other* congregation, whether *Pariſh* or *City*, or *Dioceſe*, or *Province*, or *Nation*, of the *Weſt*, of the *Eaſt*, of the *whole Chriſtian* world, as far as each *member* is qualified to exerciſe any *fraternal* duty toward them. So again the ſeveral *Deacons* or *Presbyters* of any *Dioceſe*, the ſeveral *Biſhops* of any *Province*, the ſeveral *Metropolitans* of any *Nation*, the ſeveral *Primates* or *Patriarchs* one with another (as the ſeveral *Apoſtles*) over the *whole world*, are each of them to be looked on as *equals* to all others of the ſame ſort; And proportionably (and together with the *Paſtours*) the *flocks*, the ſeveral *communities*, or congregations of *Chriſtian* men conſidered *in complexo*, the *Pariſhes*, *Dioceſes*, *Provinces*, *Nations*, *Climes* of the whole *Chriſtian* world. And according to theſe ſo many *equalities*, there are, or ought to be ſo many ſorts of *unities*, ſo many *Relations* of that *mutual fraternal charity*, which *Chriſt* came to plant in his *Church*.

Communion.

Sect. 6. Having ſeen what the *unity* is (to which *Communion* ſuperadds no more but the *relation* of *external aſſociation*, whether by *aſſembling* for the *worſhip* of *God* in the *ſame* place, where the matter is capable of it, or whether by *letters communicatory*, by which we may maintain *external communion* with thoſe which are moſt *diſtant* from us) it will be eaſie to diſcern what *Schiſm* is, *viz.* the *breach* of that *Unity* (and *Communion*) and what be the *ſorts* or *ſpecies* of it, either thoſe that offend againſt the *ſubordination* which *Chriſt* hath by *himſelf*, and his *Apoſtles*, ſettled in his *Church*, or thoſe that offend againſt the *mutual charity*, which he left among his *diſciples*.

The branches of Schiſm as it is an offence againſt Subordination.

Schiſm againſt the Deacons or Presbyters.

Sect. 7. For the firſt of theſe, thoſe that offend againſt the due *ſubordination*, they are poſſibly of as many ſorts as there be *diſtinct links* in the *ſubordination*. As firſt thoſe *brethren* or *people*, which reject the *miniſtery* of the *Deacons*, or *Presbyters* in any thing wherein they are *ordained*, and appointed by the *Biſhop*, (and as long as they continue in *obedience* to him) and of their own accord break off, and *ſeparate* from them, refuſe to live regularly under them, they are by the *Ancient Church* of *Chriſt* adjudged and looked on as *Schiſmaticks*; So *Ignatius* the *holy Biſhop*, (and *Apoſtolical* perſon) and *Martyr of Antioch*, in *Ep. ad Trall.* admoniſhing them to *beware of the poiſon of ſeducers*, i. e. the *Schiſmaticks* of thoſe times, he directs them this one way to doe it. Τοῦτο ἔστω ὑμῖν μὴ φυσιοῦσθαι, καὶ ἦτε ἀκέραιοι ἀπὸ Θεοῦ, Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ τοῦ Ἐπισκόπου——Ὁ ἐντὸς θυσιαστηρίου ὢν καθαρός ἐστιν, τουτ' ἔστιν, ὁ χωρὶς Ἐπισκόπου καὶ πρεσβυτερίου καὶ διακόνων ποιέων τι, οὗτος ἁγνὸς οὐκ ἔστι τῇ συνειδήσει, *This ye ſhall doe*, ſaith he, *if ye be not puffed up, and if ye be not ſeparated from God, from Chriſt, from the Biſhop*——*He that continues within the ſept is pure, He that doeth ought without the Biſhop and Presbytery and Deacon, is not of a pure conſcience*, accounting all that live out of this *obedience* to be ſo far infected and defiled with *ſchiſm*. So again in the former part of the ſame *Epiſtle*, Πάντες ἐντρεπέσθωσαν τοὺς διακόνους ὡς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὡς καὶ τὸν Ἐπίσκοπον ὡς Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ὄντα υἱὸν τοῦ παλεός, τοὺς δὲ πρεσβυτέρους ὡς Συνέδριον Θεοῦ, καὶ ὡς Συνδρομὴν Ἀποστόλων, χωρὶς τούτων Ἐκκλησία οὐ καλεῖται, *Let all revere the Deacons as the Miniſters of Jeſus Chriſt, and in like manner the Biſhop as Jeſus Chriſt the ſon of the Father, the Presbyters as the Senate of God and College of Apoſtles, without theſe it is not called a Church.* Where every particular *Church* being adminiſtred by theſe, no man is farther deemed a *member* of the *Church*, than he lives regularly within this *obedience*: And the ſame is the importance of his exhortation to the *Philippians*, Τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ προσέχετε, καὶ τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ, καὶ διακόνοις, *Obſerve the Biſhop, and the Presbyters, and the Deacons*, intimating this to be the onely way of preſerving *unity* againſt *ſchiſm*, as appears by that which had gone before, Εἷς θυσιαστήριον, ὡς εἷς ἐπίσκοπος, ἅμα τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ, καὶ διακόνοις——ἵνα ὃ ἐὰν ποιῆτε κατὰ Θεὸν πράσσητε, *There is one altar (or ſept) as there is one Biſhop together with his Presbyters and Deacons, and the living in union with, obedience to thoſe, is the onely way to doe, whatſoever ye doe, according to the will of God.* Where this *ſubordination* being looked on, as that which is placed in the *Church* by *God*, it is both *ſchiſm* and *impiety* not to continue *regularly* under it; And ſo in the *inſcription* of that *Epiſtle*, ἣν ἁγιάζομαι ἐν αἵματι Χριστοῦ, μάλιστα ἐὰν ὦσιν ἑνὶ ὄντες, σὺν τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ καὶ τοῖς σὺν αὐτῷ πρεσβυτέροις

βυτίεσθε ἐν ἑνὶ σώματι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, *He salutes them in the blood of Christ, especially if they be at one with their Bishop, and the Presbyters with him, as also the Deacons designed by the appointment of Jesus Christ*, looking upon all as *Schismaticks*, that were not so. Thus again in his *Epistle* to the *Ephesians*, he admonisheth them to *obey the Bishop, and Presbyters ἀδιασπάστῳ διανοίᾳ with an undivided mind*, making the *disobedience* an act of *schism* or *division* in any; And so generally throughout all those Epistles.

Sect. 8. In like manner; if we ascend to the *next higher link*, that of the *Bishop*, to whom both *Presbyters* and *Deacons*, as well as the *brethren*, or people, are obliged to live in *obedience*, the withdrawing or denying this *obedience* in any of these will certainly fall under this *guilt*. So the same *holy Ignatius* in *Ep. ad Smyr.* Μηδεὶς χωρὶς τοῦ ἐπισκόπου τι τῶν ἀναγκόντων εἰς ἐκκλησίαν, *Let no man without the Bishop doe any of those things which belong to the Church.* Ὅπου ἂν φανῇ ὁ ἐπίσκοπος, ἐκεῖ τὸ πλῆθος ἔστω, *Wherever the Bishop appears, there let the multitude be*, ὁ λάθρα ἐπισκόπου τι πράσσων, τῷ διαβόλῳ λατρεύει, *he that doeth any thing without the privity of the Bishop serves the Devil*; the title by which those foul *Gnostick hereticks* and *schismaticks* (the κατατομή, the *troublers* and *dividers* of the *Church*) were signified. So in the process of that *Epistle*, having mentioned *obedience* to their *Bishop*, as a necessary requisite to their *sanctification*, supposing the contrary to be an act of *pollution*, i. e. of the *poyson* of the *schismaticks*, and again admonishing them as of their duty (πρέπει οὖν ζωπυρεῖν τῇ ἐπισκόπου γνώμῃ) to *concur with the sentence of their Bishop*, he adds, *that he that doth not* so (expressed by *not* being *within the altar or sept*) ὑστερεῖται τοῦ ἄρτου τοῦ Θεοῦ, *falls short of the bread of God*, is an *excommunicate person*, being rendred such by this act of *division* from the *Bishop*. So in the *Epistle* to the *Magnesians*, speaking of those that *act without* the *Bishop* (χωρὶς αὐτοῦ πάντα πράσσουσι) εἰ πιστοί, saith he, οὐκ εὐσυνείδητοί μοι εἶσι) συνάγονται μὴ ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ κατὰ ἐντολήν ζωοποιοῦσαν, *these seem not to him to be men of a good conscience* (the phrase by which he oft expresses *Schismaticks*, whose *mind and conscience was defiled* by the *poyson* of the *Gnosticks* at that time) *because they assembled not according to that order and establishment which was settled in the Church.* And again, *as Christ did nothing without his Father* (ἡνωμένος ὢν) *being united to him, or all one with his Father*, ἵνα μηδὲν ὑμεῖς ἄνευ ἐπισκόπου ——— *so neither must ye doe any thing without the Bishop*, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ μία προσευχὴ, *but assemble together and have but one prayer common to you all*, where the living out of this *regular obedience* to the *Bishop*, is the contrary to *union* and *communion*, and so is formally *schism*. And to the *Philadelphians*, ὅσοι θεοῦ εἰσιν καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἅτινα μετὰ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου εἰσίν, *as many as are God's and Christ's, are with the Bishop*, excluding them from the *unity* of *Christ's body* who are thus *separated* from the *Bishop*; And in the same *Epistle* speaking of the *repentance* of *schismaticks*, and *hereticks*, and *God's pardon* offered to such, the [a] *condition* of that *pardon*, and κριτήριον of the *sincerity* of that *repentance*, is, ἐὰν μετανοήσουσιν εἰς ἑνότητα Θεοῦ καὶ συνέδριον τοῦ ἐπισκόπου, *if they return to the unity of God and Senate of the Bishop.* So frequently in Saint *Cyprian*, the *schism* especially of the *five Presbyters* of *Faliciſſimus* his *faction*, *Ep.* 40. appears to consist in their *disobedience* to, and *breaking off* from their [b] *proper Bishop*, and *causing others to do so*; and *De Unit. Eccl.* the *schismatick* is described to be *filius impius qui contemptis Episcopis & Dei Sacerdotibus derelictis, constituere audet aliud altare, an impious son, which having contemned the Bishops, and* (which is all one) *forsaken the Priests of God, dares constitute another altar*; and *Ep.* 76. *qui schisma faciunt & relicto Episcopo alium sibi foris Pseudo-episcopum constituunt, the schismaticks are they that having left their Bishop set up for themselves abroad another false Bishop, and all their adherents are involved in the same guilt, qui se schismaticis contra Præpositos & Sacerdotes irreligiosâ temeritate miscuerunt, who joyn with the schismaticks against their Bishops,* and *Ep.* 65. *Hi sunt conatus schismaticorum ——— ut sibi placeant, ut Præpositum superbo tumore contemnant, These are the endeavours of schismaticks, that they may please themselves, and proudly contemn their Bishop*, and *Ep.* 69. *Unum scire debes ——— si quis cum Episcopo non sit, in Ecclesiâ non esse, One thing you are to know, that he that is not with the Bishop, is not in the Church*, the *Church* being there by him defined *plebs Sacerdoti adunata & Pastori suo grex adhærens, the people united to the Bishop, and the flock to their Pastour.*

Against the Bishop.

[a] Πᾶσιν μετανοοῦσιν δῴη ὁ Κύριος.

[b] *Contra Episcopatum meum, &c. Ep.* 40. *Hi tribuebant, ne concordarent cum Episcopo suo.* Ibid. *contra Sacerdotium Dei portionem ruptæ fraternitatis armare voluisse.* And so *Optatus*, of *Parmenian* the *Donatist*, &c. *Quia collegium Episcopale nolunt habere nobiscum commune, non sint collegæ si nolunt.* l. 1.

Sect. 9. And as this disobedience may be of *two* sorts, either of a *lower*, or of a *higher* kind, the denying *obedience* in any particular *lawfull command* of the *superiour*, or the *casting* off all *obedience* together, *dethroning* them or *setting* up our selves either in their *steads*, or in *opposition* to them (the first *parallel* to the *contumacy* of the *Levites*, *the sons of Eliab*, *Num.* 16. 12. 14. which said, *We will not come up*; the *second*, to their *rebellion*, *levelling* and equalling themselves to *Moses and Aaron*, ver. 3. and both together subjecting them first to that *curse*, of *God's* not *accepting their sacrifice*, ver. 15. and then to that sudden *exemplary destruction*, ver. 31.) so will the *schism* be also a *lighter*, and a *grosser separation*, a *defection* from the *Bishop*, and a *rebellion* against him, the *former* ordinarily called σχίσμα *schism*, the latter στάσις *sedition*, the latter adding very much to the guilt of the former, and uncapable of the alleviating *excuses* of *ignorance* or mistake (in thinking the *commands unlawfull*, and consequently the *obedience*) which may be pretended in the former.

This of a lighter and a grosser sort.

Sect. 10. From this of *Bishops* we may farther ascend to the *higher dignity*, and *authority* of *Metropolitans*, over *Bishops* themselves, which what it is, will be fit to be examined a while.

Against the Metropolitan.

Sect. 11. And the first rise may be taken from *Scripture* it self, where the *Commission* which is given to *Titus* by S. *Paul*, to *ordain* Elders, *Tit.* 1. 5. (that is *Bishops*, *ver.* 7.) *in every City* of *Crete*, demonstrates him to have had *Metropolitical authority* bestowed on him; so saith S. *Chrysostome* (on *Tit.* 1. *Hom.* 1.) of *Titus*, εἰ μὴ δόκιμος ἦν, οὐκ ἂν αὐτῷ τὸ νῆσον ὁλόκληρον ἐπέτρεψεν, οὐκ ἂν τὰ ἐλλιπῆ ἐᾶτα ἀναπληρῶσαι προσέταξεν, οὐκ ἂν τοσούτων ἐπισκόπων κεῖσιν ἐπέτρεψεν, *If he had not been an approved person, in whom the Apostle had perfect confidence, he would never have committed a whole Island to him, never have appointed him to perfect what he had left imperfect, never have intrusted to him the jurisdiction over so many Bishops:* And *Theodoret in Arg. Ep. ad Tit.* That *Titus* was *ordained by* S. *Paul*, Τῆς Κρήτης μητρόπολις ὕστις τοῦ τότε αὐτὸν ἐπισκόπους χειροτονῆσαι, *to ordain Bishops under him for the governing of that whole Province, being a very great one*; and * *Eusebius* τὸν ὅλη Κρήτης ἐκκλησιῶν ἐπισκοπὴν εἰληχέναι, *That* Titus *had the inspection of all the Churches in* Crete, of which that there was an *hundred* in number, and *Gortyna* the *Metropolis* of them all, appears by *Dionysius* Bishop *of Corinth* about the year of *Christ* 175. who inscribes an *Epistle* τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ παροικούσῃ Γορτύναν, ἅμα τῇ λοιπῇ πάσῃ Κρήτῃ ἐκκλησίαις, *to the Church about* Gortyna, *together with the rest of the Dioceses in* Crete, of all which he mentions and com-

The original of Metropolitans in *Titus*.

* *Eccl. Hist.* l. 3. c. 4.

mends *Philip* their *Biſhop*, i. e. the *Metropolitan*, under whom they all were, as appears by *Euſebius*, l. 4. c. 7.

In Timothy. *Sect.* 12. What hath been thus ſaid of *Titus*, is with the ſame evidence of the *Text* affirmable of *Timothy*, when being placed by S. *Paul* at *Epheſus* the *chief Metropolis* of *Aſia*, he had by that means the *Hom.* 15. *in* 1 Tim. 3. 15. *inſpection* of all the *Biſhops* there, and conſequently is directed both for the *ordaining* (1 *Tim.* 3. 2.) and *exerciſing juriſdiction* over them c. 5. 1. 19. and ſo ſaith S. *Chryſoſtome*, Ἁπλῶν δὴ ὁπλήσεως λοιπὸν ἦν ἐμπιπραμένος Τιμόθεος, ἢ καὶ ἔστι ὁλόκληρον τὸ τῆς Ἀσίας, ἀλλὰ καὶ σφοδρότερον αὐτῷ διαλέγεται, *'Tis manifeſt that* Timothy *was intruſted with more Churches than one, even with a whole Nation, that of* Aſia, *and therefore* S. Paul *diſcourſes to him of Elders or Biſhops:* So the *Anonymous writer* of the *Martyrdom of Timothy*, ὁ Ἀπόστολος Τιμόθεος ὢν τῆς μεγάλης Παύλου καὶ χειροτονῆται τῆς Ἐφεσίων μητροπόλεως ἐπίσκοπος, καὶ ἐνθρονίζεται, *The Apoſtle* Timothy *is ordained by* S. Paul, *and enthroned Biſhop of the Metropolis of* Epheſus; and accordingly is by *Theodoret* ſtyled Ἁπάντων Ἀπόστολος *the Apoſtle*, i. e. *chief ruler* or *Biſhop of the Aſiaticks*; and by *Euſebius*, ὁ ἐν Ἐφέσῳ Παροικίας ἐπίσκοπος, *Biſhop of the Province about* Epheſus.

Photii *lib. num.* 254.

Eccl. Hiſt. l. 4. 5.

In James, &c. *Sect.* 13. The ſame might be ſhew'd of *James* Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, who by that means was evidently *Metropolitan* of all the *Cities* of all *Judæa*; And even of *Syria* and *Cilicia* alſo, if we may argue concludently from the ſending of that *Canon* to thoſe *Regions*, *Acts* 15. 23. It is likewiſe the affirmation of *Agrippa* (in *Philo*) of *Jeruſalem*, Μητρόπολις ἡ οὐ μιᾶς χώρας Ἰουδαίας ἀλλὰ καὶ διὰ πλειόνων διὰ τὰς ἀποικίας ἃς ἔπεμψεν, *that it was the Metropolis, not onely of one Region* Judæa, *but of many more, becauſe of the Colonies it had ſent out, naming* Συρίας, Κιλικίας, *Syria* and *Cilicia* among others. And thereto agrees again (as far as *Syria*) what we find in the Letters of *Commiſſion*, which *Saul* had received from the *Sanhedrim* at *Jeruſalem*, to the *Synagogues* of *Damaſcus*, a City of *Syria*, as being ſuppoſed under that *Metropolis* of *Judæa*, *Acts* 9. 1, 2. And accordingly after the deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*, *Tiberias* had this privilege, as appears both by the *Imperial Code*, *tit. de Jud. & Cælic.* and by *Epiphanius*, in the *hereſie* of the *Ebionites*, who refers all *Syria* and *Cilicia* to that *Metropolis*, in the ſame manner as the *Synagogues* in *Aſſyria* and *Media* to the *Sanhedrim* in *Bagdat*, and in all *Ægypt* to that in *Alexandria*; But all this doth rather belong to the *Jewiſh Form* among themſelves and the *Juriſdiction* of that *Great Sanhedrim* over their *Colonies* thus far diffuſed, and is not ſo appliable to the *Chriſtian Church* at *Jeruſalem*, it being affirmed by *Joſeph. de bel. Jud. l.* 3. *c.* 7. that *Antioch* was *Metropolis* of all *Syria*; But this by the way.

Epiſt. 247. *Sect.* 14. Thus *Philippi* appears to have been the *Metropolis* of *one part of Macedonia* (as *Theſſalonica* another) πρώτη τῆς μερίδος Μακεδονίας πόλις, *the prime City of a portion*, or *diviſion*, or *Province* of *Macedonia*, *Acts* 16. 12. and is accordingly ſo ſtyled by *Photius* the *Patriarch of Conſtantinople* Ἡ Φιλίππων πόλις τῆς Μακεδόνων Ἐπαρχίας Μητρόπολις οὖσα, *the City of* Philippi *being a Metropolis of a Province of the Macedonians*, and ſo *Epaphroditus* their *Biſhop* in Saint *Paul*'s time (as [c] *Theodoret* and others reſolve from his being called Ἀπόστολος ὑμῶν, *their Apoſtle*, Phil. 2. 25.) had under him *many Biſhops*, who are accordingly named in the *plural*, Phil. 1. 1. and all theſe *ſubordinate* to him as their *Metropolitan*.

[c] ὃ ὁμοεπῶς θεσσαλονίκης πόλει καλυμένοις Ἀποστόλοις ἐπέθηκαν, ὅτιπερ Φιλιππησίων Ἀπόστολος ὁ Ἐπαφρόδιτος λῶ —— Theod. *in* 1 Tim. 3. 1.

d *In Arg. Ep. ad Eph.* *Sect.* 15. So of the *ſeven Churches of Aſia*, Revel. 2. and 3. it appears (what hath been elſewhere proved) that they were all *Metropoles*; Of *Epheſus* it hath been already clear, and Saint [d] *Chryſoſtome* is expreſs. Ἔφεσος δὲ μὲν ἡ Ἀσίας Μητρόπολις, Epheſus *is a Metropolis of* Aſia, and *Theod. in Ep. ad Dioſcor.* τὴν Ἐφεσίων Μητρόπολιν τῆς Ἀσίας, and in *Photius*, the *Ancient* writer of the *Martyrdom* of *Timothy* (*bib. num.* 254.) ſaith of Saint *John*, that being *returned from his baniſhment* τὴν Ἐφεσίων ὑπὲρ Μητροπόλεως, *he reſided at the Metropolis of the* Epheſians. And in *Ulpian*, the *Proconſul* under *Antoninus* being to go to *Aſia*, was to touch upon τὴν Μητροπόλεων Ἔφεσον, Epheſus *one and the chief of the Metropoles of* Aſia: and accordingly, *Acts* 19. 38. it is ſaid of that City, Ἀνθύπατοί εἰσι καὶ Ἀγορᾶιοι ἄγονται, *the Proconſuls were there, and the Aſſiſes, as in the chief City* of that *Province*; and in *Euſebius*, *Antoninus Pius* his *Epiſtle* concerning the *Chriſtians* is ſaid to have been read and proclaimed at *Epheſus*, ἐν τῷ κοινῷ τῆς Ἀσίας, *in the common Council* or *conſeſſus* of *Aſia*, and in *Ariſtides* it is ſtyled ταμεῖον κοινὸν τῆς Ἀσίας, *the common Magazine of* Aſia, καὶ τῆς χρείας καταφυγὴ, *whither they applied themſelves for all their wants.* All which are evidences that it was a *Metropolis* (and the *chief*) of *Aſia*.

L. Obſer. D. de Offic. Proconſ.

Eccl. Hiſt. l. 4. c. 27.

Or. ad Aſiat.

Geog. l. 5. c. 2. *Act.* 5. *Sect.* 16. So of *Thyatira*, ſaith *Ptolomy*, Θυάτειρα Μητρόπολις that it was a *Metropolis*. Of *Philadelphia* the *Council* of *Conſtantinople ſub Mena*, Ἐπίσκοπος τῆς Φιλαδελφείας Μητροπόλεως τῆς Λυδῶν Ἐπαρχίας, *the Biſhop of the Metropolis of the Philadelphians of the Province of the Lydians*, i. e. in this *Lydian* or *Proconſular Aſia*. So *Laodicea*, *Sardis* and *Smyrna* (together with *Epheſus*) are ſet down by *Pliny* as *Cities* in which the *Roman Proconſuls* kept their *Aſſiſes*, and diſpenſed *juſtice* to all the neighbouring *Cities*, which is the *character* of a *Metropolis* in the *civil* notion, and the ſame he alſo affirms elſewhere of *Pergamus*: And thus the whole *number* of the *ſeven Churches* appear each of them, to have been *Metropoles*, and accordingly by *Ignatius* his *Epiſtles* to the *Trallians* and *Magneſians*, (the *Chriſtians* of two neighbour *Cities* of *Lydia* on the *Banks* of *Meander*, and ſo of this *Aſia*) and by the mention of their *Biſhops Damas* and *Polybius*, it is evident that there were other *Epiſcopal Sees* in that *Aſia*, beſide thoſe *ſeven* named in the *Revelation*, and thoſe afterward appear to have been *ſubject* to the *Metropolis* of *Epheſus*, which alone of all the *ſeven* continued till *Conſtantine*'s time, the reſt being deſtroyed.

Nat. Hiſt. l. 5. c. 29. *Ibid.* c. 30. Τραλλις πόλις Λυδίας περὶ τὸν Μαιανδρον ποταμόν. Steph. Byzant. περὶ Πολ.

In Ignatius. *Sect.* 17. From theſe manifeſt footſteps of *Metropolitical* power in *Scripture*, it is eaſie to deſcend through the *firſt* times, and find the like; As when *Ignatius* the *Archbiſhop of Antioch* (the *Primitive Martyr*) in his *Epiſtle* to the *Romans* ſtyleth himſelf τῆς ἐν Συρίᾳ ἐκκλησίας ποιμένα, *Paſtour of the Church which was in Syria*, that whole *Region* belonging then to that *Metropolis* of *Antioch*: Agreeable to which is that of the *authour* of the *Epiſtle* to the *Antiocheni* (whoſoever it was) inſcribing it, Ἐκκλησίᾳ Θεοῦ Πατρικιάσῃ ἐν Συρίᾳ τῇ ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ, to the *Church of God in Syria, that belongs as a Province to that of Antioch*: So the *Epiſtle* to the *Romans* is inſcribed, Ἐκκλησίᾳ ἥτις προκάθηται ἐν τόπῳ χωρίου Ῥωμαίων, *to the Church which hath the Preſidency in the place of the Region or Province of the Romans*, which gives the *Biſhop of Rome* a *Metropolitical* power over all other the *Biſhops* of that *Province*, the *Urbicarian Region*, as it was ſtyled, and

In the Biſhop of *Rome.* (what his Province.)

[e] *diſtingui-*

[a] *distinguished* from the *Province* of *Italy* properly so called, confined to the *seven Provinces* of the *civil jurisdiction* of the *Vicarius Italiæ*, and the *Ecclesiastical* of the *Archbishop* of *Milan* the *chief Metropolis* thereof. Of the *circuit* or *compass* of this *Province* of the *Bishop of Rome*, many *learned* men have discoursed excellently out of the *Ancient Surveys* of the *Provinces*, particularly that *very learned Frenchman* so rarely skilled, and *judicious* in *Antiquity*, *Jacobus Leschaserius*, in his *little Tract de Region. Suburbicar.* but none with more evidence of conviction, than our *Modest* Countryman Mr. *Brerewood*, who thus describes the *ancient jurisdiction* of the *Bishop of Rome*, "*That it contained all those Provinces of the Diocese of Italy, which the old Lawyers term Sub-*" *urbicarias, of which there were ten, three Islands, Sicily, Sardinia and Corsica, and the other seven in the firm* " *land of Italy, taking up in a manner all the narrow part of it, viz. all Italy Eastward, but on the West no farther* " *extended than to the River Magra (the limit of Tuscany) toward the Tyrrhene sea, and to the River Esino (an-*" *ciently Asius) toward the Adriatick sea.* For at that *River Esino* met both the *Picenum Suburbicarium*, and *Annonarium*, the former of which belonged to the *Prefecture* of *Rome*, of which that City was the *Metropolis*, And the latter, with all the other *Provinces* in the *broader* part of *Italy* (*seven* of them in all) to the *Diocese of Italy*, of which *Milan* was the *Metropolis*. Thus *Ruffinus* in his *Paraphrase* rather than *Translation* of the *Nicene Canon* saith, that the *Bishop of Rome* was thereby authorized *Suburbicariarum Ecclesiarum Solicitudinem gerere*, to *take and manage the care of the suburbicarian Churches*; and there is no reason to doubt but that he that lived so near after that *Council*, and was of *Italy*, knew competently what he affirmed of that matter. And it being evident that in all other places the [f] *ecclesiastical Jurisdictions* were proportioned to the *temporal* of the *Lieutenants*, and that the *suburbicarian Region*, and the so many and no more *Provinces* in them, pertain'd to the *Prefecture* of the *City* of *Rome*, It must follow that these were the *limits* of the *ecclesiastical Jurisdiction* of that *Bishop* also. But this by the way, in passing.

[a] Οἱ κατὰ τὴν Ἰταλίαν καὶ τὴν Ῥωμαίων πόλιν Ἐπίσκοποι. *Euseb. Eccl. Hist. l. 7. c. 30.* Ἡ ἁγία σύνοδος συναχθεῖσα ἔκ τε Ῥώμης καὶ Ἰταλίας. *Syn. Sardic. Epist. ad Alex. ap. Athan. Apol. 2.* Ἀπὸ μεγάλης Ῥώμης καὶ Ἰταλίας πάσης. *Athan. Epist. ad solit. vit. agent. Ex Provincia Italia, civ. Med. ex Prov. Romana, Civitate Portuensi. Syn. Arelat. in nominibus Synodo præfixit.*

[f] Οὕτω καὶ ἡ κατὰ χώραν ἐκκλησία ἑκάστης πόλεως ἐγγέγραπται ἐν τῇ πόλει ταύτῃ. *Orig. contr. Cels. l. 3.*

Sect. 18. So when of Saint *Mark* it is affirm'd out of the ancient Records by *Eusebius*, that he Ἐκκλησίας πρῶτον Ἀλεξανδρείας συνέστησατο, *first constituted Churches* (in the *plural*) in *Alexandria*, and under the title of ἡ ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ Παροικίας, *the Province of Alexandria*, put them all into the hands of *Anianus* in the 8th. of *Nero*, it is evident that *Alexandria* was a *Metropolitical*, or *Patriarchal See* to which all *Ægypt* did belong.

In *Alexandria*. *Eccl. Hist. l. 2. c. 16.* *Ibid. c. 24.*

Sect. 19. So Saint *Cyprian* the *Bishop* of *Carthage*, to which the whole *Province* of *Africk* pertained, is by the *Council of Constantinople in Trullo*, *Can.* 2. called Ἀρχιεπίσκοπος τῆς Λιβύων χώρας, the *Archbishop* of the *Region of Africk*, And accordingly he often mentions the *many Bishops* in his *Province*, *Universis vel in nostra Provincia*——*to all the Bishops in our Province*——Ep. 40. And *Latiùs fusa est nostra Provincia, habet etiam Numidiam & Mauritanias duas sibi cohærentes, Our Province is extended farther, hath Numidia and the two Mauritania's annexed to it*, Ep. 45. in each of which there being a *Church*, and consequently a *Bishop* in *every City* (as κατ' Ἐκκλησίαν, *Acts* 14. 23. is all one with κατὰ πόλιν *in every City*, *Acts* 16. 4.) they were all *subject* to this *Metropolitan*.

In S. *Cyprian.*

Sect. 20. By all this, and much more which might be added, it is manifest, that as the *several Bishops* had *Prefecture* over their *several Churches*, and the *Presbyters*, *Deacons*, and *people* under them, such as could not be *cast off* by any without the *guilt* and brand of *Schism*; So the *Bishops* themselves of the *ordinary*, *inferiour Cities* (for the preserving of *unity*, and many other good uses) were subjected to the *higher* power of *Archbishops* or *Metropolitans*.

The subjection of Bishops to Archbishops.

Sect. 21. Nay we must yet ascend one degree higher from this of *Archbishops* or *Metropolitans*, to that *supreme* of *Primates* or *Patriarchs*, the *division* of which is thus cleared in the *division* and *Notitia* of the *Roman Empire*. *Constantine* the *Great* instituted *four Præfecti Prætorio*, two in the *East*, and as many in the *West*; Of the *Western*, one at *Rome*, another at *Triers*, this last then called *Præfectus Prætorio Galliarum*. These *Prefects* had their *several Vicarii*, who in *their* power and name judged the *Provinces*: As for example, The *Præfectus Prætorio* placed at *Triers* had *three Vicarii*, or *Lieutenants*, *one* placed at *Triers*, a *second* at *Lions*, a *third* at *Vienna*, from the greatness of whose authority, and the resort of all other *Cities* and *Provinces* to them for *justice* sprang the *splendour*, and *dignity* of those Cities where they resided, and the dependence of large *Provinces* and many other Cities on each of them. This whole *circuit* which was thus subject to, or dependent on any such *Lieutenant*, was by the *Greeks* called ἐξαρχία, διοίκησις, παροικία, and the style devolving from the *Civil* to the *Ecclesiastical* divisions, as the former both of *Cities*, and of *Territories*, and of *Metropoles* or *Mother Cities* (the *chief* in every *Province*) had done, the *Bishop* being answerable to the *Defensor Civitatis*, and the *Archbishop* to the *President* in every *Province*, from thence it came that every such *Metropolis* which was the *seat* of any *Vicarius* or *Lieutenant General*, was (over and above Μητρόπολις) called Ἐξαρχία and Παπεξαρχία, and the *Bishop* thereof *Primas*, Ἔξαρχος, *Patriarcha*, a *Primate*, *Exarch*, or *Patriarch*, and all that διοίκησις (which is larger than a *Province*, the *joynt administration of many Provinces*, with the several *Metropoles*, and *Metropolitans* contained in it) was subjected to him. Thus Saint *Irenæus* being *Bishop* of *Lyons*, is by *Eusebius* affirm'd τοῦ κατὰ Γαλλίαν Παροικίας Ἐπισκοπεῖν, *to have the oversight* or *Government of the Provinces of France*, either those onely that were under that *Primate*, or perhaps of all *France*, of which *Lyons* was then in the *Ecclesiastical* account the first *Exarchate*; for so the same *Eusebius*, ἧς Μητρόπολις ἐτύγχανον, ἡ δηλονότι τῶν ἄλλων κατ' αὐτὸν διαφέρουσι βεβούλευται Λούγδουνος καὶ Βίεννα, *Lyons*, and *Vienna* (but *first*, *Lyons*) *were famously known to be beyond all others in those parts, the principal Metropoles of France*. And again αἳ τῇδε διαφανέστεραι, *these were the most splendid illustrious Churches there*. To which first times I conceive belongs that verse of *Guiliehmus Brito in Philippeide*,

Of Archbishops to Primates, &c. (Original of Primates.)

Et Lugdunensis, quo Gallia tota solebat,
Ut fama est, Primate regi——

Eccl. Hist. l. 5. c. 24. *Ibid. c. 1.*

placing all *France* under the *Primate* of *Lyons*, or affirming it from *tradition* (*ut fama est*) that it was *wont anciently* to be so placed, which was not well understood or taken notice of by the learned *Jos. Scaliger*, when he affirms it *nuperum & novitium, & ex beneficio Romani Pontificis indultum, a privilege lately granted to the Bishop of Lyons by the Pope, quod Primatem sese vocari gaudeat, that he calls himself Primate*, which privilege, if not *title*, did so long since belong to *Irenæus* the *Bishop* of that *Diocese*.

In Notit. Galliæ p. 882.

Sect. 22. I ſhall not need inlarge on this ſubject, or ſet down the ſeveral *Primates* and *Dioceſes* belonging to them. It is known in the *ancient notitiæ* of the *Church*, that beſide the *three Patriarchs* of *Rome*, *Alexandria* and *Antioch* (to which title afterward *Conſtantinople*, and *Jeruſalem* were advanced) there were *eleven Primates* more, there being *fourteen Dioceſes*, or *joynt adminiſtrations of many Provinces* (for ſo the word anciently ſignified, not in the modern ſenſe of it, one *City* and the *territory*, the *juriſdiction* of an ordinary *Biſhop*, for which they then uſed παροικία) *ſeven* in the *Eaſt*, and the *Prefecture* of the *City* of *Rome*, and *ſix* more in the *Weſt*, into which the *whole Empire* was divided. And though the *Patriarchs* had in *Councils* the *precedence*, or deference in reſpect of *place*, whether becauſe theſe three Cities had the honour to *diſperſe Chriſtianity* in a moſt *eminent* manner to other *Cities* and *Nations*, or rather from the great *dignity* of the *Cities* themſelves, (g *Rome* being the *ſeat* and *firſt City* of the *Empire*, and thereupon thus dignified ſaith the *Council* of *Chalcedon*: and *Alexandria* by h *Dio Chryſoſtome*, and others affirmed to be the *ſecond*, and *Antioch* the *third*, ſaith *Joſephus*) yet it is certain that the *power* and *juriſdiction* of *Primates*, was as great as of *Patriarchs*, and the *Office* the ſame (ſee *Anacletus Epiſt. ad Epiſc. Ital.* and *Gratian Diſt.* 99.) and many times in *Authours* the very titles confounded, as appears by *Juſtinian*, who commonly gives *Primates* the names of *Patriarchs* of the *Dioceſes*. And if it be now demanded whether there were not anciently ſome *Summum Genus*, ſome *one Supreme* either of, or over theſe *Patriarchs*, I anſwer, that if we reſpect *order*, or priority of place again, then the *Biſhop of Rome* had it among the *Patriarchs*, as the *Patriarchs* among the *Primates*, that *City* of *Rome* being *Lady* of the *World*, and the *ſeat* of the *Empire*; But if we reſpect *power*, or *authority*, there was none *anciently* in the *Church* over that of *Primates*, and *Patriarchs*, but onely that of the *Emperour* in the *whole Chriſtian* World (as of every *Sovereign Prince* in his *Dominions*) as may appear by the *ancient* power, and practice of *congregating*, or convoking of *Councils*, *Provincial* by the *Metropolitan*, *Patriarchal* by the *Patriarch*, or *Primate*, *National* by the *Prince*, for the firſt 1000 years, through the whole *Weſt*, and *General* by the i *Emperour*, when for the conſerving the *unity*, or taking care for the neceſſities of the *Church*, thoſe laſt remedies appeared ſeaſonable. But this of *General Councils* being *extraordinary*, and ſuch as the *Church* was without them for the firſt *three hundred years*, and are now morally impoſſible to be had, we need not farther to aſcend to theſe, but content our ſelves with thoſe *ſtanding* powers in the *Church*, the uppermoſt of which are *Archbiſhops*, *Primates* and *Patriarchs*, to whom the *Biſhops* themſelves are in many things appointed to be ſubject, and this *power* and *ſubjection*, defined, and aſſerted, by the *Ancient Canons*, and the moſt *ancient*, even immemorial *Apoſtolical Tradition*, and *Cuſtome* avouched for it, as may appear *Concil. Nicen.* 1. *Can.* 4. 6. *Concil. Antioch.* c. 9. 20. *Concil. Chalced.* c. 19. In the *ſixth Nicene Canon*, where the *juriſdiction* of *all Ægypt*, *Lybia and Pentapolis* is affirmed to belong to the *Patriarch* of *Alexandria*, and order is taken that the πρεσβεῖα or *privileges* of *eminency* which belong to the *Biſhop* of *Rome*, of *Antioch*, and *Metropolitans* of all other *Provinces*, ſhall be conſerved intire to them, the *Introduction* is made in theſe words, Τὰ ἀρχαῖα ἔθη κρατείτω, *Let the Ancient cuſtoms be in force*, The very form which Saint *Ignatius* uſeth concerning *Apoſtolical cuſtoms* which were to be ſolicitouſly retained in the *Church*, and ſeems there particularly to refer to thoſe orders, which Saint *Mark* had left in *Ægypt*, *Lybia* and *Pentapolis*, ſubjecting all the *Biſhops* there to the *Patriarch* by him conſtituted in *Alexandria*.

The primates power equal to that of the Patriarch.

g Τῷ θρόνῳ πρεσβυτέρου Ῥώμης διὰ τὸ βασιλεύειν τὴν πόλιν ἐκείνην οἱ πατέρες εἰκότως ἀπεδώκασι τὰ πρεσβεῖα. *Concil. Chalced. Can. penult.*

h *Or.* 32. *ad Alexandrin.* ſee *Ariſtid. Or. de Rom. Laud.*

And no power but of the Prince above them.

i Αἱ μετὰ σὺνοδοι τῶν αὐτῶν γνώμην μόναν γίνονται. *Socrat.* l. 5. *Proœm. Ex Superioribus habetur, Imperatores Sanctos congregationes Synodales Univerſalium Conciliorum totius Eccleſiæ ſemper feciſſe. Ità ego perluſtrans geſta omnium Univerſalium uſque ad octavum inclusivè Baſilii tempore celebratum verum eſſe reperi. Cuſan. de concord. Cathol.* l. 3. c. 16. and c. 13. See Saint *Hierome in Apol. ad Ruffin.* l. 2. where ſpeaking of *a pretended Synod*, he adds, *Quis Imperator hanc Synodum juſſerit congregari?*

Sect. 23. So in the ninth *Canon* of the *Council* of *Antioch*, where ὁ ἐν τῇ Μητροπόλει πρεσβύτερος Ἐπίσκοπος, *the Biſhop preſiding in the Metropolis*, is appointed τὴν ὀφειλὴν ἀναλήψεσθαι πάσης τῆς ἐπαρχίας, *to undertake the care of the whole Province* (and all the *inferiour* Cities, and *Biſhops* in them) and the *Biſhops* commanded μηδὲν πρᾶττειν πρεσβύτερον ἄνευ αὐτοῦ, it is ſtreight added κατὰ τὸν ἀρχαῖον κρατήσαντα τῆς Πατέρων ἡμῶν Κανόνα, *according to the ancient Canon of the Fathers, which hath continued in force* (from the *firſt* times alſo, unto that *Council.*) Where if it be demanded what is the importance of μηδὲν πρᾶττειν, I conceive the word to be beſt explained by *Heſychius*, πρᾶτα, πρᾶσσει, πράττει, πράττοι, (it ſhould doubtleſs be πράττοι) and ſo the meaning of the *Canon* to be, agreeably to the expreſs words of other *Canons*, that as any *ordinary Biſhop* hath full *power* in his *own Church*, which he may in all things, wherein that *alone* is concerned, exerciſe *independently* from the *commands* or directions of any; So in any thing of a more *foreign* nature, wherein any *other Church* is concerned equally with that, and ſo falls not under the ſole cognizance or judgment of either, there the *Biſhop* of that *Church* is to doe nothing without directions from the *Metropolitan*, and that is the meaning of πρᾶττειν, as that is all one with πράττοιν——that no *Biſhop* muſt doe any thing but what belongs particularly to him *ratione officii* (any thing that another is concerned in, as well as he) without the *Metropolitan*.

Act. 15. *Can.* 9.

Sect. 24. So in the *Council* of *Chalcedon* the direction is given for *appeals* in this *order*, from the *Biſhop* to the *Metropolitan*, from the *Metropolitan* to the Ἐξάρχῳ or *Primate* of the *Dioceſe* or *Province*, as where there are more *Metropolitans* than one (as was ſhewed of *Epheſus* in *Aſia*, and elſewhere frequently) there ſome one is *Primate* or *Patriarch* among them, and to him lies the *appeal* in the *laſt* reſort, and from him to no other, ſee *Juſtinian Novel.* 123. c. 22. and *Cod.* l. 1. *tit.* 4. *leg.* 29. who ſpeaking of this calls it an *ancient* decree.

τῆ Μιλησπόλεων πρώτη Ἐφεσῳ. *Vlp. Obſer. D. de Offic. Proconſ.*

Sect. 25. That which we find in the *eighth Canon* of the great *Council* of *Epheſus*, ſhall conclude this matter; When upon ſome claim of the *Patriarch* of *Antioch* for an intereſt in the ordaining of the *Patriarch* of *Cyprus*, the *Biſhops* of *Cyprus* deny his claim, and deduce their *privilege* of αὐτοκεφαλία or *independence* from any *foreign Biſhop*, from the very *Apoſtles* times, *A ſanctis Apoſtolis*, ſay they, *nunquam poſſunt oſtendere, quòd adfuerit Antiochenus & ordinaverit, vel communicaverit unquam inſulæ ordinationis gratiam, neque alius quiſquam, From the very Apoſtles times they can never ſhew that the Patriarch of Antioch or any other was preſent and ordained, or* (being *abſent*) *ſent the grace of ordination to this Iſland, but that the Biſhops of Conſtantia*, the *Metropolis of that Iſland*, by name *Troilus*, *Sabinus*, and *Epiphanius*, and all the *orthodox Biſhops from the Apoſtles times, ab his qui in Cypro conſtituti ſunt, have been conſtituted and ordained by their own Biſhops of the Iſland*, and accordingly they required that they might *continue* in the ſame manner, *Sicut initio à temporibus Apoſtolorum*——

lorum —— permansit Cyprierum Synodus, as they had done from the times of the very Apostles, still appealing εἰς τὸ ἀρχαῖον ἔθος, ἀρχαίαν συνήθειαν, τὰ ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἄνωθεν δίκαια, *to the ancient manner,* the *ancient custome,* the *privileges,* which from their *first plantation* they had enjoyed, and that from the *Apostles* themselves: And accordingly that *Council* condemned the pretension of the *Patriarch* of *Antioch,* as that which was πρᾶγμα ξένον παρὰ ἐκκλησιαστικοὺς θεσμοὺς καὶ παρὰ κανόνας τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων καινοτομούμενον, *an innovation against the Ecclesiastical Laws and Canons of the holy Fathers, and orders not* onely in behalf of the *Cypriots* that the *Bishops* of their *Churches* ἔχειν τὰ ἀνυπόβλητον καὶ ἀβίαστον ——— *shall continue to enjoy their right inviolate according to the ancient custome,* but *extended* their sentence to all othre *Dioceses* in these words, Τόδε αὐτὸ καὶ ὅπῃ τῶν ἄλλων διοικήσεων καὶ τῶν κατὰ παντὸς ἐπαρχιῶν ὁπωσδήποτε ἁρπάζειν ἐπιχειρήσει, ὥστε μηδένα τῶν θεοφιλεστάτων ὁποσωνοῦν ἐπαρχίαν ἐπίσκοπον ἐπιβάλλειν, ἢ ἔσται ἄνωθεν καὶ ἐξ ἀρχῆς οὕτω τῷ αὐτῷ, ἤγουν τῶν περὶ αὐτὸν χεῖρα, κεκρατηκέναι, *The same shall be observed in all other Dioceses and Provinces whereseever, that no Bishop shall lay hold of another Province, which hath not been formerly and from the beginning under their or their ancestours power.* And again Ἔδοξε τῇ ἁγίᾳ καὶ οἰκουμενικῇ συνόδῳ σώζεσθαι ἑκάστῃ ἐπαρχίᾳ κατὰ καὶ οὐσίας τὰ αὐτῇ προσόντα ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἄνωθεν καὶ τὸ πάλαι κρατήσαντα ἔθος, *This holy and Oecumenical Synod hath decreed, that the privileges and rights of every Province shall be conserved pure and inviolate, as they have enjoyed them from the beginning, according to the custome that hath anciently been in force.* All deducing this *power* of *Primates* over their *own Bishops,* (and together excluding all *foreign* pretenders) from the *Apostles* and *first planters* of the *Churches,* and requiring all to *remain,* as they were *first* thus *constituted.* Wherein as there be many things of *usefull* observation, which will be more fitly appliable in the *progress* of this discourse, so that which is alone pertinent to this place is onely this, that there may be a *disobedience,* and *irregularity,* and so a *Schism,* even in the *Bishops* in respect of their *Metropolitans,* and of the *authority* which they have by *Canon* and *Primitive custome* over them, which was therefore to be added to the several *Species* of *Schism* set down in the former Chapters.

CHAP. IV.

The pretended evidences of the Romanist against the Church of England examined, and first that from the Bishop of Rome's Supremacy by Christ's donation to St. Peter.

Sect. 1. THE *Scene* being thus *prepared,* and the *nature* and *sorts* of *Schism* defined and summarily enumerated, our method now leads us to inquire impartially, what evidences are producible against the *Church* of *England,* whereby it may be thought liable to this *guilt* of *Schism,* and these pretended evidences may be of several sorts, according to the several *Species* of this sort of *Schism* described, and acknowledged by us.

Sect. 2. The *first* evidence that is offered against us is taken from a presumed *Supremacy* of the *Bishop of Rome,* as *Successour* to St. *Peter,* over all *Churches* in the world, which being in the days of *Henry VIII.* *renounced,* and *disclaimed, first* by both *Universities,* and most of the greatest and famous *Monasteries* of this *Kingdom* (in their *negative* answer and determination of this question, *An aliquid Authoritatis in hoc Regno Angliæ Pontifici Romano de jure competat plusquam alii cuiquam Episcopo extero? Whether the Pope of Rome have of right any authority in the Realm of England, more than any other foreign Bishop hath)* and that *determination* of theirs testified under their *hands* and *seals,* and after by *Act* of *Convocation* subscribed by the *Bishops* and *Clergy,* and confirmed by their *corporal oaths,* and at last the like imposed by *Act* of *Parliament,* 35 *Hen. VIII.* c. 1. all this is looked on, and condemn'd, as an Act of *Schism* in this *Church* and *Nation,* in renouncing that *power* of Saint *Peter's Successours* placed over all *Christians* by *Christ.* The first charge against us, Our casting out the Pope's Supremacy.

Sect. 3. This objection against us consisting of many branches, every of which must be manifested or granted to have truth in it, or else the objection will be of no force, 1. the matter of *fact,* that thus it was in *England;* 2. the *consequence* of that *fact,* that it were *Schism,* supposing these *Successours* of Saint *Peter* were thus set over all *Christians* by *Christ;* 3. the matter of fact again, that Saint *Peter's Successours* were thus constituted *Universal Pastours* by *Christ;* This again of two branches, 1. that Saint *Peter* was so *constituted,* 2. that the *power* instated on Saint *Peter* devolved on the *Bishops* of *Rome;* I shall endeavour to expedite this matter by *granting,* and not requiring the pretenders farther to prove the *two* first branches, and leave the issue of the debate to *their* manifesting the *truth,* or *our* manifesting the *falshood* of (the last mentioned, but indeed) the principal *fundamental* part of the contention, as it consists of two branches, one as it respects Saint *Peter,* the other as it respects his *Successour* in the *See* of *Rome;* wherein if the *Romanists* pretensions shall appear to have truth in them, we must be acknowledged by breaking off from our *submission* to that See, to be formally *Schismaticks,* according to the grounds already laid, and acknowledged by us; But on the other side, if their *pretensions* herein shall appear to be *false,* or unsufficiently proved and manifested, there is no other branch of the argument, be it never so true, which can give the conclusion any *authority* with any pondering *rational* man, it being in the power of any *weak* link to destroy the usefulness of the whole *chain,* and consequent to the *falseness,* or *inevidence* of any *one* proposition, that the *conclusion* shall not be inferred by that *arguing.*

Sect. 4. And first for the pretension as far it respecteth Saint *Peter,* and must be managed by *evidences,* and *so* concluded either on one side or the other, I shall begin with offering my evidences for the *Negative.* The supremacy of Saint *Peter* examined.

Sect. 5. And first it is evident by *Scripture,* that this *Apostle* was the *Apostle* of the *Circumcision,* or *Jews, exclusively* to the *uncircumcision,* or *Gentiles,* which were generally another's *Province;* By *Apostle* here I under- Evidences against it: First from his

being Apoſtle of the Circumciſion peculiarly.

I underſtand a *Commiſſioner* of *Chriſt's*, endued with *authority* by him, and this *Commiſſion* given to him, as to all the other *Apoſtles*, *indefinitely*, and *unlimitedly*, not reſtrained by *Chriſt's* words to any particular *Province*, but extending *equally* to the *whole* world; what therefore is done in this kind is by *ſubſequent* act of the *Apoſtles* themſelves, who are teſtified to have done that, which it had been very *unskilfull*, and improvident, and conſequently *unreaſonable* not to have done, *viz.* *diſtributed* their *Univerſal* great *Province* into ſeveral κλήρους ἀποστολῆς, *Acts* 1. 25. *diſtributions*, or *Lots*, or *leſſer Provinces*, one or more to go *one* way, the other *another*, which is there called by Saint *Peter* πορεύθῆναι εἰς τὸν τόπον τὸν ἴδιον, *to go to his own*, or *proper place*, or *aſſignation*, for the witneſſing the *Reſurrection*, and *proclaiming* the *faith* or *Doctrine* of *Chriſt* to the *world*.

Sect. 6. Now if the *circumciſion*, or *Jewiſh Chriſtians* were peculiarly Saint *Peter's Province*, the *lot*, or *diviſion* aſſigned unto him, (agreeable unto which it is, that both his *preaching* in the *Acts* is to the *Jews* in *Judæa* and *Samaria*, and his *Epiſtles* are *both* of them addreſſed to the *Jews* of the *diſperſion*, and none elſe) then it is not imaginable, how he ſhould be the *Univerſal*, or *ſupreme Paſtour*, or *Biſhop* of the *whole* world: For the *Chriſtians* of that age of the World being either *Jews* or *Gentiles*, the *Jews* again either thoſe that *remained* in their *Country*, or thoſe that were *diſperſed* in *other* Regions, there was but one *portion* of one of theſe, which can reaſonably be placed under Saint *Peter's jurisdiction*. The *Jews* that were in *Judæa* were all *immediately* ſubject to the *ſeveral Biſhops* in each *City*, and all they to their *Metropolitan*, *James* the *Biſhop* of *Jeruſalem*; Of this *James* the *brother* (or *near kinſman*) of *Chriſt*, many [a] of the *Ancients* affirm, that he was by *Chriſt* after his *reſurrection* conſtituted *Biſhop* there; [b] others that it was done by *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles*; [c] others the more *ancient*, that the *Apoſtles* conſtituted him in that *See*, Saint *Peter*, Saint *James*, and Saint *John*, the *three moſt honoured by Chriſt*, *conferring this honour upon him*, whereupon in this his *See* he is named *before Peter* and *John*, *Gal.* 2. 9. and hath the *principal* place in the *Council* at *Jeruſalem*, where Saint *Peter* is preſent, and accordingly gives the *Sentence*, *Act.* 15. 19. upon which the *Reſcript* is grounded, *ver.* 22. From all which as it appeareth, that the *Juriſdiction* in that *Metropolis* (which had extended very far among the *Jews*, not onely to all *Judæa*, but even to *Syria* and *Cilicia* and other *regions*, ſaith *Agrippa* in [d] *Philo*, as hath formerly been mentioned) belonged to *James* the *Juſt*, and not to Saint *Peter*; ſo it is as evident, that it was not by Saint *Peter* alone intruſted to him (which might conclude ſome peculiar *tranſcendent* power of Saint *Peter* there) but by Saint *James* and Saint *John* together with Saint *Peter*, which quite takes off all pretenſion of his to the *ſingular Supremacy* there.

[a] Ὤφθη Ἰακώβῳ τῷ ὑπ' αὐτῆς καταξιωθεὶς ὀθισκόπῳ πρώτῳ Ἱεροσολύμων. *Theoph. in* 1 Cor. 15. 7. *ex Sententia Chryſoſtomi.*

Ἰάκωβος ὁ πρῶτος ἀρχιερέων, καὶ ἀποστολικῇ χειρὶ τὸ ἱερὸν χρίσμα καὶ τὴν ἐφοδείαν Ἱεροσολύμων λαχὼν, *Photius Epiſt.* 2.

So *Nicephorus* l. 2. c. 38. Ὁ θεῖος Ἰάκωβος ὁ τῆς Ἱερουσαλημιτῶν ἐκκλησίας τὸν κλῆρον λαχὼν, καὶ πάσης πρῶτος ἐπίσκοπος ὑπὸ τῶν μακάρων ἀρχιερέων Χριστοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν καταξιωθείς. *Procl. Conſtant.* πρ. Φλαβ. τῆς Θείας λειτουργ. p. 156. [b] Ἰάκωβος πρῶτος τῆς Ἱεροσολύμων ἐκκλησίας παρὰ τοῦ σωτῆρος καὶ τῶν Ἀποστόλων κατεδέξατο. *Euſeb. Eccl. Hiſt.* l. 2. c. 1. [c] Πέτρον φησὶ καὶ Ἰάκωβον καὶ Ἰωάννην, οἷς ἀν καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου πρεσβεῖα μὴ ὑπολιμάζειν δόξειν, ἀλλ' Ἰάκωβον τὸν Δίκαιον ἐπίσκοπον Ἱεροσολύμων ἐλέσθαι. *Euſeb. ex Clement. Τυπωσ.* l. 5. Τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον διαδίδεται ἐκκλησίας πρὸς τοῦ Ἀποστόλων ὁ ἀδελφὸς τοῦ Κυρίου ὁ Ἰάκωβος. *Hegeſippus Τυμνησ.* ὁ. *ap. Euſeb.* l. 2. c. 23. Ὧ πρὸς τοῦ Ἀποστόλων ὁ τὴν ἐπισκοπὴς ἐγκεχείρισο θεόν. *Euſeb.* l. 2. c. 1. *vide Athan. in Synopſ. Epiph. Hær.* 78. *Nyſſen. de Reſur. Or.* 2. *Hieron. in Gal.* 1. *& in Catal. Euſeb. in Chron.* p. 43. [d] Μητρόπολις ἡ μᾶς χώρας Ἰουδαία, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν πλείστων διὰ τὰς ἀποικίας ἃς ἔπεμψεν εἰς τὰς μὲν ὁμόρους, Αἴγυπτον, Φοινίκην, Συρίαν——εἰς δὲ τὰς πόρρω διωκισμένας, Παμφυλίαν, Κιλικίαν τὰ πολλὰ τῆς Ἀσίας ἄχρι Βιθυνίας καὶ Πόντου——

The Gentiles were not St. *Peter's* Province.

Sect. 7. So again for the *uncircumciſion* or *Gentile Chriſtians*, they were not Saint *Peter's Province* but peculiarly Saint *Paul's* (by Saint *Peter's* own confeſſion and acknowledgment, *Gal.* 2, 9.) who is therefore ſtyled the *Apoſtle* of the *Gentiles*, *Rom.* 11. 13. and that without any *commiſſion* received, or conſequently, *dependence* from Saint *Peter*, as he declares and conteſts it, *Gal.* 1. 12, 17. having his *aſſignation immediately* from *Chriſt*, ver. 16. Accordingly whenſoever thoſe *two great Apoſtles* came to the ſame *City*, the one conſtantly applied himſelf to the *Jews*, received *diſciples* of ſuch, formed them into a *Church*, left them, when he departed that region, to be governed by ſome *Biſhop* of his *aſſignation*: and the other in like manner did the ſame to the *Gentiles*.

Sect. 8. This we know it was at *Antioch*, where Saint *Peter* converted the *Jews*, and Saint *Paul* the *Gentiles* (and certainly Saint *Paul* no way *Subordinate*, or dependent on *him*, as appears by his behaviour toward him avowed, *Gal.* 2. 11.) and accordingly in *Ignatius* his *Epiſtle* to the *Magneſians* we reade of the *Church* of *Antioch*, that it was τεθεμελιωμένη founded by Saint *Peter* and Saint *Paul*, not by *one*, or other, but by *both*; and in the *ancient*, if not *Ignatian Epiſtle* to the *Antiochians*, You, ſaith he, Πέτρε καὶ Παύλου μαθηταὶ γεγόνατε, *have been the diſciples of Peter and Paul*, i. e. *converted* and *ruled* by them, the *Jewiſh* part by *one*, and the *Gentile* by the *other*, and the *Church* of the *Gentiles* at *Antioch*, and *Syria* (of which *Antioch* was the *chief City*) and *Cilicia*, is it, to which peculiarly the *decrees* of the *Council* at *Jeruſalem* are ſent, *Act.* 15. 23. and inſcribed [τοῖς κατ' Ἀντόχειαν——ἀδελφοῖς τοῖς ἐξ ἐθνῶν, *To the brethren at Antioch*——*thoſe of the Gentiles*] and that ſeparately from the *Jewiſh Church* in that *City* or *Region*, as is evident both by the contents of that *Reſcript*, or *Decretal Epiſtle*, in which onely the *Gentiles* were concerned, *v.* 28, 29. and alſo by that which we reade of Saint *Peter*, and the *Jewiſh proſelytes*, *Gal.* 2. 11. that they *withdrew* from all *communion* and *ſociety* with the *Gentile Chriſtians*, upon which Saint *Paul reproved* him *publickly*, ver. 12. According to this condition of *diſparate*, not *ſubordinate Churches* at *Antioch*, it is, that the *writer* of the *Apoſtolical Conſtitutions* tells us, that *Euodius* and *Ignatius* at the *ſame* time ſate *Biſhops* of *Antioch*, one ſucceeding Saint *Peter*, the other Saint *Paul*, one in the *Jewiſh*, the other in the *Gentile Congregation*, and ſo continued a while, till both the *Churches* (the *wall of Separation* being by *compliance* and *Chriſtian Charity* removed) joyned, and *united* together under *Ignatius*, who therefore as by * *Origen* and [f] *Euſebius* he is called the *Second*, ſo by Saint *Hierome* is called the *third Biſhop* of *Antioch*, and yet as truly by [g] *Athanaſius*, μετὰ τοὺς Ἀποστόλους καταξιωθεὶς ὀθισκόπου ſaid to be *conſtituted Biſhop after the Apoſtles*, and by [h] Saint *Chryſoſtome* to the ſame purpoſe (αἱ τῶν μακαρίων Ἀποστόλων χεῖρες——) *that the bleſſed Apoſtles hands were laid upon him*, whilſt yet *Theodoret* (ὑπὸ τῶν μεγάλου Πέτρου λαξάτων) affirms him to have received the *Archiſacerdotal honour from the hands of Saint Peter*.

* *Hom.* 4. *in Luc.*
[f] l. 2. c. 2.
[g] *de Syn. Arim. & Seleuc.*
[h] *Excom. Ignat.*

Sect. 9. The ſame is as evident at *Rome* where theſe two great *Apoſtles* met again, and each of them erected and managed a *Church*, Saint *Peter of Jews*, Saint *Paul of Gentiles*. So ſaith [i] Saint *Ireneus*, θεμελιώσαντες καὶ οἰκοδομήσαντες οἱ μακάριοι Ἀπόστολοι τὴν ἐκκλησίαν——*the bleſſed Apoſtles founded and built the Church there*;

[i] l. 3. c. 3. *Euſeb.* l. 4. c. 6.

there; and [k] *Epiphanius* more expresly, ἐν Ῥώμῃ γεγόνασι Πέτρος καὶ Παῦλος, οἱ Ἀπόστολοι αὐτοὶ καὶ ἐπίσκοποι, *Peter and Paul were Apostles and Bishops in Rome*: So the *Inscription* on their *Tombs*, which, saith [l] *Eusebius*, continued to his time, mentions them *both* as *founders* of that *Church*. So *Gaius* an *Ecclesiastick* writer of great antiquity, *contemporaneous* to *Pope Zephyrinus*, speaking of the monuments of Saint *Peter* and Saint *Paul*, calls them [m] τρόπαια τῶν τὴν τοιαύτην ἱδρυσαμένων ἐκκλησίαν, *the monuments of them that founded that Church*.

[k] l. 1. adv. Carpocrat.
[l] l. 2. c. 25.
[m] Euseb. Ibid.

Sect. 10. So *Dionysius* the *Bishop of Corinth*, who lived about twenty years after their *death*, affirms both of the *Church* of *Rome* and of *Corinth*, [n] τὴν ὑπὸ Πέτρου καὶ Παύλου φυτείαν γεγενῆσθαι, *that it was* (each of them) *the plantation of Peter and Paul*; And [o] *Prosper*, *Petrus & Paulus Apostoli in urbe Roma*—*Peter and Paul the Apostles consecrated or constituted a Church in the City of Rome*. And the very *Seals* of *Popes* are an *irrefragable* evidence of the same, as they are set down by *Matthew Paris* in the year of our Lord 1237. *In bulla Domini Papæ*, saith he, *stat imago Pauli à dextris crucis in medio bullæ figuratæ, & Petri à sinistris*; *In the bull of the Pope stands the Image of Saint Paul on the right hand of the Cross, which is graven in the midst of the Seal, and the Image of Saint Peter on the left hand*; and this onely account given for Saint *Paul*'s having the nobler place, *Quia Paulus credidit in Christum quem non vidit, à dextris figuratur, because he believed on Christ without seeing him* (here on earth.) And all this very agreeable to the story of *Scripture*, which as (according to the *brevity* of the relations there made) it onely sets down Saint *Peter* to be the *Apostle* of the *Circumcision* (and of his being so at *Rome* we make no question,) So it affirms of Saint *Paul*, that he *preached* at *Rome* in his *own hired house*, *receiving them which came unto him*, *Acts* 28. 30. which will most fitly be applied to the *Gentiles* of that *City*, the *Jews* having solemnly departed from him, *v.* 29.

[n] Euseb. Ibid.
[o] Dimid. Temp. c. 5.

Sect. 11. Accordingly in *Ignatius*, *Ep. ad Trall.* we reade of *Linus* and *Clemens*, that one was Saint *Paul*'s, the other Saint *Peter*'s *Deacon*, both which afterwards succeeded them in the *Episcopal Chair*, *Linus* being constituted *Bishop* of the *Gentile*, *Clemens* of the *Jewish Christians* there; And hence grows (unquestionably) that *variety*, or difference observed among Writers, some making Saint *Peter*, others Saint *Paul* the *founder* of that *Church*, but others (as hath been shewed) both of them; some making *Clemens*, others *Linus* the *first Bishop* after the *Apostles*, both affirmers speaking the truth, with this *Scholion* to interpret them: *Linus* was the *first Bishop* of the *Gentile Christians*, after Saint *Paul*; *Clemens* the *first* of the *Jewish* after Saint *Peter*; and after *Linus* his death, *Cletus* (or *Anacletus*) succeeding him, and dying also, *both* Congregations were at length *joyned* in one, under *Clemens*; by which one clew I suppose it easie to extricate the *Reader* out of the mazes, into which the *ancient writers* may lead him, in rehearsing the *first Bishops* of *Rome* so very diversly, but this is not a place to insist on it.

Sect. 12. By all which it appears that even in those *Churches*, whereof Saint *Peter* is acknowledged the *founder*, as that of *Rome*, and the like, yet he cannot be deemed the *sole founder*, but *coequal* to him Saint *Paul* of the *Gentile*, as he of the *Jewish Proselytes*: and if the *sole* government of that *Church* be devolved to the *original*, it will be found to have begun in *Clemens*, in whom the *union* of the *Jewish* and *Gentile* congregations there was *first* made, and not in Saint *Peter*.

Sect. 13. But then for another great part of the *Christian world*, it is manifest that Saint *Peter* had never to doe either *mediately*, or *immediately* in the *planting*, or *governing* of it, and consequently that from him that power can never descend to any other. Not to mention the *travels* and *labours*, and *plantations* of the other *Apostles*; which certainly had each their κλῆρος and ἴδιος λαὸς, and consequently their *Provinces* by *Apostolical* joynt consent assigned them, *Act.* 1. (though that *short History* written by Saint *Luke*, Saint *Paul*'s attendant, mention them not) I shall onely insist on the *beloved Disciple* his *fellow-Apostle* of the *Circumcision*, and that *abundant Labourer* Saint *Paul*.

Sect. 14. For Saint *John*, who had the favour of *Christ*, and the *dignity* of place before all others in *Christ*'s life time, even before Saint *Peter* himself (which is the plain meaning of his style of the *beloved Disciple*, and of the ἀνάκειτο ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ ἐπὶ τὸ στῆθος αὐτοῦ, *leaning on his breast at supper*, *Joh.* 21. 20. *his having the πρωτοκλισία, the first place next to Christ*, as being in *Abraham*'s *bosome* plainly signifies being in *dignity* of place next to the *father of the faithfull*) 'tis evident that he is one of those that by agreement went to the *Circumcision*, was assigned the *Jews* for his *Province*, as well as Saint *Peter*, and consequently he had the *converting*, and the *governing* of all the converted *Jews* of that *Lydian Asia*, and placing *Bishops* over them, as [p] *Clemens Alexandrinus*, and [q] *Eusebius*, and [r] *Prosper*, and others tell us; and the † *Authour* of the *Martyrdom* of *Timothy* saith of him, that being *returned from his banishment by Nerva's decree*, τὴν Ἐφεσίων ὑπέστη Μητρόπολιν καὶ αὐτὸς δι' ἑαυτοῦ ἐπὶ συμπαρόντων ἐπισκόπων τὴν Ἐφεσίων ἀπελάμβανεν Μητρόπολιν——*he placed his seat of residence in Ephesus, and having seven Bishops with him he undertook the care of that Metropolis*, that is in effect, or by interpretation, of *all Asia*, which was under that *prime Metropolis*, as far as extended to the *Jewish Christians* there.

Not all the Circumcision.
Not the Jews of *Asia*,

[p] Ὅτου ἐπισκοπὴν κατέστησεν—— Ὅτου δὴ καὶ κλῆρον ἔσχε τινα κληρώσων. ap. Euseb. l. 3. c. 23.
[q] Τοῖς αὐτοῦ λαοῖς. Ibid. [r] *Joannes apud Ephesum Ecclesiam scaravit.* Dimid. Temp. c. 5. † Phot. *Bib. num.* 254.

15. But then as before was said of the several *Churches* and *Bishops* in the same place, one of the dispersed *Jews*, the other of the *Gentiles*; so it is evident that through all this *Asia* (the *Lydian* or *Proconsular*) the *faith* was by Saint *Paul* planted among the *Gentile* part, and by him Saint *Timothy* constituted *Bishop* there: and so saith Saint *Chrysostome*, ὅτι ὁλόκληρον τὸ τῆς Ἀσίας ἔθνος ἐπιστεύθη, *a whole intire Nation*, *that of Asia*, *was intrusted to him*.

As neither the Gentiles there,

Hom. 3. *in* 1 Tim. 5. 19.

Sect. 16. Where I shall demand of any man of the *Romish* pretensions, or perswasion, what can be said, in any degree probably, for Saint *Peter*'s *Universal Pastourship*, whilst he lived, over this *Asia*, whose *seven Metropoles* (and sure there were *inferiour Churches*, or *Episcopal* Sees under them) are so early famous, being honoured with *Christ*'s *Epistle* to them in the *Revelation*; was Saint *Peter* the *supreme Pastour* of these *Churches*? had he any, or did he ever exercise, or pretend any *jurisdiction* over them? was not all the *Jewish* part of that *Province* ultimately under Saint *John*? and the *Gentile* part under Saint *Paul*, and Saint *Timothy* constituted, and *commissionated* by him? Doth not Saint *Paul* give him full *instructions* (and such as no other *Apostle* could countermand, or interpose in them) leaving no other *appeal* or place of application for *farther* directions, save onely to *himself*, when he shall *come to him*, 1 *Tim.* 3. 14, 15. Did not Saint *Paul* by his own single power *delegate* that *Province* to him, and seat him there? (as appears by the

παρεκάλεσα

παρεκάλεσα πορεύθηναι, *I exhorted* or *appointed thee, when I went to Macedonia,* 1 *Tim.* 1. 3.) and may it not as reasonably be said that Saint *Peter* was with him in his *journey* to *Macedonia,* as that he *joyned* with him in *giving* that *Commission* to *Timothy?*

Nor in *Crete,*

Sect. 17. And so likewise of *Titus* in *Crete,* was he not by Saint *Paul* peculiarly left in *Crete,* and constituted *Primate* there? Is it imaginable that under *Christ* there could be any *head* of that *Church* of that whole *Island,* save onely Saint *Paul?*

Nor in *Britany.*

Sect. 18. The same may certainly be said of all the *Gentile Churches* in all other *Islands,* and parts of the world, and consequently in this of *Britany,* wherein our present debate is terminated: And therefore if that of [t] *Simon Metaphrastes* should be thought to have truth in it, that Saint *Peter* was in *Britany* some time, and *baptized* many into the *faith* of *Christ,* and *constituted Churches, ordaining Bishops* and *Presbyters* and *Deacons* in the twelfth of *Nero,* in all reason it must be extended no farther than Saint *Peter's line,* as he was the *Apostle* of the *Circumcision,* i. e. to the *Jews* that might at that time be *dispersed* here, and so not prejudge the other more *authentick* relations of *Joseph* of *Arimathæa* or *Simon Zelotes* having *planted* the *Faith* in this *Island.*

[t] *de* Petr. & Paul. *ad diem* 29. *Junii.* Ἐπιμένει ἐν Βρεττανίᾳ ἡμέρας τινὰς, ἵνα πολλοὺς τῷ λόγῳ φωτίσας τῷ χάριτι ἐκκλησίας τινὰς συστήσηται, ἐπισκόπους τε καὶ πρεσβυτέρους καὶ διακόνους χειροτονήσας, διαδεξάμενος ἔτει τῷ Νέωνος.

Sect. 19. This I suppose is one competent *proof* of the *Negative,* as it respects the person of Saint *Peter,* that he was not *(could* not be, as things stood with him) *Universal Pastour* of the whole *Church,* constituted by *Christ.* And accordingly we see in *Prosper* disputing against *hereticks,* which *divide* from the *Church,* he expresses it by *relictâ pace communionis, & panis unius Dei & Apostolorum, that they leave the communion of Christ and his Apostles* in the *plural,* and adds, *cum in ipsa Hierusalem Jacobus — Joannes apud Ephesum, Andreas & cæteri per totam Asiam, Petrus & Paulus Apostoli in urbe Roma, Gentium Ecclesiam pactam undmque posteris tradentes, ex Dominica pactione sacrârunt,* that *James in Jerusalem, John at Ephesus, Andrew and the rest through all Asia, Peter and Paul at Rome consecrated the Church of the Nations.* Where as the *Church* had the several *Apostles* for the *founders* (and those *independent* one from the other) so the *unity* from which *hereticks,* and *schismaticks* depart, is said to have been *founded* equally in each of them, in *John* and *James* and *Andrew* and others, as well as in Saint *Peter,* nay at *Rome,* not in Saint *Peter* alone, but in him and Saint *Paul* together.

Dimid. Temp. c. 5. *Prosper's* testimony to this matter.

A second evidence against St. *Peter's* supremacy from the donation of the keys.

Sect. 20. In the *next* place another *evidence* we may have of this (in reference again to Saint *Peter's* person) from that which is visible in the *donation* of the *power* of the *Keys* set down in *Scripture.* This *power, Matt.* 16. 19. is promised to Saint *Peter,* [*I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven* —] But to him that from hence pretends this *Donative* and consequent *power,* as a *peculiarity* and *inclosure* of Saint *Peter's,* these considerations will be of force to supersede his *conclusion,* 1. That these words here set down by Saint *Matthew,* c. 16. are not the *Instrument* of *Christ's conveyance,* the words of his *commission,* but those *other, Joh.* 20. 21. *As my Father hath sent me, so send I you,* upon which words it is added, he *breathed on them, and said, Receive the holy Ghost, Whose sins ye remit, they are remitted* — And these (as also those, *Matt.* 28. 19. which are a *repetition* much to the same purpose) are delivered in *common,* and equally to *all,* and every of the *eleven Apostles,* as is evident by the *plural* style throughout that *Commission.*

Power of the keys given to all and each.

Sect. 21. Secondly, the words, *Matt.* 16. are onely a *promise* in the *future,* what *Christ* will afterward doe, and so the *donation* there set down onely by way of προλήψις, or *anticipation,* and if the making this *promise* to him peculiarly, seem to make any thing for him, then the *repetition* of that *promise, Matt.* 18. 18. which is made to *all* the *Apostles indefinitely* will *take* off that appearance, where it is λέγω ὑμῖν, and ὅσα ἐὰν δήσητε, *I say unto you* (to *all* of them *equally* and without any *peculiarity* of restriction) *whatsoever ye shall bind,* &c. The applying the words particularly to Saint *Peter* hath one special *energie* in it, and concludes that the *Ecclesiastical* power of *œconomy* or *stewardship* in *Christ's house* (of which the *keys* are the *token, Isa.* 22. 21.) belongs to *single* persons, such as Saint *Peter* was, and not onely to *Consistories,* or *Assemblies,* that whatsoever Saint *Peter* acted by virtue of *Christ's* power thus promised, he should be fully able to *act himself,* without the *conjunction* of any other, and that what he thus did *(clave non errante)* no one (or more men) *on earth* could rescind *without him,* which is a just ground of placing the *power Ecclesiastical* in *Single persons,* and not in *Communities,* in the *Prelate* of *each Church,* and not in the *Presbytery.* But still this is no *confining* of this *power* to Saint *Peter,* any more than to any other *single Apostle,* who had this *power* as distinctly *promised* to *each* of them, as here Saint *Peter* is pretended, and acknowledged to have; To which purpose, as the words of *Scripture* are most clear, *Matt.* 18. 18. (and accordingly, *Matt.* 19. the *promise* is again made of *twelve thrones* for *each Apostle* to sit on *one,* to *judge,* i. e. to *rule,* or *preside* in the *Church,* and when that *promise* was finally performed in the *descent* of the *Spirit, Act.* 2. the *fire* that represented that *Spirit* was *divided,* and ἐκάθισε *sate upon every one of them,* without any peculiar *mark* allowed Saint *Peter, and they were all filled with the Holy Ghost,* and so this *promise equally performed,* as it was *made,* to *all)* so is this exactly the notion, which the *ancient Fathers* of the *Church* appear to have had of them; Thus *Theophylact* according to Saint *Chrysostom's* sense, Εἰ δὲ καὶ πρὸς Πέτρον μόνον εἴρηται, τὸ, [Δώσω σοι,] ἀλλὰ καὶ πᾶσι πᾶσι τοῖς Ἀποστόλοις δέδοται, *Though the words* [*I will give thee*] *were delivered to Saint Peter alone, yet the power hath been conferred on all the Apostles.* Saint *Cyprian* hath an *eminent* place to this purpose, *Dominus noster — Episcopi honorem & Ecclesiæ suæ rationem disponens in Evangelio loquitur, & dicit Petro, Ego tibi dico, Quia tu es Petrus, & tibi dabo claves — Inde per temporum & successionum vices Episcoporum ordinatio & Ecclesiæ ratio decurrit, ut Ecclesia super Episcopos constituatur, & omnis actus Ecclesiæ per eosdem gubernetur, Christ meaning to set down the way of ordering his Church, saith unto Peter I will give thee the keys — From this promise of his, the ordination of Bishops and course of the Church hath continued by all successions and vicissitudes, So that the Church is built upon Bishops* (in the *plural)* *and every Ecclesiastick act is governed by them.* So Saint *Ambrose, Claves illius regni cœlorum in beato Petro cuncti suscepimus Sacerdotes, All we Bishops have in Saint Peter received those keys of the kingdom of heaven.* And accordingly Saint *Athanasius* mentions the *office* of *Bishop* as one of those things ἃ ὁ κύριος διὰ τῶν Ἀποστόλων τετύπωκε, *which Christ effigiated or formed in or by the Apostles;* And Saint *Basil* the *great* calls *Episcopacy* προεδρείαν τῶν Ἀποστόλων, *the Presidency of the Apostles,* the very same that *Christ* bestowed upon *all,* and not onely on *one* of them.

in Matt. 28.

Epist. 27.

De Dign. Sacerd. c. 5. & 6. *Ep. ad* Dracont.

Sect. 22.

Sect. 22. By all which it is evident again, that the *power* which *Christ's Commiſſion* inſtated on Saint *Peter*, was in like manner intruſted to every other *ſingle Apoſtle*, as well as to him, and conſequently that this of *univerſal Paſtour* was no *perſonal* privilege or *peculiarity* of Saint *Peter's*.

Sect. 23. Thirdly, that argument which is taken by learned Romaniſts from the name of *Peter* [πέτρος *Rock* or *foundation ſtone*] beſtowed on him by *Chriſt*, as if that were ſufficient to *found* this pretended *Supremacy*, is preſently *evacuated*, and *retorted* on the pretenders, when 'tis remembred 1. that πέτρος, and πέτρα, directly the ſame, ſignifies vulgarly *a ſtone* (μυλοειδὴς πέτρη, in *Homer's Iliad.* ϛ.) and of it ſelf denotes no more, but by the *context*, *Matt.* 16. 18. being applied to a *building* muſt needs ſignifie a *foundation ſtone*; and then 2. that *all* the twelve *Apoſtles* are in like manner (and not *he onely*, or *above* any other) ſtyled δωδεκα θεμελιοι, *twelve foundations*, *Apoc.* 21. 14. each of which *ſtones* having the name of an *Apoſtle* on it, in reſpect of the *power* and *dignity* that belonged to every one, is ſeverally compared to a *pretious ſtone*; And it being there in *viſion* apparent, that the *wall* of the *City*, i. e. of the *Church*, being meaſured exactly, was found to be an *hundred forty four*, i. e. *twelve times twelve cubits*, 'tis evident that that menſuration aſſigns an *equal* proportion whether of *power* or *province* to *all* and *every* of the *Apoſtles*, which is again a *prejudice* to the *univerſal Paſtourſhip* of any one of them.

The Romaniſts argument from *Tu es Petrus* evacuated.

CHAP. V.

The Evidences from the Biſhop of Rome ſucceeding S. Peter examined.

Sect. 1. FRom this argument of the pretenders as it reſpects S. *Peter's perſon*, and hath been thus manifeſted to be utterly incompetent to infer the deſigned *concluſion*, It is now very eaſie, but withall very unneceſſary to proceed to the other part of it, as it concerns S. *Peter's ſucceſſours* in his *Epiſcopal*, or (which is all one as to this matter) his *Apoſtolical* ſeat, and power at *Rome*, For certainly what he had not *himſelf*, he cannot *devolve* to any of his *ſucceſſours* upon that one ſcore of *ſucceeding* him, and therefore as this of S. *Peter's perſonal* power, and eminence is the *principal*, So it is in effect the *onely* ground of the *Romaniſts* pretenſion, this other of *derivative* power in his *ſucceſſour*, being like water that flows from a *ſpring*, apt to *aſcend* no higher, than the *fountain* ſtood, and therefore I again think fit to remind the *Romaniſt*, and peremptorily to inſiſt on this *exception*, that if he cannot make good S. *Peter's Oecumenical* power, and *Paſtourſhip* over *all* the reſt of the *Apoſtles*, from the *donation* of *Chriſt* (which I ſuppoſe hath been evidenced he cannot do, and for any proofs made uſe of by any to that purpoſe, and drawn either from *Feed my ſheep*, and *lambs*, or from the mention of the *two ſwords*, or from *Thou art Peter*—they have ſo little appearance of ſtrength in them, and have ſo *often* been anſwered by thoſe of *our* perſwaſion, that I cannot think it uſefull, or ſeaſonable to deſcend to any *farther* ſurvey of them) his other pretenſions are at an end for the *Univerſal Paſtourſhip* of the *Pope*, his *ſucceſſour*, whoſe *power*, and *authority* over all other *Biſhops* cannot farther be extended (upon this account of *ſucceſſion*) than S. *Peter's* was over all other *Apoſtles*, the ſeveral *Biſhops* of the world *holding from* (as *ſucceeding*) ſome *Apoſtle* or other, as certainly as the *Biſhop* of *Rome* can by any be ſuppoſed to *ſucceed* S. *Peter*, according to that of * *Tertullian*, *Sicut Smyrnæorum Eccleſia Polycarpum à Joanne collocatum refert, Sicut Romanorum Clementem à Petro ordinatum edit, perinde utique & cæteræ exhibent quos ab Apoſtolis in Epiſcopatum conſtitutos Apoſtolici ſeminis traduces habent, As the records of the Church of Smyrna deduce Polycarp their Biſhop from Saint John, and as the Church of Rome relates that Clement (their Biſhop) was ordained by Saint Peter, in like manner the reſt of the Churches ſhew us the Biſhops which they have had conſtituted by the Apoſtles, and who have brought down and derived the Apoſtolick Seed unto them.*

No privilege by ſucceſſion from S. *Peter*, but as S. *Peter* is proved to have himſelf.

* *De Præſcript.* c. 32.

Sect. 2. What therefore I ſhall now add in return to the *ſecond branch* of this *argument*, concerning the *power* of S. *Peter's ſucceſſour*, as ſuch, will be perfectly *ex abundanti*, *more than* needs, and ſo I deſire it may be looked on by the reader, whoſe *curioſity* perhaps may require farther *ſatisfaction*, when his *reaſon* doth not; and in *compliance* therewith I ſhall propoſe theſe few *conſiderations*. Firſt, whether S. *Peter* did not as truly *plant* a *Church* of *Jewiſh believers* at *Antioch*, and leave a *ſucceſſour Biſhop* there, as at *Rome* he is ſuppoſed to have done? 2. Whether this were not done by him, before ever he came to *Rome*? 3. Whether the *Conceſſion* of theſe *two* unqueſtioned matters of *fact*, do not *devolve* all *power*, and *juriſdiction* on the *Biſhop* of *Antioch* S. *Peter's ſucceſſour* there, which by that tenure and claim of *ſucceſſion* from S. *Peter* can be pretended to by the *Biſhop of Rome*, S. *Peter's ſucceſſour* alſo? Nay, Whether the *right* of *Primogeniture* be not ſo much more conſiderable on this ſide, than any circumſtance on the other ſide, which can be offered to *counterbalance* it, that he which *ſucceeded* him in his *firſt ſeat* (*Antioch*) is, if there be force in the *argument* of *ſucceſſion*, to be looked on as the *chief of his ſtrength*, partaker of *more power* by *virtue* of that *ſucceſſion*, than he that afterward *ſucceeded* him at *Rome*?

The privileges attending S. *Peter's* ſucceſſour belonging rather to the Biſhop of *Antioch* than of *Rome*.

Sect. 3. This we know, that *anciently* there were *three Patriarchates*, and *Antioch* was one of them, as *Rome* was another; and though I, who lay not that weight on the *argument* of *ſucceſſion* from S. *Peter*, am not engaged to affirm that *Antioch* was the *chief* of theſe, yet this I contend, that there is much leſs reaſon, that any *precedence*, which is afforded *Rome* by the *ancient Canons*, ſhould be deemed imputable to this *ſucceſſion* from S. *Peter*, when 'tis evident that claim belongs to *Antioch*, as well as to *Rome*, and firſt to *Antioch*, and afterwards to *Rome*, and no otherwiſe to *Rome*, than as it was firſt competible to *Antioch*.

Sect. 4. Of *Rome* it is confeſſed that the *primacy* of *dignity* or *order* belonged to that, the *next* place to *Alexandria*, the *third* to *Antioch*, which is an evidence that the *ſucceſſion* from S. *Peter* was not conſidered in this matter, for then *Alexandria*, which held onely from S. *Mark*, muſt needs have yielded to *Antioch* which held from S. *Peter*. The original of this *precedence*, or *dignity* of the *Biſhop of Rome* is ſure much

The Primacy belonged to *Rome* upon another ſcore.

Can. penult. more fitly deduced by the *fourth General Council* holden at *Chalcedon*, confirming the *decree* of the *Council* of *Conſtantinople*, that that *See* ſhall have ἴσα πρεσβεῖα, *equal privileges*, and *dignities*, and *advantages* with *Rome*, upon this account, that *Conſtantinople* was *New Rome*, and the *ſeat* of the *Empire* at that time; which, ſay they, was the *reaſon* (and not any *donation* of *Chriſt*'s to S. *Peter*, or *ſucceſſion* of that *Biſhop* from him) that *Rome* enjoyed ſuch *privileges* (Καὶ διὰ τοῦτο τὰ πρεσβεῖα τοῖς Ῥώμης διὰ τὸ βασιλεύειν τὴν πόλιν ἐκείνην οἱ πατέρες εἰκότως ἀπέδωκαν τῷ πρεσβείᾳ) and therefore τῷ αὐτῷ σκοπῷ κινούμενοι, *The Fathers at Conſtantinople being moved with the ſame reaſons had rightly judged that now the ſame privileges ſhould belong to that Church or City*, Καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἐκκλησιαστικοῖς ὡς ἐκείνην μεγαλύνεσθαι πράγμασι βάδην μετ' ἐκείνην ὑπάρχουσαν, and that this being next to *Old Rome* ſhould in all *Eccleſiaſtical affairs* have the *ſame dignity*, or *greatneſs* that *Old Rome* had. Where, as the *Original* of the *dignity* of that *See* is duly ſet down, and (which is obſervable) in the whole *conteſt* never ſo much as quarrelled at by the *Legates*, *viz.* the *reſidence* of the *Imperial Majeſty* there (a thing very remarkable in the ſeveral degrees of dignity in the *Church*, that of *Patriarchs*, *Primates*, *Archbiſhops*, *Biſhops*, which generally obſerved their proportions with the *Civil ſtate*, as hath been ſhewed) ſo is the nature of it alſo, no *ſupremacy* of *power* over all the *Biſhops* of the *world* (for that *Monarchical* power is not at once competible to two *equals* or *rivals*) and withall the *movableneſs* or *communicableneſs* of that *dignity*, as that which may follow the *Imperial ſeat*, whitherſoever it is *removable*, and is not fixed at *Rome* by any *commiſſion* of *Chriſt* or *ſucceſſion* from S. *Peter*.

The Canon of the Council of *Chalcedon* rejected by the *Romaniſts*.

Sect. 5. But becauſe I ſhall ſuppoſe that a *Canon*, though of an *Univerſal Council*, when it is found thus derogatory to the *height* which *Rome* now pretends to, ſhall not by the *Romaniſt* be acknowledged to be *authentick*, as wanting that which the *Romaniſt* makes abſolutely neceſſary to the validity of *Councils* or *Canons*, the *ſuffrage* of the *Biſhop* of *Rome* and conſent of his *Legates*; and becauſe I mean not here to go out of my way to vindicate (which I could very readily do) the *authority* of that *Canon*, or to ſhew the ſtrangeneſs of this dealing, not to admit any *teſtimony* againſt them, but wherein they have given their *own ſuffrage* (a method of *ſecurity* beyond all *amulets*, if no man ſhall be *believed* againſt me, till I have *joyned* with him to *accuſe* and *condemn* my *ſelf*) I ſhall therefore lay no more weight on this, than will, without this ſupport, be otherwiſe upheld, and is in ſome meaſure evident by the *Romaniſts* rejecting this *Canon*, and adding that the *Church* of *Antioch* rejected it alſo; which argues that that which the *Church* of *Conſtantinople* was willing to acquire by this decree, was as derogatory to the *dignity* of *Antioch* as of *Rome*. And as that concludes that *Antioch* had profeſſedly the ἴσα πρεσβεῖα, *equal privileges* with *Rome*, the *dignity* of a *Patriarchate*, and the attendants and *pomps* of that, So it proceeds on a *conceſſion*, that all that *Conſtantinople* wanted, or in which this *New* came ſhort of the *Old Rome*, was onely the *dignity* of a *Patriarchate*, without any *ordinary juriſdiction* over other *Churches*. Which again ſhews us what was the nature of the *preeminence* of the *Roman See* at that time; no *ſupreme authoritative* power over other *Primates*, but onely a *precedence*, or *priority* of place in *Councils*, an *eminence* in reſpect of *dignity*, which is perfectly reconcileable with the αὐτοκεφαλία and *independence*, the *no-ſubordination* or *ſubjection* of others *Primates*.

The dignity of Patriarchs reconcileable with the independency of Primates.

The Canon of *Epheſus* againſt incroaching on any others *Province*.

Sect. 6. This hath *formerly* been manifeſted, when we diſcourſed of the *original*, and *power*, and *dignity* of *Primates*, and *Patriarchs*, and is put beyond all controll by that *Canon* of the *Council* of *Epheſus* in the cauſe of the *Archbiſhop* of *Cyprus*, over whom the *Patriarch* of *Antioch*, though *Patriarch* of *all* the *Orient*, was adjudged to have no manner of *power*. And this *independency* of *Cyprus*, not onely from the *Patriarch* of *Antioch*, but from *all* others whomſoever, was conteſted then, as from the *Apoſtles* times, and aſſerted, and vindicated by that *Council*, and order given *indefinitely* againſt all invaſions from time to come, in whatever *Dioceſe*, that no *Biſhop* ſhall incroach upon *anothers Province*, or uſurp a *power*, where from the *Apoſtles* times he had not *enjoyed* it; which how directly it (is applicable to, and) *prejudgeth* the pretenſions of *Rome*, as well as of *Antioch*, is ſo manifeſt, that it cannot need farther demonſtrating.

Inſtances of Independent power in Archbiſhops.

Sect. 7. Of the ſame kind, two farther inſtances I ſhall here add; firſt of the *Archbiſhop* of *Carthage*, who being the *chief Primate*, or *Metropolitan* (for theſe two words in the *African* ſtyle different from the uſage of other *Churches*, are obſervable to ſignifie the ſame thing) in *Africk*, i. e. in one of the *thirteen Dioceſes* of the *Empire*, appears to have been *independent* from all other *power*, an abſolute *Primate*, ſubject to no *ſuperiour*, or *Patriarch*, whether of *Alexandria*, or *Rome*. This is evident by *Juſtinian* in the 131. *Novel*, where the *Emperour* gives the ſame privileges to the *Archbiſhop* of * *Carthage*, which he had formerly given to the *Biſhop* of *Juſtiniana Prima*; which being the *ſecond example* I meant to mention, I ſhall briefly ſhew what that *Prerogative* was, which equally belonged to theſe two.

* Καὶ τὸ ὅμοιον πρέπον τὸ δίκαιον τῷ Ἀρχιεροσύνῃ τῷ τῆς ὁσιοτάτης ἐκκλησίας Καρχηδόνος τῆς Ἀφρικῆς διοικήσεως πάσης, ἐξ ὧν ὁ θεὸς ταύτῃ ἡμῖν ἐποικτίσατο φυλάττεσθαι κελεύομεν.

[a] *Cæteræ Provinciæ ſub ejus ſint authoritate* i. e. *tam ipſa mediterranea Dacia, quàm Dacia Ripenſis, nec non Myſia, Secunda Dardania, & Prævalitana Provincia & ſecunda Macedonia, & pars ſecunda etiam Pannoniæ, quæ in Bacenſi eſt civitate.* Juſtin. *de Privileg. Archiep.* Juſt. Prim. *ed. à* Gothofred.

[b] *Volumus ut Primæ Juſtinianæ patriæ noſtræ pro tempore ſacroſanctus Antiſtes, non ſolùm Metropolitanus, ſed etiam Archiepiſcopus fiat.* Ibid.

[c] *Multis & variis modis noſtram patriam augere cupientes, in qua Deus præſtitit nobis hunc modum* (So *Gothofred* reads, but certainly it ſhould be *ad*, or *in hunc modum*) *quem ipſe condidit, venire.* Ibid. *Neceſſarium duximus ipſam glorioſiſſimam Præfecturam, quæ in Pannonia erat, in noſtra felicisſima patria collocare.* Ibid.

Sect. 8. *Juſtiniana Prima* was the head of [a] *Dacia* the new; a *Dioceſe* (as that ſignifies *more* than a *Province*, a [b] *Primate*'s, a *Patriarch*'s dominion) erected by *Juſtinian the Emperour*; and that City thus dignified, as the [c] place where he had been *born*, the *Archbiſhop* thereof made *Primate* of all that *Dioceſe*. This is thus expreſſed in the *Imperial Conſtitutions*, *Nov.* 11. *that he ſhall have omnem cenſuram Eccleſiaſticam, ſummum Sacerdotium, ſummum faſtigium, ſummam dignitatem, all power of Eccleſiaſtical juriſdiction, the ſupreme Prieſthood, ſupreme honour and dignity*; And in the *Conſtitutions* ſet out by *Gothofred* out of an *old MS. Copy*, *Tu & omnes Juſtinianæ Primæ Antiſtites, quicquid oriatur inter eos diſcrimen, ipſi hoc dirimant, & finem eis imponant, & nec ad alium quendam eatur, ſed ſuum agnoſcant Archiepiſcopum omnes prædictæ Provinciæ* — *that all the Provinces ſhall in their laſt reſort make their appeal to him for all controverſies.* And *Nov.* 131. c. 3. *that in all that Dioceſe he ſhall have locum Apoſtolicæ ſedis, the place or dignity of the Apoſtolical ſeat*; which gave *Nicephorus* occaſion (in his relation of this matter) to affirm that the *Emperour* made it a *free City*, *and* αὐτοκέφαλον *an head unto it ſelf*, with *full power independent* from all others: And though the *firſt Biſhop* thereof was conſecrated by *Vigilius*

Biſhop

Bishop of Rome, as by some *Bishop* it is certain he must, yet that is of no force against the *conclusion*, to which I design this instance, it being evident that being *consecrated*, he was *absolute*, and *depended* not on any, and his [d] *successours* were to be ordained by his *Council* of *Metropolitans*, and not by the *Pope*.

[d] *Quando autem te ab hac luce decedere contigerit, pro tempore Archiepiscopum ejus à venerabili suo Concilio Metropolitanorum ordinari sancimus, quemadmodum decet Archiepiscopum omnibus honoratum Ecclesiis provehi.* Ibid. Αὐτῷδε ἐπὶ τ οἰκείας ζωῆδε χειροτονεῖσθ. Νεαρ. ρλα.

Sect. 9. Which as it makes a *second instance* of the point in hand, so when it is remembred, that all this *independent absolute* power was conferred upon this *City* (the *Emperour*'s favourite) onely by his making it a *Primate*'s, or chief *Metropolitan*'s *See*, and that *Carthage*'s being the *Prime Metropolis* of *Africk* is expressed by having the *same privileges*, that *Justiniana Prima* had, It will follow (what is most certain, and might otherwise be testified by innumerable evidences,) that *every Primate*, or *chief Metropolitan* was *absolute* within his own *circuit*, neither *subject* nor subordinate to any *foreign Superiour*, whether *Pope* or *Patriarch*; And that was all which was *usefull* (much more than was *necessary*) to be here *demonstrated*. And being so, there remains to the *See* of *Rome* no farther claim to the *subjection* of this *Island*, nor appearance of proof of the charge of *schism*, in casting off that yoke, upon this *first* score of S. *Peter*'s, or his *successours* right to the *Universal Pastourship*.

Sect. 10. Upon this head of discourse depends also all that is, or can be said for the confining the *Catholick Church* to the number of those, who live in *obedience* to the *Roman Church*, or *Bishop*. For if there have been from the *Apostles times*, an *independent power* vested in *each Primate*, or *chief Metropolitan* (as hath been evidently shewn) then how can it be necessary to the being of a *member* of the *Catholick Church*, to be *subject* to that one *Primate*? 'Tis certainly sufficient to the *conservation* of the *unity* of the whole *Church*, that every one pay an *obedience*, where an *obedience* is due, and no way usefull to that end, that those that are *born free*, should *resign* up, devest themselves of that *privilege*, and become αὐθαίρετοι δοῦλοι *servants* or *subjects* of their *own making*. But I shall not enlarge on this matter, but conclude with that of our *Bishops* in *Convocation*, *Anno Chr.* 1537. in their *Book* intituled, [*The Institution of a Christian man*:] that *it was many hundred years before the Bishop of Rome could acquire any power of a Primate over any other Bishops, which were not within his Province in Italy, And that the Bishops of Rome do now transgress their own profession made in their Creation, For all the Bishops of Rome always when they be consecrated and made Bishops of that See, do make a* * *solemn profession and vow, that they shall inviolably observe all the Ordinances made in the eight first General Councils, among which it is especially provided, that all causes shall be determined within the Province, where they be begun, and that by the Bishops of the same Province; which absolutely excludes all Papal*, i. e. *foreign power* out of these *Realms*.

The unreasonableness of confining the Catholick Church to the number of those that live in the Roman subjection.

* *In Diurn. lib. Profess. Rom. Pont. vid. Corp. Jur. Decret. par.* 1. *distinct.* 16. *c.* 8.

CHAP. VI.

Their second plea, from the Bishop of Rome having planted Christianity among us.

Sect. 1. THE *next* part of the *Romanist*'s arguing against us, is taken from a *peculiar right*, or claim, that the *Bishop* or *See* of *Rome* hath to *our obedience*, upon the score of having *planted Christianity* among us.

Sect. 2. But before I proceed to shew the *invalidity* of this plea, I desire it may first be observed, that the *pleading* of this, as the *title* by which the *Bishop* of *Rome* hath right to our *subjection*, is absolutely *unreconcileable* with his former *pretensions* founded in his *œcumenical Pastourship* by *succession* to S. *Peter*; For certainly he that is supposed (in gross) to have that *original* title to *all power* over *all Churches*, cannot be imagined to *acquire* it *afterward* (by way of retail) over any *particular Church*. He that claims a *reward*, as of his own *labour* and travel, must be supposed to *disclaim Donation*, which is *antecedent* to, and *exclusive* of the other, as the title of *descent* is to that of *Conquest*, And it is a very great *prejudice* to the *justice* of his pretensions, who finds it necessary to mix things that are so *incompetible*.

The plea from planting the Faith unreconcileable with the former.

Sect. 3. And therefore I am obliged to offer this *Dilemma* to the *Romanist* in this place, and to demand, Which is the *Pope*'s true title to the *subjection* of this *Island*? the *Donation* of *Christ*, or *conversion* wrought by *Augustine* the *Monk*? If the latter be affirmed to be it, then it must be granted by him, both that this *Island* before the time of *Pope Gregory* was no way *subjected* to the *Romish See*, and withall that no *Christian Nation* is at this day thus *subject*, but such as doth appear to have been *converted* by *Rome*, as the *Saxons* here are supposed to have been; And then this *concession* will lose more *subjects* to the *Apostolick See*, than the return of these *Islands* to the *desired subjection* would ever be able to *countervail*, or recompense; and therefore it is reasonable to insist on the terms of this *bargain*, and not to *yield* the one, till the other be *yielded* to us, But if the former be affirmed to be it, and that indeed the *commmission* from *Christ* to S. *Peter* be still the *fundamental* hold, by which our *subjection* is, and always hath been due to his *successours*, then is that other of the *conversion* by *Augustine* but a *fallacious* pretense, a *non causa pro causa*, to amuse us, and need not farther be answered, or invalidated, than by this *confession*.

A Dilemma to the Romanist.

Sect. 4. But then passing by this *advantage*, and taking the *objection* as it lies by it self, these farther considerations will take off all force from it. 1. That this *Island* was converted to the *Faith* of *Christ*, long before *Augustine*'s preaching to the *Saxons*, either *in*, or very *near* the *Apostles times*, in *Tiberius* his *reign*, saith *Gildas*, and long before *Tertullian*'s and *Origen*'s time, as by them appears, *Tertul. in Apol.* and *Orig. in Ezech. Hom.* 4. To this I shall not need to add the testimony of *Eleutherius* the *Bishop* of *Rome*, in the vulgar *Epistle* to our *Lucius*, the first *Christian King* of the world, styling him, *Vicarium Dei in Regno suo, God's Vicegerent in his own Kingdom*, because, as there is some doubt of the *authentickness* of that *Epistle*,

The Faith planted here before *Augustine* the Monk.

so the * onely thing that we have now need to conclude from it, is otherwise evident, viz. *that the Nation was in his time converted*, and so long *before Augustine's* coming. And though by *Diocletian's persecution*, *Christianity* were here shrewdly *shaken*, yet I suppose, that will not be thought *argumentative*, both because it might be of *ill example* against *other* Nations, where the *faith* was as bloudily persecuted in that, or other times, and possibly at *some* point of time against *Rome* it self, where S. *Peter's Chair* was not always *amulet* sufficient to avoid the like *destructions*, and especially because it is evident, that the *British Church* survived that *calamity*, and began to *flourish* again, saith *Bede*, l. 1. c. 8. their *Churches*, saith he, *were rebuilt, holy-days celebrated*, the *memories* of their *Martyrs erected*, and the *offices* of the *Church* duly performed, which farther appears by *authentick* testimonies, three of our *Bishops* being *ten years* after that, *present* (and their *names subscribed, Eborius of York, Restitutus of London, and Adelfius Coloniæ Londinensium*) at the *Council of Arles, eleven years* before the *first Council of Nice*. So likewise at the time of that *Nicene Council* it appears, that as *Britany* was one of the *six Dioceses* of the *West Empire* (see *Notitia Provinc. Occident.*) so there were in it *three Metropolitans, the Bishop of York* (his *Province Maxima Cæsariensis*) the *Bishop of London* (his *Province Britania prima*) the *Bishop of Caeruske* (his *Province Britania secunda*) in *Monmouthshire*, [a] which after in *King Arthur's* time was translated to Saint *David's*, where it continued an *Archbishoprick* till *King Henry* I. who subjected it to *Canterbury*, and [b] all this space of about 500 years after *Augustine's* coming, the *Bishops* thereof, *eleven in number, were all consecrated by the suffragan Bishops of that Province, without any profession, or subjection to any other Church, as the Annals there affirm.*

* *Suscepistis nuper in Regno Britania legem & fidem Christi.*

And not quite destroyed by *Diocletian.*

[a] See S. *Hen. Spelman, Concil. Anglic.* pag. 26. out of the Annals of *Gisburne.*

[b] *A Samsone usque tempus Henrici primi, sederunt Meneviæ undecim Episcopi, & usque ad hoc tempus Episcopi Meneviæ à suis suffraganeis Wallensibus ibidem fuerunt consecrati, nullâ penitus professione vel subjectione fallâ alteri Ecclesiæ.* Ibid.

Sect. 5. To the same purpose is it, that when *Augustine* required *subjection* to the *Pope* and *Church of Rome*, the *Abbot* of *Bangor* is recorded to have returned him this *answer*, *Notum sit vobis quòd nos omnes sumus—— Be it known unto you, that we are all subject, and obedient to the Church of God, and the Pope of Rome, but so as we are also to every pious and good Christian*, viz. *to love every one in his degree and place, in perfect Charity, and to help every one by word and deed to attain to be the sons of God*; * *Et aliam obedientiam quàm istam non scio debitam ei quem vos nominatis esse Papam, nec esse Patrem Patrum vendicari & postulari, And for any other obedience I know none due to him whom you call the Pope, and as little do I know by what right he can challenge to be Father of Fathers, Bishop of Bishops or Universal Bishop. Præterea nos sumus sub gubernatione Episcopi Caerlegionensis super Osca—— As for us, we are under the rule of the Bishop of Caerlegion upon Usk, who is to overlook and govern us under God.*

The Britains rejection of the Bishop of *Rome.*

* *Concil. Anglic.* p. 108.

Sect. 6. From hence the result is clear, that whatever is pretended from *Augustine* the *Monk*, or supposed to have been then pressed by him, for the *advancing* of the *Pope's* interest in this *Island*, and concluding us guilty of *Schism* in *casting off* that yoke, yet the *British Bishops* still holding out against this *pretension*, and that with all *reason* on their side, if the title of *conversion*, which the *Romanist* pleads for our *subjection*, may be of any *validity* with him, it must needs *follow*, that the whole *Island* cannot upon this score of *Augustine's conversion*, be now deemed *schismatical*, it being certain, that the *whole Island*, and particularly the *Dominion of Wales*, was not thus converted by *Augustine*, nor formerly by any *sent* from *Rome*, or that observed the *Roman Order* (as appears by the observation of *Easter*, contrary to the usage received at *Rome*) but either by *Joseph* of *Arimathea*, or *Simon Zelotes*, as our *Annals* tell us most probably. And this in the first place must needs be yielded to by those that expect to receive any *advantage* to their cause by *this* argument; And if they will still extend their *title* equally, to those parts of *Britany*, which *Augustine* did *not*, as to those which he *did convert*, to *Wales*, as well as to *Kent*, it is evident they must doe it upon some *other* score (whatsoever the pretense be) and not upon this of *conversion*.

The invalidity of the argument from conversion, when the Britains were certainly not converted by *Augustine.*

Sect. 7. But then secondly, for as much of this *Island*, as was *really converted* to the *Faith* by the coming of *Augustine*, there is no title for their *subjection*, and the perpetual *subjection* of their *posterity* from this.

No title from conversion for subjection.

Sect. 8. To examine this a while by other known *practices* of the *Christian* world, S. *Paul* by himself or his *Apostles*, or *Procuratours*, was the *great Converter* of the *Gentiles*; Concerning him I shall demand, whether all those *Nations converted* by him and his ministers, are to all ages obliged to be subject to that *Chair*, where S. *Paul* sate (whether in the *Church* at *Antioch*, or *Rome*, or the like) at the time of his *sending* out, or going himself to *convert* them; If so, then 1. there cannot be a greater *prejudice* imaginable to S. *Peter's Universal Pastourship*; And 2. it will in the *story* of the *fact* appear to have no degree of *truth* in it; *Timothy* that was placed over *Asia* in *Ephesus*, and *Titus* over *Crete*, being (as hath formerly appeared) *supreme* in those *Provinces*, and *independent* from any other *See*. And generally that is the nature of *Primates* or *Patriarchs*, to have no *superiour* either to *ordain*, or *exercise jurisdiction* over them, but themselves to be *absolute* within their *Province*, and their *successours* to be *ordained* by the *suffragan Bishops* under them; which could not be, if every such *Church*, where such a *Primate* was placed, were *subject* to that *Church*, from which they received the *Faith*.

The power of Kings to erect Patriarchates.

Sect. 9. To put this whole matter out of *controversie*, It is, and hath always been in the *power* of *Christian Emperours*, and *Princes* within their *Dominions* to *erect Patriarchates*, or to *translate* them from one City to another, and therefore whatever title is supposable to be acquired by the *Pope* in this *Island* upon the first *planting* of the *Gospel* here, this cannot so oblige the *Kings* of *England* ever since, but that they may freely *remove* that *power* from *Rome* to *Canterbury*, and *subject* all the *Christians* of this *Island* to the *spiritual* power of that *Archbishop* or *Primate independently* from any *foreign Bishop*.

[c] Examples, in *Justiniana Prima*, c. 5. sect. 8.

Sect. 10. For the *erection* of *Primacies* or *Patriarchates*, that of *Justiniana Prima* [c] forementioned, and set down at large, is an evident proof, *Justinian* erecting that (long after the rest of the *Primates* seats in the *Empire*) to be an *Archiepiscopal See absolute* and *independent*, and *subjecting* all *Dacia* the *new* to it; And though the *Pope Vigilius* was by the *Emperour* appointed to *ordain* the *first Bishop* there, yet were his *successours* to be *ordained* by his own *Metropolitans*, and the *Bishops* under him not to *appeal* to any others, as hath in each particular formerly been *evidenced*.

Sect. 11.

Sect. 11. The same also hath in like manner been shewn of *Carthage*, which was by the same *Justinian* (not *originally* dignified, but) [d] after the rescuing it out of the *Vandals* hands, restored to a state of *Primacy*, after the pattern or image of *Justiniana Prima*, and *two Provinces* more annexed, than had anciently belonged to that *Bishop's jurisdiction*. *Carthage.* [d] ἐξ ὅπερ ἐπὶ τοῦτο ἦλθε καὶ τύχην. Διάταξις 131.

Sect. 12. Before either of these, the *Emperour Valentinian* the Third, *Anno Christi*, 432. by his *Rescript* constituted *Ravenna* a *Patriarchal seat*; And from his time, * that held the *Patriarchate* without any *dependence* on the *Bishop* of *Rome* to the time of *Constantinus Pogonatus*; And though at that time the *Greek Emperour's Vicarii* or *Exarchs* being not able to support the *Bishop* of *Ravenna* against the *Longobards*, he was fain to flie for support to the *Bishop* of *Rome*, and so *submitted* himself unto him, and after *Reparatus*, the next *Bishop Theodorus* did the like to *Pope Agatho*, whether upon the score of great *friendship* with him, or in *despite* to his own *Clergy* (with whom he had *variance*) saith *Sabellicus*, yet the people of *Ravenna* thought themselves *injured* hereby, and joyned with their next *Bishop Fœlix* to maintain their *privilege*, though *Pope Constantine* stirring up *Justinian* Ῥινότμητον against them, they were *worsted*, and *defeated* in their attempt. *Ravenna.* * *r.* it

Sect. 13. Other *examples* there are of this kind; * *Balsamon* points at some which from the [f] *Emperour's Charter* had this *privilege*, not to be *subject* to the *Patriarch* of *Constantinople*, calling them αὐτοκέφαλοι Ἀρχιεπίσκοποι, which were *Archbishops independent*: So under *Phocas*, the *Patriarchate* of *Grado* in *Italy* was erected, saith [g] *Warnefridus de gestis Longobard.* Others, as *Eginartus*, *Chancellour* to *Charles* the *Great*, and who wrote his *Life*, say it was done by *Charles* the *Great*. And so doth *Rhegino*, who lived in the next age. And accordingly in *Duarenus de Benef. lib.* 1. *cap.* 9. among the *Minorum Gentium Patriarchatus*, that of *Grado* is reckoned for one, and joyned with *Aquileia*, *Canterbury* and *Bourges*. * *De privileg. Patriar.* [f] ἀπὸ τῆς φιλοτιμίας βασιλικῆς ἰδιαίτερον τοῦτο τὸ δίκαιον λαβόντες. [g] l. 4. c. 34. *Grado.*

Sect. 14. And that it was a frequent usage in the *East* may appear by the twelfth *Canon* of the *Council* of *Chalcedon*, where we find mention of πόλεις διὰ γραμμάτων βασιλικῶν τὸ τῆς μητροπόλεως ὄνομα καὶ ἀξίωσιν, *Cities honoured by Letters Patents from the Kings or Emperours with the name and dignity of Metropoles*, and where the *Council* represses the *ambition* of *Bishops*, which *sought* those *privileges* διὰ ἀναγραπτῶν, *by Rescripts from the Emperours*, and *censures* it, (in them that so sought it) as ἔξω τοῦ ἐκκλησιαστικοῦ διατάγματος, *not agreeable to the Ecclesiastical Canons*, repressing the *ambition* of the *Bishops*, but not *cassating* the *Rescripts*, nor *withdrawing* the *honour* from the *Metropolis* so erected; Of this *Canon Balsamon* saith, that when it was made, many *Emperours* had erected many *Metropolitans*, and naming *three*, adds, καὶ ἄλλαι ὁπόσαι ἐτιμήθησαν, that *other Bishopricks were thus honoured*, and that the *Emperours* did it, κατὰ τὴν δοθεῖσαν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν, *according to the power that was given them*. Where it is farther to be observed, 1. that this *Council* was within 20 years after that grant of *Valentinian*, and consequently, if *Balsamon* say right, (that at that time many *Emperours* had erected *many*) there must needs be *others* before *Valentinian*. 2. that the seventeenth *Canon* of the *Council* of *Chalcedon* doth more expresly attribute this power to the *Prince*, Εἰ δὲ καί τις ἐκ βασιλικῆς ἐξουσίας ἀναγνισθεῖσα πόλις, ἢ αὖθις καινισθεῖσα, τοῖς πολιτικοῖς καὶ δημοσίοις τύποις, καὶ τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν παροικιῶν ἡ τάξις ἀκολουθείτω, *If a City be built or restored by the King's power, let the Ecclesiastical order follow the Political.* And the same power is acknowledged to belong to the *Prince* by the *Council in Trullo Can.* 38. And then 3. that these two last *Canons* are reconciled with that twelfth of *Chalcedon*, by the *Law* of *Alexius Comnenus*, and assented to by the *Synod* under him, See *Balsam. in Can.* 38. *Concil. in Trullo*, who concludes that the *King* might doe it, αὐθορμήτου γενόμενος, *upon his own incitation or motion, but it should not be lawfull for any by base solicitation to seek or obtain it*, adding that in that case, *upon any such Rescript of the Emperour for such erection, it might be lawfull for the Patriarch to suspend the confirmation of the Charter, untill he represented to the Emperour what the Canons were in that case, and understood if the Emperour did it* οἰκόθεν *from his own motion, which appearing, the Patriarch was to admit thereof.* Frequent in the East.

And accordingly the same *Balsamon* (on *Concil. Carthag. Can.* 16.) doth upon that *Canon* professedly found the *authority* of *Princes*, Ἐπισκοπὴν εἰς μητρόπολιν ἄγειν —— καὶ ὁπόταν νῦν ὁπόσαι καὶ μητροπόλεις γεγόνασιν, *to advance an Episcopal See into a Metropolis, and anew to constitute Bishops and Metropolitans.*

Sect. 15. As for the *transplanting* it also from one *City* to another, besides that the power of doing that is consequent to the *former*, the *examples* of this practice are *ancient*, and *frequent* in *this* Kingdom; The passage set down out of the *Annals* of *Gisburn* may be *sufficient*, From *Caeruske* the *Metropolitan* seat was *translated* to Saint *David's* by *King Arthur*, where it continued till *Henry* I. and then was reduced to *Canterbury*. So also to translate. Examples in *England*. *Concil. Angl.* p. 26.

Sect. 16. In like manner 'tis evident that the *Kings* of *England* have *divided Bishopricks*, and *erected* new ones; About the year 630. *Kinigilsa King* of the *West-Saxons*, and *Oswald* of the *Northumbers*, *erected* an *Episcopal See* at *Dorchester*, and placed *Birinus* in it, so saith *Guil. Malmesb. de Gest. Pontif. Angl.* l. 2. About the year, 660, *Kenewalch King* of the *West-Saxons divided* this *Bishoprick*, and left part to *Dorchester*, and assigned the *western* part to be the *Diocese* of the *new Bishop*, which he constituted at *Winchester*, so saith *Hen. Huntingd. Hist.* l. 3. Then *Winchester* was *subdivided* in the time of *King Ina*, who also erected a *new Bishoprick* at *Sherburne*, and gave it to *Aldelme*, so *Henr. Huntingd.* l. 4. and *Guil. Malm. de Reg. Angl.* l. 1. c. 2. And after the *Norman* Conquest, *Henry* I. divided *Cambridgeshire* from the *See* of *Lincoln*, and *erected* the *Bishoprick* of *Ely*, so saith *Guiliel. Malm. de Gest. Pontif. Angl.* l. 4. and *Florentius Wigorn. Anno* 1109. who lived at that time. So also saith *Eadmer* with some variation, *Regi, Archiepiscopo, cæterisque Principibus Regni visum fuit de ipsa Parochia (Lincolniæ) sumendum, quo fieret alter Episcopatus, cujus Cathedra Principatus poneretur in Abbatia de Eli, It seemed good to the King, the Archbishop, and the rest of the Princes of the Kingdom to take as much out of the Diocese of Lincoln, as would make another Bishoprick, the Chair whereof should be set up in the Abbacy of Ely.* Adding indeed that *Anselme* (a *zealous* promoter of the *Papal* authority, as the *authour Eadmer* was a *disciple* and *admirer* of *Anselme*) wrote to *Pope Paschalis*, desiring his *consent* to it, as a thing fit to be done, and yet to which he assures him he would not give his *consent*, but *salvâ authoritate Papæ, reserving the rights of the Pope*; Which though it doth suppose the *Pope's* pretensions to that *authority* at *that* time, and *Anselm's yielding* it to him, yet it proves also this right of our *Kings* to have been even then *adhered* to, *preserved*, and *exercised* by them, as the former *authours* had set it down.

Sect. 17.

So to exempt from Episcopal Jurisdiction.

Sect. 17. Of this nature also is the *authority* of *Kings* in *exempting* any *Ecclesiastical* person from the *Bishop's jurisdiction* and granting *Episcopal jurisdiction* to such person, which is largely asserted and exemplified in *Cawdry's* Case 5. *Report.* 14. One instance of this will serve for all, that of *William* the *Conquerour*, who exempted *Battel Abbey* in *Sussex* from the *jurisdiction* of the *Bishop* of *Chichester*, and gave the *Abbat Episcopal jurisdiction* in his *Territories*, and the words of the *Charter* are produced by Mr. *Selden* on *Eadmer*, *Hoc regali authoritate & Episcoporum ac Baronum meorum attestatione constituo, I appoint this by my royal authority by the attestation of my Bishops and Barons.*

Kings founders of Bishopricks and Patrons.

Sect. 18. Add unto this, that even the *Western Princes* (in those parts where the *Bishops* of *Rome* have much *heightned* their *power*, ever since the *Kings* were *Christians*) the *German Emperours*, the *Kings* of *France* and *England*, always claimed to be *founders* of all *Bishopricks* in their *Dominions*, *Patrons* of them to *bestow* them by *investiture*, that the *Kings* of *France* and *England* often claimed and were acknowledged to have *right*, that no *Legate* from *Rome* might come into the Land, and use *jurisdiction* without their *leave*; All which put together are a *foundation* for this *power* of the *Princes* to *erect* or *translate* a *Patriarchate*, It being withall acknowledged that *our Kings* have the same *authority* in their *Territories*, that the *Roman Emperour* had in the *Empire*.

The reason of all, supreme power of Kings.

Sect. 19. And the *reason* of all this is *clear*, not onely from the *supreme authority of Kings* in all sorts of *causes*, even those of the [h] *Church*, as well as *Civil* (as might be proved at large, if here it were needfull, and cannot be reasonably so *confined*, as not to belong to a matter of this *nature*) but peculiarly from that which hath been already noted (and expresly ordered, *Can.* 17. of the *Council* of *Chalcedon* even now cited) of the *Ecclesiastical division* of *Provinces*, &c. following the *Civil*. For, 1. it being certainly in the *power* of the *King* to place his *Prætoria* or *Courts* of *Assises*, where he please; and, 2. it being the known *original* of *Metropoles*, and *divisions* of *Provinces* (as *Strabo* saith, *Geogr.* l. 17. Αἱ ἐπαρχίαι διήρηνται ἄλλοτε ἄλλως, *Provinces are variously distributed, διὰ τὸ τοὺς Ῥωμαίους μὴ κατὰ φύλα διελεῖν αὐτὰς, ἀλλ' ἕτερον τρόπον διατάξαι διοικήσεις ἐν αἷς τὰς ἀρχαίους ποιοῦνται καὶ δικαιοδοσίας, because the Romans divide them not by tribes or families, but after another manner in relation to the Cities, where they set up their Courts of Assises——*) and again it being most *reasonable*, that as any new *accident raises* one City to a greater *populousness*, or *depresses* another, so for the *convenience* of the people one should be made the seat of *Judicature*, the other cease to be so, (and no man so fit to pass the *judgment* when this should be, as the *King*;) and, 3. the very same reasons of *convenience* moving in the *Church*, as in the *State*, the *Bishops*, and over them *Metropolitans* and *Primates* having their *Judicatures*, and *Audiences*, which in all reason must be so disposed of, as may be most for the *convenience* of *administration*, that they and all under them may doe their duties with most *facility*, and to greatest *advantage*; and *lastly*, there being no *obstacle* imaginable from any *contrary* constitution either of *Christ* or his *Apostles*, against which the *Prince* can be said to *offend* either *directly* or *interpretatively* (as I suppose is already clear from the refutation of the plea from S. *Peter's Universal Pastourship*) whensoever he shall think fit to make such *changes*, the *Conclusion* is *rational*, as well as *evident*; *just* that it should be so, as well as *clear*, that elsewhere it hath oft been so *de facto*, (and appointed by the *Canon* of *Chalcedon de jure*) that the *King* may *erect* a *Primacy* when he please (and so it is certain that *King Ethelbert* at the time of *Augustine's planting* the *faith*, did at *Canterbury*, the *seat* of his *Kingdom*, *Imperii sui totius Metropolis* saith *Bede* l. 1. c. 25.) and consequently *remove* it from any other place at his *pleasure*: Had it not been for this, there is no reason assignable, why, this *Nation* being in *Constantine's* time under three *Metropolitans*, the *Archbishop* of *York* (and the *Primacy* belonging to *that* City, as being then the *Emperour's seat*, where *Septimius Severus*, and *Constantius Chlorus* died, and the *Prætorium* of the *Diocese* of *Britany*) the *Archbishop* of *London*, and the *Archbishop* of *Caerusk* in *Monmouthshire*, either 1. there should be (as there was) an *addition* of *two Provinces* more, *Valentia*, and *Flavia Cæsariensis*, or 2. the *Metropolitical power* should be removed from *London* to *Canterbury* (as also from *Caerusk* to S. *David's*, as hath been said) and the *Primacy* from *York* to *Canterbury*.

[h] Ὁ Βασιλεὺς οἷα κοινὸς τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐπισκοπεύσεως καὶ ὢν καὶ ὀνομάζεσθαι θέλει, the King is as it were the common directer and Ruler of the Church, both in title and reality. *Demetrii Chomateni Resp. ad Const. Cab. Jur. Græc. Rom.* l. 5. Ἡμεῖς μὲν τῆς ἔξω ἐκκλησίας, ἐγὼ καὶ τῆς ἐντὸς ὑπὸ θεοῦ καθεσταμένοι ἐπισκόπου ἐσμὲν ἂν εἴην. Euseb. *de Vit. Const.* l. 4. f. 150. Ye are Bishops of the Church for those things which are celebrated within it, but for external things, I am constituted overseer or Bishop by God, saith *Constantine* the Great in an assembly of Bishops. Ἐγὼ Βασιλεὺς καὶ ἱερεύς εἰμι, I am King and Priest, saith *Leo Isaurus* to *Gregory* the Second, *Nec tamen eo nomine à Pontifice reprehenditur*, and was not for this reprehended by the Pope, see *J. C. de Lib. Eccl. ap. Goldast. Monarch.* t. 1. p. 686. So *Socrates* the Historian, of the Emperours in general, after their receiving the faith of Christ, τὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας πράγματα ἤρτητο ἐξ αὐτῶν, the affairs of the Church depended on them, *in Proœm.* l. 5. And by *Optatus* l. 3. it is noted, and censured as a Schismatical piece of language in the Donatists, *Quid enim Imperatori cum Ecclesia?* And all this according to the principles of civil policy acknowledged by *Aristotle*, *Pol.* 3. Βασιλέα δεῖ πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς εἶναι κύριον εἶναι, the King hath power of those things that belong to the Gods; and by *Diogenes* in *Stobæus Ser.* 46. that a perfect King ought to be both a good Captain, and a Judge, καὶ ἱερέα, yea and a Priest also; And accordingly among the ancient Roman regal Laws, this is one, *Sacrorum omnium potestas sub Regibus esto*, Let the power of all sacred things be under the Kings, and so in the practice, *Caius Cæsar in Suetonius* c. 13. was both *Augur* and *Summus Pontifex*. *Galba tres Pontificatus gerebat.* Ibid. *Gal.* c. 8. *Claudius* is by *Josephus* called, Ἀρχιερεὺς μέγιστος, the greatest High-priest, and *Tacitus* makes it his observation, *Deum nunc munere summum Pontificem summum hominem esse. Annal.* l. 3. The same appears among the Jewish Kings in Scripture, *David* ordering the courses of the Priests, *Solomon* consecrating the Temple, *Hezekiah* 2 *Chron.* 29. 2 *Kings* 18. and *Josiah* 2 *Kings* 22. ordering many things belonging to it. And so Saint *Paul* appealed from the judgment of the chief Priests to the tribunal of *Cæsar*, see *G. de Heimburg. de usurp. Pap.* so in the Βασιλικὰ, the whole third Book is made up of *Justinians*, *i. e.* the Emperours Constitutions, *de Episcopis, Clericis & Sacris*, concerning Bishops, Clergy-men and sacred Offices. And the Canons of Councils have mostly been set out (and received their authority) by the Emperours, and accordingly in the *Theodosian* Code we shall find many of those which are now called *Papal Decrees*.

This power of Kings if taken away by foreign Laws, &c. resumable.

Sect. 20. Now what is thus vested in the *Regal power*, cannot be *taken away* by *foreign Laws*, or by *prescription* be so *alienated*, but that it remains perfectly *lawfull* for the *Prince* to *resume* it.

Sect. 21. That *Laws* made at *Rome* do not take away the *liberty* of another *national Church* to make *contrary Laws* thereunto, and that by such *obviation* no *Schism* is incurred, we find delivered in the *Council* of *Carthage* (*Can.* 71. according to *Balsamon's* division) And though the *Canon* be not set down by *Binius*, yet both he and *Baronius* acknowledge, that what was contain'd in that particular *Canon*, was the main *occasion* of the *Synod*; And the *antiquity* thereof is considerable, those *Canons* being made, say *Baronius* and *Binius*, *An.* 401.

Sect. 22. So likewise that a *Law* (though made by a *General Council*, and with the *consent* of all *Christian Princes*, yet) if it have respect to a *civil right*, may, in this or that *Nation*, be *repealed*, is the judgment of *Roger Widrington* (or *Father Preston*) in his *last rejoynder to Fitsherbert*, c. 11. sect. 44. and c. 8. he con-

he confirms it by the *doctrine* of *Suarez*, l. 2. *de Leg.* c. 19. and the reason of *Suarez* is, because such a *Law* made at a *general* meeting of *Princes*, is *intrinsecally* a *civil Law*; and hath not force by virtue of the *Law* to bind the *subjects* of any *particular Kingdom*, or *Commonwealth*, any otherwise than as it is enacted, or received by the *Governours* and *subjects* of that *Kingdom*.

Sect. 23. And this is affirmed, and extended by *Balsamon* to all *Canons* in *general*, as the judgment of *learned* men, in his *notes* on that sixteenth *Canon* of the *Council* of *Carthage* before cited.

Sect. 24. And for the matter of *prescription*, the decision of [1] *Sayr* is worth observing, that in such cases as these, *Cum præscriptio sit tantùm de jure Civili & Canonico, When the prescription is neither of the law of Nature, nor the Divine law, nor the Law of Nations, but onely of the civil and Canon law*, there *non plus se extendit quàm unusquisque Supremus Princeps in suo Regno eam suis legibus extensam esse velit, it extends no farther than every supreme Prince in his Realm by his laws is supposed to will that it shall be extended*, which, saith he, cannot be supposed, in matters of this nature, of *exempting subjects from making their appeal to their King*, for, saith he, *non est de mente alicujus Principis ut quispiam subditorum possit præscribere quòd ad Principem ab eo non appelletur, aut quòd eum coercere non possit, quando ratio & justitia postulat, It is not imaginable to be the mind of any Prince, that any of his subjects should be able to prescribe that he is not to appeal to his Prince* (but to *some* other) *or that his Prince may not punish him when reason and justice requires.* It were easie to apply this *distinctly* to the confirming of all, that I here pretend, but I shall not thus *expatiate*.

So if alienated by prescription. [1] *Clav. Reg.* l. 9. c. 12.

CHAP. VII.

Their third evidence from our casting off Obedience to the Bishop of Rome at the Reformation.

Sect. 1. UPON that *one* ground laid in the *former Chapter*, the *power* of *Kings* in *general*, and *particularly ad hunc actum* to *remove Patriarchates*; whatsoever can be pretended against the *lawfulness* of the *Reformation* in *these Kingdoms*, will easily be *answered*. And therefore supposing the *third*, and last *objection* to lie against our *Reformation*, that it was *founded* in the *casting* off that *obedience* to the *Bishop* of *Rome*, which was formerly paid him by our *Bishops*, and *people* under them, I shall now briefly descend to that, *first* laying down the matter of *fact*, as it lies visible in our *Records*, and then *vindicating* it from all blame of *schism*, which according to the *premisses* can any way be thought to *adhere* to it.

Sect. 2. And *first* for the matter of *fact*, it is acknowledged, that in the *Reign* of *King Henry* VIII. the *Papal* (and with it all *foreign*) *power* in *Ecclesiastical* affairs was both by *Acts* of *Convocation* of the *Clergy*, and by *Statutes* or *Acts* of *Parliament*, cast out of this *Kingdom*. The *first* step or degree hereof was the *Clergy*'s *synodical recognizing* the *King*, *singularem Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ Protectorem, unicum & supremum Dominum*——*the singular Protectour, the onely and supreme Head of the Church of England*. Upon this were built the *Statutes* of 24 *Hen.* VIII. *prohibiting* all *appeals* to *Rome*, and for the *determining all Ecclesiastical suits, and controversies within the Kingdom*; The *Statute* of 25 *Hen.* VIII. for the *manner of electing and consecrating of Archbishops and Bishops*, and another, in the same year, *prohibiting the payment of all impositions to the Court of Rome, and for the obtaining of all such dispensations from the See of Canterbury, which were formerly procured from the Popes of Rome*, and that of 26 *Hen.* VIII. *declaring the King to be the supreme Head* (which in *Queen Elizabeth's Reign* was, to avoid mistakes, changed into *supreme Governour*) *of the Church of England, and to have all honours and preeminences, which were annexed to that title.*

The history of what was done against the Bishop of *Rome* in the Reformation.

1531.

Sect. 3. This was in the next place attended with the *submission* of the *Clergy* to the *King*, agreed on, *first* in *Convocation*, and *afterward* in 25 *Hen.* VIII. enacted by *Parliament*, to this purpose, that *as it was by the Clergy acknowledged that the Convocation of the Clergy then was, always had been, and ought to be assembled by the King's Writ, and as they submitting themselves to the King's Majesty had promised* in verbo Sacerdotis, *that they would never from thenceforth presume to attempt, alledge, claim, or put in ure, enact, promulge, or exercise any new Canons, Constitutions, Ordinances Provincial or other*——*unless the King's most royal assent may to them be had to make, promulge and execute the same*——*so it was now enacted that none of the Clergy should enact, promulge, or execute any such Canons, Constitutions and Ordinances Provincial or Synodical, without assent and authority received from the King, upon pain of imprisonment, and fine at the King's pleasure.*

Sect. 4. The *third* and *last* step of this began with the debate of the *Universities*, and most *eminent Monasteries* in the Kingdom, *An aliquid authoritatis in hoc Regno Angliæ Pontifici Romano de jure competat, plusquam alii cuiquam Episcopo extero? Whether any authority did of right belong to the Bishop of Rome in the Kingdom of England more than to any other foreign Bishop?* And upon *agitation*, it was generally defined in the *negative*, and so returned testified under their *hands* and *seals*. The like was soon after *concluded*, and *resolved* by the *Convocation* of the *Bishops*, and all the *Clergy*, and *subscribed* and *confirmed* by their *corporal oaths*: And at that time was written and *printed* the *Tract de vera differentia Regiæ & Ecclesiasticæ potestatis*, set out by the *Prelates*, the *chief* composers of which were, *John Stokesly*, *Bishop* of *London*; *Cuthbert Tunstall*, *Bishop* of *Durham*; *Stephen Gardiner*, *Bishop* of *Winchester*; and D. *Thirlby* afterward *Bishop*; where from the *practice* of the *Saxon*, and first *Norman Kings* they evidence the truth of that *Negative* out of story. And what was thus concluded by the *Clergy* was soon turned into an *Act* of *Parliament* also 28 *Hen.* VIII. called *An Act extinguishing the authority of the Bishop of Rome*, and prescribing an *oath* to all *Officers Ecclesiastical*, and *Lay*, of *renouncing the said Bishop and his authority.*

Sect. 5. By these *three* degrees it is acknowledged, that the *Bishops* and *Clergy* first, then the *King* confirming the *Acts* of the *Convocation*, and after making *Acts* of *Parliament* to the same purposes, *renounced* the

the *authority* of the *Roman See*, and *caſt* it out of this *Iſland*; and though the *firſt Act* of the *Clergy* in this were ſo induced, that it is eaſie to believe that nothing but the *apprehenſion* of *dangers* which hung over them (by a *Præmunire* incurred by them) could probably have inclined them to it, and therefore I ſhall not pretend that it was *perfectly* an *act* of their *firſt will*, and *choice*, but that which the *neceſſity of affairs* recommended to them, yet the matter of *right* being upon that occaſion taken into their moſt *ſerious* debate in a *ſynodical* way, and at laſt a *fit* and *commodious* expreſſion uniformly pitch'd upon by *joint* conſent of both *Houſes* of the *Convocation*, there is no reaſon to doubt, but that they did *believe* what they did *profeſs*, the *fear* being the *occaſion* of their *debates*, but the *reaſons* or *arguments* offered in *debate*, the *cauſes* (as in all *charity* we are to judge) of their *deciſion*.

The *Præmunire*.

Sect. 6. But I ſhall not lay much weight on that *judgment* of *charity*, becauſe if that which was thus determined by *King* and *Biſhops* were *falſly* determined, then the *voluntarineſs*, or *freeneſs* of the *determination* will not be able to *juſtifie* it, and on the other ſide, if the *determination* were *juſt*, then was there *truth* in it, *antecedent* to, and *abſtracted* from the *determination*, and it was their *duty* ſo to *determine*, and *crime* that they were *unwilling* to doe it. And therefore the whole *difficulty* devolves to this *one enquiry*, Whether at that time of the *Reign* of *Henry* VIII. the *Biſhop* of *Rome* were *ſupreme Head*, or *Governour* of this *Church* of *England*, or had any *real authority* here, which the *King* might not *lawfully remove* from him to ſome other, *viz.* to the *Archbiſhop* of *Canterbury*, if he pleaſed.

The right of the Biſhop of *Rome* conſidered.

Sect. 7. And this is preſently determined upon the *grounds* which have been *formerly* laid, and confirmed to have *truth* in them. For the *pretenſions* for the *Pope's ſupremacy* of *power* among us being by the aſſerters thereof founded in one of theſe *three*, either in his *right* (as S. *Peter's ſucceſſour*) to the *Univerſal Paſtourſhip*, that including his *power* over *England*, as a *member* of the *whole*; or 2. by the *paternal right* which by *Auguſtine's planting* the *Goſpel* among the *Saxons* is thought to belong to the *Pope* (and his *ſucceſſours*) that *ſent* him; or 3. in the *voluntary conceſſion* of ſome *Kings*; the two former of theſe have been largely *diſproved* already, *Chap.* 4, 5, and 6. in diſcourſes purpoſely, and diſtinctly applied to thoſe *pretenſions*. And for the *third*, that will appear to have received its *determination* alſo, 1. by the *abſoluteneſs* of the *power* of our *Princes*, (to which purpoſe I ſhall mention but one paſſage, that of [a] *G. de Heimburg*, ſome *two hundred years* ſince in the laſt words of his *Tract de Injuſt. Uſurp. Pap.* where ſpeaking of the *Emperour's* making *oath* to the *Pope*, he ſaith, that *this is a ſubmiſſion in him, and a patience above what any other ſuffers*, and proves it by this argument, *Nam eximius Rex Angliæ, Franciæ, Dux, Marchio, non aſtringitur Papæ quocunque juramento: factus Imperator jurare tenetur ſecundum Decretales eorum fabuloſè fictas, ita ut ſupremus Monarcha magis ſervilis conditionis, quàm quilibet ejus inferior fieri cenſeatur, The King of England and France, any Duke or Marqueſs of that Kingdom is not bound to the Pope by any oath, yet the Emperour at his creation is thus bound to ſwear according to the Pope's Decretals fabulouſly invented, ſo that the ſupreme Monarch is made to be of a more ſervile condition than any his inferiour Prince———*) And 2. by the *rights* of *Kings* to *remove* or *erect Patriarchates*, and will be farther confirmed in the *Negative*, if anſwer be firſt given to this *Dilemma*.

The conceſſion of Kings.

[a] *In* Goldaſt. *de* Mon.

A Dilemma againſt the plea drawn from that.

Sect. 8. The *authority* of the *Pope* in this *Kingdom*, which is pretended to be held by the *conceſſion* of our *Kings*, was either ſo *originally* veſted in our *Kings*, that they might *lawfully grant* it, to whom they pleaſed, and ſo did *lawfully* grant it to the *Pope*; or it was not thus *originally* veſted in our *Kings*; If it were not, then was that *grant* an *invalid*, *null* grant, for ſuch are all *conceſſions* of that which is not *ours* to give, *preſumptions*, *invaſions*, *robberies* in the *giver*, which devolve no *right* to the *receiver*, and then this is a *pitifull* claim which is thus founded: But if that *authority* were ſo veſted in the *Kings* of *England*, that they might *lawfully* grant it to whom they pleaſed, (which is the onely way by which the *Pope* can pretend to hold any thing by this *title* of *regal conceſſion*) then certainly the *ſame* power remains ſtill veſted in the *King* to diſpoſe it *from* him to *ſome* other as *freely*, as the ſame *King* may upon *good* cauſes *remove* his *Chancellour*, or any other of his Officers from his place, and *commit* it to another (this way of arguing is made uſe of by the *Biſhops* in *Convocation*, *Anno Chr.* 1537. in the *Book* by them intituled [*The Inſtitution of a Chriſtian man*]) Or if the ſame power do not ſtill *remain* in the *King*, then is the *King's power* diminiſhed, and he conſequently by this his *act*, of which we treat, become *leſs a King*, than formerly he was, And then we know that ſuch *acts* which make him ſo, are *invalid acts*, it being acknowledged to be *above* the *power* of the *King* himſelf, to *deveſt* himſelf and his *ſucceſſours* of any part of his *regal* power.

Two ſorts of gifts.

Sect. 9. To which purpoſe it muſt be obſerved, 1. that ſome things are ſo *ours*, that we may freely *uſe* them, but cannot freely *part* with them, as all thoſe things, wherein our *propriety* is not *confined* to our *perſons*, but intailed on our *poſterity*, and ſuch the *regal power* is ſuppoſed to be; 2. that as ſome things which are part of our *perſonal proprieties*, are ſo *freely ours* to *give*, that when they are *given*, they are departed out of our ſelves, and cannot juſtly be by us *reſumed* again (in which caſe that *Maxime* of the *civil Law* ſtands good, *data, eo ipſo quo dantur, fiunt accipientis, what is given, by the very act of being given, becomes the goods of the receiver*) ſo other things are *given* to others, ſo as we do *not part* with them our ſelves; they are as *truly*, and properly *ours*, *after*, as *before* the *conceſſion*.

Some revocable.

Sect. 10. Thus the *Sun communicates* his *beams*, and with them his *warmth* and *influences*, and yet *retains* all which it thus *communicates*, and accordingly *withdraweth* them again. And *God* the *ſpring* of all *life*, and *grace*, doth ſo *communicate* each of theſe, that he *may*, and doth freely *withdraw* them again, and when he *taketh away our breath we dye*——— And thus certainly the *King*, being the *fountain* of all *power* and *authority*, as he is *free* to *communicate* this *power* to one, ſo is he equally *free* to *recall*, and *communicate* it to another, And therefore may as *freely beſtow* the *power* of *Primate*, and *chief Metropolitan* of *England*, or (which is all one) of a *Patriarch*, on the *Biſhop* of *Canterbury*, having formerly thought fit to *grant* it to the *Biſhop* of *Rome*, as he or any of his *Anceſtours* can be deemed to have *granted* it to the *Biſhop* of *Rome*; And then as this being by this means evidenced to be no more than an act of *regal power* (which the *King* might *lawfully* exerciſe) takes off all *obligation* of *obedience* in the *Biſhops* to the *Pope*, at the firſt minute, that he is by the *King* deveſted of that *power*, or declared not to have had it *de jure*, but onely to have *aſſumed* it formerly (which *freedom* from that *obedience* immediately clears the whole buſineſs of *ſchiſm*, as that is a *departure* from the *obedience* of the *lawfull Superiour*) ſo will there not want many weighty *reaſons*, deducible

deducible from the *ancient Canons*, as well as the *maximes* of *civil Government*, why the *King* who *may freely* place the *Primacy*, where *he* pleaſe, ſhould chuſe to place it in a *Biſhop* and *ſubject* of his own *Nation*, rather than in a *foreign Biſhop* far *removed*, and him not onely *independent* from that *King*, but himſelf enjoying a *Principality*, or *Territory*, which is too apparent how willing he is to *enlarge unlimitedly*, and to *improve* the *conceſſions*, which are either acknowledged, or *pretended* to be made him, to that purpoſe. The reaſonableneſs of revoking it.

Sect. 11. And here it is not amiſs to obſerve, in the *Reign* of *Queen Mary*, who was no way favourable to the *Reformation* in points of *Doctrine* and *Liturgy*, and made all ſpeed to repeal what had been done in *King Edward*'s time in that matter, yet 1. that ſhe left not the *title* of *Supreme Head*, till the *third Parliament* of her *Reign*; and 2. that in the *ſecond Parliament*, *authority* is granted her *to make, and preſcribe to all ſuch Cathedral and Collegiate Churches, as were erected by Henry the VIII. ſuch Statutes and Orders as ſhould ſeem good to her*, and that *Statute* never repealed but expired: 3. that in her *third Parliament* it was with much difficulty obtained, that the *ſupremacy* of the *Pope* ſhould be acknowledged, the matter being urged by her, as that which concerned the *eſtabliſhing* the *Matrimony* of her *Mother*, and her *legitimation*, which depended upon the *abſolute power of the Pope*: 4. that in the fourth year of her *Reign*, when the *Pope* ſent *Cardinal Petow* to be his *Legate* in *England*, and to be *Biſhop* of *Sarisbury*, ſhe would not permit him to *come* into the *Land*, neither could he have that *Biſhoprick*, which as it was ſome *check* to the *Pope's abſolute ſupremacy*, and an *aſſertion* and *vindication* of the *Regal power*, ſo being added to the former it will be leſs ſtrange, that this *ſupreme power* of the *Popes* ſhould be by the *Biſhops* in the *Reign* of *Henry* VIII. *diſclaimed*, and *ejected*. Title and power of Supreme Head of the Church retained by Q. *Mary*.

Sect. 12. Upon this bottom the *foundation* of *Reformation* being laid in *England*, the *ſuperſtructure* was accordingly *erected* by the *King* and *Biſhops* and *Clergy* in *Convocation*, but this not all at once, but by diſtinct ſteps and degrees. Somewhat in the *Reign* of this *Henry* the VIII. as in the *number* of the *Sacraments*, the *uſe* of the *Lord's Prayer*, &c. in the *Engliſh Tongue*, and the *tranſlation* of the *Bible*, all reſolved on in *Synod*, the *King* which duly *aſſembled* it, *preſiding* in it by his *Vicar General*.

Sect. 13. This was much farther advanced in the time of his Son *Edward* the VI. who being a *Child*, and the *Laws* and *Conſtitutions* of this *Realm* committing the *exerciſe* of the *ſupreme power* in that caſe, into the hands of a *Protectour*, what was thus regularly done by that *Protectour*, cannot be doubted to be of the ſame *force*, and *validity*, as if the *King* had been of *age*, and done it himſelf; Or if it ſhould, it would be an unanſwerable *objection* againſt all *hereditary*, *ſucceſſive Monarchy*, a maim in that *form* of *Government*, which could no way be repaired, there being no *amulet* in the *Crown*, which ſecures the *life* of each *King*, till his *ſucceſſour* be of *age*, nor *promiſe* from *heaven* that the *Children* of ſuch *Princes* ſhall, by ſucceeding to the *Crown*, advance by *miracle* to the *years*, and abilities of their *Parents*, So *irrational* is the *ſcoff*, and exception of ſome, that what was done in *King Edward*'s days being the *Acts* of a *Child* is as ſuch to be *vilified* and deſpiſed. The advance of the Reformation in King *Edward*'s days.

Sect. 14. In the *Reign* of this *Prince*, many *Changes* were made in the *Church*, and *Receſſions* from the *Doctrines*, and *practices* of *Rome*; Beſide that of *Images*, the *lawfulneſs* of the *marriage* of the *Clergy* was aſſerted, a body of an *Engliſh Liturgy* formed, and ſettled for *publick* uſe, the *Euchariſt* appointed to be adminiſtred to the people in *both kinds*, &c. and though *Biſhop Gardner* of *Wincheſter*, and *Biſhop Bonner* of *London* made *oppoſition* againſt theſe *changes*, and for ſome misbehaviours herein were *impriſon'd*, (and two more moderate, learned men, *Biſhop Tunſtal* of *Durham*, and *Biſhop Day* of *Chicheſter*, upon another ſcore) yet *Archbiſhop Cranmer*, and the reſt of the *Biſhops* making up the far *greater* number, joyned with the *Supreme power* in the *Reformation*. And as it is no great marvel, that there ſhould be ſome (ſo few) *diſſenters*, ſo the *puniſhment* inflicted on them will not be deemed *exceſſive* by any, that ſhall compare it with the far *ſeverer executions*, the *fire*, and *fagot*, which were ſoon after in *Queen Mary*'s days inflicted on *Archbiſhop Cranmer*, *Biſhop Ridley*, and *Biſhop Latimer*, as the reward of their diſputing in the *Synod* againſt *Tranſubſtantiation*, (and the like *cruelties* on multitudes more) and the *Exiles*, and *deprivations*, which befell ſo many others in her *Reign*; However this can be no prejudice to the *regularity* of the *Reformation* in the *Reign* of *King Edward*, wrought, as hath been ſaid, by the *Supreme power*, with the *conſent* of the *major* part of *Biſhops*.

Sect. 15. That which afterward followed in the beginning of *Queen Elizabeth's Reign*, may be thought more *diſtant*, and leſs reconcileable to our pretenſions, (not that of her *ſex*, her being a *woman*, for ſo was *Queen Mary* before, which acted ſo *vigorouſly* for the *contrary* way; and the *conſtitution* of our *Monarchy* inveſts equally either ſex in the *plenitude* of *Regal power*, in *ſacred*, as well as *civil affairs*, and it was but to raiſe *envy* againſt the *Reformation*, that *Queen Elizabeth's ſex*, as before *King Edward's non-age*, hath by ſome been thought fit to be mention'd, and cannot by any *ſober* judgment be admitted to have any force in it) but becauſe, as it is from our *Hiſtories* more pertinently objected, *moſt* of the *Biſhops* were by her *deveſted* of their *dignities*, and *new created* in their ſtead; To this therefore in the laſt place, I muſt apply my ſelf to give *ſatisfaction*. And 1. In Queen *Elizabeth*'s.

Sect. 16. In this matter, as much as concerns the *Ordination* of thoſe *new Biſhops*, that it was performed *regularly*, according to the *Ancient Canons*, each by the *Impoſition* of the *hands* of *three Biſhops*, hath been evidently ſet down out of the *Records*, and vindicated by Mr. *Maſon* in his *Book de Miniſt. Angl.* and may there be view'd at large, if the Reader want ſatisfaction in that point.

Sect. 17. As for the *ſecond* remaining part of the *objection* which alone is pertinent to this place, it will receive anſwer by theſe degrees, Firſt that the *death* of *Cardinal Pool Archbiſhop* of *Canterbury*, falling near upon the *death* of her *Predeceſſour Queen Mary*, it was very regular for *Queen Elizabeth* to aſſign a *ſucceſſour* to that *See*, then *vacant*, *Archbiſhop Parker*; ſecondly, that thoſe *Biſhops*, which in *Queen Mary*'s days had been *exiled*, and *deprived*, and had *ſurvived* that calamity, were with all juſtice reſtored to their *dignities*; thirdly, that the *Biſhops* by her *deprived*, and *deveſted* of their *dignities*, were ſo dealt with, for *refuſing* to take the *Oath* of *Supremacy*, formed and enjoyned in the days of *Henry* the VIII. and in the *firſt Parliament* of this *Queen revived*, and the *Statutes* concerning it reſtored to full force, before it was thus *impoſed* on them. So that for the *juſtice* of the cauſe of their *deprivation*, it depends *Immediately* upon the *Right* and *power* of the *Supreme Magiſtrate* to make *Laws*, to impoſe *Oaths* for the *ſecuring* his The Creation of new Biſhops in Queen *Elizabeth*'s time, vindicated.

Government, and to *inflict* the *punishments*, prescribed by those *Laws*, on the *disobedient*; but *Originally* upon the truth of that decision of the *Bishops*, and *Clergy*, and *Universities*, in the *Reign* of *Henry* the VIII. that *no authority belonged in this Kingdom of England to the Bishop of Rome, more than to any other foreign Bishop.* The former of these I shall be confident to look on as an undoubted truth, in the maintenance of which *all Government* is concerned, and hath nothing, peculiar to *our pretensions*, which should suggest a *vindication* of it in this place, And the *second* hath, I suppose, been sufficiently cleared in the former *Chapters* of this discourse, which have examined all the *Bishop* of *Rome*'s claims to this *Supremacy*, And both these grounds being *acknowledged* (or, till they be *invalidated*, or *disproved*, *supposed*) to have *truth* and force in them, the *conclusion* will be sufficiently induced, that there was no *injustice* in that *Act* of the *Queen*'s, which *devested* those *Bishops*, and thus *refused* to secure her *Government*, or to approve their *fidelity* to their *lawfull Sovereign.*

Sect. 18. *Fourthly*, that those *Bishops* being thus deprived, it was most *Regular*, and *Necessary*, and that against which no *objection* is imaginable (that of their due *Ordination* being formerly cleared) that other *Bishops* should be nominated, and *advanced* to those *vacant Sees*, and that what should be for the *future* acted by those *new Bishops* in *Convocation* was *regular*, *Synodical*, and *valid* beyond all *exception* in respect of the *formality* of it.

Sect. 19. *Fifthly*, that as by the *Uniform* and *joynt consent* of these *Bishops* thus constituted a *Declaration* of *certain Principal Articles of Religion* was *agreed on*, and set out by *Order* of *both Archbishops*, *Metropolitans*, *and the rest of the Bishops*, for the *Unity* of *Doctrine*, *to be taught*, *and holden of all Parsons*, *Vicars and Curates*, &c. and this not before the *third* of that *Queen's Reign*, So before this time there had not been, as far as appears, any *debate* in any *former Convocation* of that *Queen's Reign* concerning *Religion* (onely an *offer* of a *disputation* betwixt *eight Clergy-men* on each side, which came to *nothing*) but all done by the *Parliament's restoring* what had been *debated*, and *concluded* by *former Synods*, in the *Reigns* of *King Henry the eighth*, and *Edward the sixth*, without any *new* deliberation in any *present Synod.* By this means were *revived* the *Statutes* for the *Regal Supremacy*, as also of the *Book* of *Common-prayer*, as it was in the time of *Edward the sixth*, (with few alterations) which included the *abolition* of the *Romish Missals.* And so all this again, as far as it concerned *Queen Elizabeth*'s part in the *Reformation*, is regularly superstructed on the forementioned *foundation* of *Regal Supremacy* (with the concurrence, and advice of *Synods*) which hath been in the *former* part of this discourse (I hope, sufficiently) *vindicated.*

Sect. 20. And that being granted, it cannot be here *necessary*, or pertinent to descend to the consideration of each *several* matter of the *Change* thus wrought in this *Church*, either as branches of the *Reformation*, or under the name, or *title* of it. For our present *enquiry* being no farther extended, than this, whether the *true Church* of *England*, as it stands by *Laws established*, have in *Reforming* been guilty of *Schism*, as that signifies in the first place a *recession*, and *departure* from the *obedience* of our *lawfull Superiours*, and this being cleared in the *Negative*, by this one *evidence*, that all was done by those, to whom, and to whom *onely*, the *rightfull power legally* pertained, *viz.* the *King*, and *Bishops* of this *Nation*, supposing (as now *regularly* we may, having competently *proved* it, and answered all the colours, that have been offered against it) that the *Pope* had *no right* to our *obedience*, and consequently that our *departure* from him is not a *departure* from our *obedience* to our *superiours*, it is presently visible, that all other matters will belong to some other heads of *Discourse*, and consequently must be debated upon other principles, All *variation* from the *Church* of *Rome* in point of *Doctrine* if it should (as I believe it will never) be proved to be *unjust*, falling under the head of *Heresie*, not of *Schism*; and for *acts* of *sacrilege*, and the like *impieties* (as certainly *Henry the eighth*, and some others, cannot be freed from such) they are by us as freely charged upon the *actours*, as by any *Romanist* they can be, But yet *sacrilege* is no more *schism*, than it is *adultery*, and the *Church*, on which *one* sin hath been *committed*, cannot be from thence proved to be *guilty* of *every* other.

CHAP. VIII.

Of the Second sort of Schism, as that is an Offence against mutual Charity; This divided into three species, and the first here examined.

Sect. 1. BUT beside that *first species* of *Schism*, as it is an *offence* against the *subordination*, which *Christ* hath by *himself* and his *Apostles* settled in the *Church*, (from the *guilt* of which I have hitherto endeavoured to *vindicate* our *Church*) another was taken notice of, as it signifies an *offence* against the mutual *unity*, and *peace*, and *charity*, which *Christ* left among his *Disciples*; And to that I must now proceed, as far as the *Accusations* of the *Romanist* give us occasion to vindicate our *innocence.*

Three branches of the second sort of Schism.

Sect. 2. And for *method*'s sake, this branch of *Schism* may be subdivided into *three species.* The *first* is a breach in the *Doctrines*, or *Traditions*, a *departure* from the *unity* of the *Faith*, *which was once delivered to the Saints*; under that head also comprehending the *institutions* of *Christ*, of his *Apostles*, and of the *Universal Church* of the *first* and *purest* ages, whether in *Government*, or other the like *observances* and *practices*: The *second* is an *offence* against *external peace* and *Communion Ecclesiastical*: The *third* and *last* is the *want of that charity*, *which is due from every Christian to every Christian.* Beside these I cannot foresee any other *species* of *Schism*, and therefore the *vindicating* our *Reformation* from all grounds of charge of any of *these three*, will be the absolving the whole *task* undertaken in these sheets.

1. A departure from the Unity of Doctrines, or

Sect. 3. For the *first* it may be considered either in the *Bullion*, or in the *Coin*, in the *gross*, or in the *retail*, either as it is a *departure* from those *rules* appointed by *Christ* for the *founding* and *upholding* his *truth* in the

in the *Church*, this *unity* of *Doctrine*, &c. or else as it is the asserting any *particular* branch of *Doctrine*, contrary to *Christ*'s, and the *(Apostolical, pure) Churches* establishment. Traditions Apostolical.

Sect. 4. And here it is first *suggested* by the *Romanist*, that by *casting out* the *authority* of the *Bishop* of *Rome*, we have *cast off* the *head* of *all Christian Unity*, and so must needs be guilty of *Schism*, in this *first* respect. To which the *answer* is obvious, 1. that the *Bishop* of *Rome* was never appointed by *Christ* to be the *head* of all *Christian Unity*, or that *Church* to be the *conservatory* (for ever) of *all Christian truth*, any more than any *other Bishop*, or *Church* of the *Apostles ordaining*, or planting; and whatever can be pretended for the contrary will be easily *answered* from the grounds already laid, and cleared in the *former* part of this discourse, concerning the *Universal Pastourship* of S. *Peter's successours*, which must not be here so unnecessarily repeated. Our Church vindicated from this, in two branches. In the first, Christ's Rules for upholding the truth.

Sect. 5. Secondly, That the way provided by *Christ*, and his *Apostles* for the *preserving* the *unity* of the *faith*, &c. in the *Church* is fully acknowledged by us, and no way *supplanted* by our *Reformation*. That way is made up of *two acts* of *Apostolical providence*. First their *resolving* upon some *few heads* of special force and *efficacy* to the *planting* of *Christian life* through the World, and *preaching*, and *depositing* them in *every Church* of their *plantation*. 2. Their establishing an excellent *subordination* of all *inferiour Officers* of the *Church* to the *Bishop* in every *City*, of the *Bishops* in every *Province* to their *Metropolitans*, of the *Metropolitans* in every *Region* or Διοικησις to *Patriarchs*, or *Primates*, allowing also among these such a *Primacy* of *Order*, or *dignity*, as might be proportionable to the Πρῶτος Σίμων in the *Scripture*, and agreeable to what is by the *ancient Canons* allowed to the *Bishop* of *Rome*; And this standing *subordination* sufficient for all *ordinary* uses, and when there should be need of *extraordinary* remedies, there was then a supply to be had by congregating *Councils*, *Provincial*, *Patriarchal*, *General*, as hath formerly been shewed. And all this, is most certain, *asserted*, and acknowledged by every *true Son* of the *Church* of *England*, as zealously, as is pretended by any *Romanist*. And from hence, by the way, that speech of the *learned* and *excellent Hugo Grotius* (which I discern to be made use of by the *Romanists*, and look'd on with *jealousie* by others) will, I suppose, receive its *due* importance, and *interpretation*, in his *Rivet. Apologet. Discuss.* p. 255. *Restitutionem Christianorum in unum idémque corpus*, &c.

Sect. 6. As for the *subjection* (and *dependence*) of this *Church* to the *Monarchick power* of the *Bishop* of *Rome*, this will never be likely to tend to the *unity* of the whole *body*, unless first *all* other *Churches* of *Christians* paid that *subjection* too, and were obliged, and so by *duty* morally *ascertain'd* always to continue it (which it is evident the *Eastern Churches* had not done long before the time of our pretended *departure*) and 2. unless the *Bishop* of *Rome* were in probability able to *administer* that *vast Province*, so as would be most to the *advantage* of the *whole* body, For which whether he be fitly *qualified* or no, as it is not *demonstrable* in the *causes*, so is it to be looked on, as a *Politick Probleme*, the truth of which belongs to *prudent persons*, and such as are by *God intrusted* with the *Flock* to judge of, *i. e.* to the *Princes*, the *nursing Fathers of every Church*, who are *prudentially*, and *fatherly* to *determine* for themselves and those that are under them, what is most ordinable to that end, and cannot be obliged to *conclude*, farther than the *motives* or premisses will bear, to decree what they do not *reasonably*, and cordially *believe*.

Sect. 7. *Lastly*, for the *particular Doctrines* wherein we are affirmed by the *Romanists* to depart from the *Unity* of the *Faith*, and so by *departing* from the *unity*, to be *schismatical*, as *heretical* by *departing* from the *faith*, this must be contested by a strict survey of the *particular Doctrines*, wherein as we make no doubt to *approve* our selves to any that will judge of the *Apostolical Doctrine* and *Traditions* by the *Scriptures*, and *consent* of the first 300 years, or the *four General Councils*, (the most *competent witnesses* of *Apostolical Traditions*) so we shall secure our selves of our *innocence* in this behalf, by that *principle* acknowledged in our *Church*, and owned, as the *rule* by which we are concluded in any *debate*, or *controversie*: That whatever is *contrary* to the *doctrine*, or *practices* of those *first* and *purest ages*, shall by us (as soon as it thus appears) be *renounced*, and disclaimed also. Which resolution of *rulines*, and *obedience*, will, I suppose, conserve us in the *unity* of the *Faith*, and render us approvable to *God*, though our *ignorance* (thus *unaffected*) should betray us to some *misunderstandings* of those *first* times, and be an instrument much more probable to *lead us into all truth*, than the supposed *infallibility* of the *Church* of *Rome* can be imagined to be, which as it leaves the *proudest presumer* really as *liable* to *errour*, as him that acknowledgeth himself most *fallible*, so it *ascertains* him to *persevere incorrigible* whether in the *least*, or *greatest errour*, which by *fault*, or *frailty* he shall be guilty of. In the second, Particular Doctrines. The Church of *England*'s temper in respect of particular Doctrines.

Sect. 8. This *consideration* of the *humble*, *docible* temper of our *Church* (together with our professed *appeal* to those *first* and *purest* times, to stand or fall, as by those evidences we shall be adjudged) as it necessarily renders it our *infelicity*, not our *crime*, if in *judging* of *Christ's truth*, we should be deemed to *err*, so may it reasonably *supersede* that larger trouble of the *Reader*, in this place, which the *view and examination* of the *severals* would cost him, it being thus far *evident*, that it is our avowed *wish* and our *care* (should it be denied to be our *lot*) a special mark of the *Church of England's Reformation*, to *preserve the Unity of the Apostolical Faith and Primitive Practices*, *as intire*, *as we would have done Christ's body or garment*, and the probability being not *weak* on our side, that the *fact* of the *crucifying souldiers*, which hath so much of our *abhorrence* and *detestation*, shall never be our *choice*, our *known*, or *wilfull guilt*, or if it be, that we so far *recede* from our *Profession*.

CHAP. IX.

The Second ſpecies of this Schiſm examined, as it is an offence againſt external Peace, or Communion Eccleſiaſtical.

This Church free from breach of Communion Eccleſiaſtical. As appears by ſix Conſiderations. The firſt. The ſecond. The third.

Sect. 1. NOW for the *ſecond branch* of this *ſecond ſort of Schiſm*, as it is an *offence* againſt *external Peace*, or *Communion Eccleſiaſtical*; This cannot with any colour be charged on us, of whom theſe ſix things are *manifeſt*, and that by the *tenure* of our *Reformation*, 1. that we have always retained the *form* of *Government* in, and under which the *Apoſtles* founded *Eccleſiaſtical Aſſemblies*, or *Communion*, viz. that of the *Biſhop*, and his *inferiour Officers* in every *Church*, and ſo in that reſpect are, in *Ignatius* his phraſe, ἐντὸς θυσιαστηρίου, *within the altar*, have no part of that *breach* of *Eccleſiaſtical Communion* upon us, which conſiſts in *caſting* out that *Order*. 2. That as we maintain that *Order*, ſo we regularly *ſubmit* to the *exerciſe* of it, acknowledge the due *authority* of theſe *Governours*, profeſs *Canonical Obedience* to them, *ſubmit* to their *Cenſures*, and *Decrees*, and give our ſelves up to be *ruled* by them in all things that belong to their *cognizance ſecundum Deum*, *according to God*. 3. That the *circumſtances* which are neceſſary to the ἐπουσιωσία the *aſſembling* our ſelves together for the *publick worſhip*, whether 1. that of *place*, (our *Churches conſecrated* to thoſe *Offices*) or 2. that of *time*, (the *Lord's day*, and other *primitive Feſtivals* and *Faſts*, and, in their degree *every* day of the *week*) or 3. that of *forms* of *Prayer*, and *Praiſes*, *celebration* of *Sacraments*, and *ſacramentals*, *Preaching*, *Catechiſing*, &c. or 4. that of *Ceremonies*, ſuch as the practice of the *Primitive Church* hath ſent down *recommended* to us, or laſtly, that of *Diſcipline* to *bind* all theſe performances upon every *member* of the *Church* in his *office*, or place, are *all* entred into our *Confeſſions*, ſettled by *Article*, as part of our *eſtabliſhment*, and ſo the *want* of *either*, or *all* of thoſe are not imputable to our *Reformation*.

The fourth.

Sect. 2. *Fourthly*, That in every of theſe *three*, whatſoever the *Romaniſt* requires us to add farther to that which we *voluntarily*, and profeſſedly *receive*, (1. the *ſupreme*, *tranſcendent*, *monarchick power* of the *Pope*, 2. the *acknowledgment* of, and *obedience* to his *ſupremacy*, 3. the uſe of more *Ceremonies*, *Feſtivals*, &c.) is *uſurpation*, or *impoſition* of the *preſent Romaniſts*, abſolutely without *Authority*, or *precedent* from the *ancient*, *Primitive Church*, from whom we are ſo unwilling to *divide* in any thing, that we chuſe a *conformity* with them, rather than with any *later* model, and if by receding from the *Ordo Romanus* in any *particular*, we do not approve our ſelves to come nearer to the *firſt*, and *pureſt* times, it is the *avow'd profeſſion of our Church*, the *wiſh*, and *purpoſe* of it, which I may juſtly ſtyle part of our *eſtabliſhment*, to *reduce*, and *reſtore* that, (whatſoever it is) which is moſt *pure*, and *Primitive* inſtead of it.

The fifth.

Sect. 3. *Fifthly*, That as we *exclude* no *Chriſtian* from our *Communion*, that will either *filially*, or *fraternally* embrace it with us, being ready to admit *any* to our *aſſemblies*, that acknowledge the *Foundation* laid by *Chriſt*, and his *Apoſtles*, ſo we as earneſtly deſire to be admitted to the like freedom of *external Communion* with all the members of *all* other *Chriſtian Churches*, as oft as occaſion makes us capable of that *bleſſing* of the *one heart*, and *one lip*, and would moſt willingly, by the uſe of the *ancient* method of *literæ Communicatoriæ*, maintain this *Communion* with thoſe, with whom we cannot *corporally aſſemble*, and particularly with thoſe which live in *obedience* to the *Church* of *Rome*.

The ſixth.

Sect. 4. *Sixthly*, That the onely hindrances that interpoſe and obſtruct this deſired freedom of *external Communion*, are wholly imputable to the *Romaniſts*.

Sect. 5. *Firſt*, their *excommunicating* and *ſeparating* from their *aſſemblies* all that maintain *communion* with the *Church* of *England*, which we know was done by *Bull* from the *Pope* about the *tenth* year of *Q. Elizabeth* (*before* which time thoſe *Engliſh*, which had not joyned in our *Reformation*, might, and did come to our *aſſemblies*, and were never after *rejected* by us, but upon their avowed *contumacy* againſt the *orders* of our *Church*, which conſequently brought the *cenſures* on them) and to that it is viſibly *conſequent*, that we that were *caſt out*, cannot be ſaid to *ſeparate*, as in the former part of this *diſcourſe* hath been demonſtrated.

Sect. 6. *Secondly*, their impoſing ſuch *conditions* on their *Communion* (*belief* of *doctrines*, and *approbation* of *practices*, which we neither *believe*, nor *approve* of, and are ready to *conteſt* and maintain our *Negatives*, by grounds that all good *Chriſtians* ought to be *concluded* by) that we cannot without *ſinning*, or ſeeming to *ſin* againſt *conſcience*, without *wilfull falling* on one ſide, or *diſſembling* and *unſound confeſſion* on the other ſide, or at leaſt the *ſcandal* of one of theſe, accept of their *communion* upon ſuch *conditions*, as hath formerly been demonſtrated alſo.

A conſideration concerning our Church.

Sect. 7. And in this matter it were very well worthy our conſidering, how far the *Articles* of our *Church* of *England* proceed in *accord* with the *preſent Roman doctrines* and *practices*, and in what particulars ἐπέχομεν, we *cannot perſwade* our ſelves to conſent to them, and then to offer it to the *Umpirage* of any *rational arbitratour*, whether we that unfeignedly *profeſs* to *believe* ſo much and *no more*, nor to be *convinced* by all the *reaſons*, and *authorities*, proofs from *Scripture*, or the *firſt Chriſtian writers* (thoſe of the *firſt three hundred* years) or the *four General Councils*, produced by them (being in full *inclination* and *deſire* of mind, ready to *ſubmit* upon *conviction*) are in any *reaſon*, or *equity*, or according to any *example*, or *precept* of *Chriſt*, or his *Apoſtles*, or the *ancient*, *Primitive Church*, to be required to offer *violence* to our *minds*, and to make an *unſound profeſſion*, or elſe (for that *one guilt* of not doing ſo) to be *rejected* as *hereticks*, and denied the *benefit* of *Chriſtian Communion*, which we heartily deſire to *extend* and *propagate* to them which *deny* it to us. All this thus put together, and applyed to this preſent matter, will certainly vindicate us from all appearance of guilt of this *ſecond branch* of the *ſecond ſort* of *Schiſm*.

CHAP.

CHAP. X.

The third ſpecies of this Schiſm, as an offence againſt that Charity due from every Chriſtian to every Chriſtian examined.

Sect. 1. LAſtly, as *Schiſm* is an *offence* againſt that *Charity*, which is *due* from *every Chriſtian* to *every Chriſtian*, ſo it will be beſt *diſtributed* (according to what we ſee noted by the *Apoſtle*, *Rom.* 14. in the *Jewiſh* and *Gentile Chriſtians*) into the *judging*, and *deſpiſing* of *others*, either of which was, if not *formally Schiſm*, yet ſoon *improvable* into it, when it would not be repreſſed by the *Apoſtles admonitions*; The *Jewiſh Chriſtians* we know *judged*, and *damned* all that would not obſerve the *Moſaical Law*, and would not *aſſociate*, or *communicate* with the *Gentiles*; and the like *height Diotrephes*, and ſome of the *Gentiles believers*, who began with the *other* branch, that of *vilifying* the *weak Jew*, at laſt arrived to, *not receiving, forbidding to receive, and caſting out the brethren*, 3 *Joh.* 10. And whether the *Romaniſts* or *we*, are thus *guilty*, will ſoon be *diſcernible*.

Contrary to Charity due from all to all.

1. Judging.
2. Deſpiſing.
Separating the effect of both.

Sect. 2. For the former, that of *judging*, and ſo *ſeparating* from their *brethren* (if yet we may be allowed that *title*) it is evident by their own acknowledgment, how *guilty* they are, and how *guiltleſs* we.

Of judging and ſeparating the Romaniſts guilty *ex profeſſo*.

Sect. 3. It hath been a ſpecial *motive*, and *argument* to gain *proſelytes* to their party for ſome years, that by *our Confeſſion* there is *ſalvation* to be had among *them*, but in their *judgment* no poſſible *hope* of it for *us*. This weapon of theirs uſed ſo ſtudiouſly againſt us, to *anticipate* and *prejudice*, in *general*, whatſoever can be *particularly* ſaid to *aſſert* our *doctrines*, and *practices*, will certainly be as uſefull in our hands, as *Goliah's ſword* in *David's* to give this wound (I wiſh it may not prove as *fatal*) to our *vaunting enemies*; For certainly, if there be any *truth* in that *motive*, then are they *profeſſedly* the men, that *judge their brethren*, and as *confeſſedly* we the men, that do *not judge* them. And if Saint *Cyprian's* rule be true (who had as well conſidered the *nature* of *Schiſm*, and as diligently armed the *Chriſtians* of his age againſt it, and given us as ſure *rules* to judge by, in this matter, as any) that they that maintain any *difference* in opinion againſt other *Chriſtians*, muſt, if they will avoid the *evil* of *Schiſm*, manage it with this *temper* (*neminem damnantes, neminem à communione noſtrâ arcentes*) *never condemn any, or forbid them our communion*, then is the *Schiſm* (becauſe the *uncharitableneſs*) on *their* parts, not on *ours*. And it is not the ſaying, we are *Hereticks*, and ſo *certainly* excluded *ſalvation*, *Schiſmaticks*, and ſo *out* of the *Church*, the *way* to *ſalvation*, that can give this *ſanguinary judgment* any meeker a *title*; For that we are ſuch, being as much *denied*, as any thing, and that *negative* offered to be *proved*, and *vindicated* by all thoſe *evidences*, by which any matter of *Doctrine*, (from whence this *queſtion* depends) can duly be cleared, this *unproved affirmation*, that we *are ſuch*, is certainly a *petitio principii*, *a begging of the queſtion*, a *ſuppoſing* that in the *debate*, which they know we are as far from *confeſſing*, as they from having *proved*, and that is the moſt certain *proof*, that ſuch *judging* is *uncharitable*; I wiſh there were not ſo many other as *pregnant indications* of it.

Sect. 4. And for that of *deſpiſing* or *ſetting at nought the brother*, which is the *Apoſtle's* argument alſo that they *walk not charitably*, and the effect whereof evident, the *caſting them out of the Church*, if the *cauſe* may be concluded by the *effect*, the guilt lies on the *Romaniſts* ſide, not on ours (as hath formerly appeared) And truly we are ſo ſenſible of the many *prepoſſeſſions*, and *ſtrong prejudices*, which by the *advantage* of *education*, the *preſcribed credulity* to all that the *Church* ſhall propoſe, the *Doctrine* of *Infallibility*, the *ſhutting up* the *Scriptures* in an *unknown language*, the *impoſſibility*, that the *multitude* ſhould *ſearch*, or examine *tradition* with their *own* eyes, the *proſperous flouriſhing* eſtate of the *Roman Church* (and the *perſecutions*, and *calamities*, and expreſſions of *God's diſpleaſure* on the *Church* of *England*) the literal ſound of [*Hoc eſt corpus meum*] for their principal (eſpouſed) *Doctrine* of *Tranſubſtantiation*, and ſome other the like means, are infuſed into the *multitude* of men and women, that are brought up without any *knowledge* of *ours*, in a firm *belief* of all their *pretenſions*, that we are as far from *ſetting* them *at nought*, or *deſpiſing* them, as from that (which by *their* doing it *firſt* is made *impoſſible* for *us* to be guilty of) *the caſting them out of the Church*.

Of deſpiſing. We are guiltleſs of it.

Sect. 5. I foreſee not any *objection*, which may give me *temptation*, or *excuſe* farther to enlarge on this matter, And profeſs not to know any other *branch* of *Schiſm*, or *colour* of faſtening that *guilt* upon our *Church* made uſe of by any, which hath not been either prevented in the *grounds* of this diſcourſe, or *diſtinctly* taken notice of, and *competently vindicated*, as far as the deſign'd *brevity* would permit.

CHAP.

CHAP. XI.

Concerning the preſent Perſecution of the Church of England, and the advantages, ſought from thence.

The Romaniſts argument from our preſent condition of Perſecution.

Sect. 1. OUR *Eſtabliſhment* being thus freed from *Schiſm*, I ſhall not now entertain my ſelf with any *fear*, that the *Perſecution*, which we are under, will *involve* us in it. Yet can I not but take notice of the *ſtyle*, that ſome *Romaniſts* have in theſe *laſt* years, on *this occaſion*, choſen to make uſe of, calling us [*the late Church of England*] The *interpretation* whereof is to my underſtanding this, that the *calamities*, under which now we ſuffer, have made us *ceaſe* to be a *Church*: And therefore having *learned*, and abundantly *experimented*, what *ſcandal* the *Croſs* hath always carried along with it, how willing enemies are to take *advantage*, and ground *arguments* on *afflictions*, and how ordinary it is for *friends*, to take *impreſſions* from ſuch *ſenſible*, *carnal* motives, and being *ſecured* by the *ſtory* of the *ancient Gnoſticks*, that it is neither *ſcandalous exceſs* of *fear*, nor want of *charity*, to think it poſſible, that this, as other *ancient hereſies*, may now as in a *Platonick year* (if not carefully warded) *return* on us, as in a revolution, I ſhall therefore conclude this paper with an attempt to remove this *prejudice*; The utmoſt whereof being formed into an *objection*, is this, that it is abſolutely neceſſary to *communicate* with ſome one *viſible Church*, that now the *Church* of *England* is not ſuch, and conſequently that it muſt be *caſt off*, and the *Roman Church* ſo *illuſtriouſly* viſible, be taken up inſtead of it.

Anſwered.

Sect. 2. To this reſerve I ſhall make my returns by theſe *degrees*, *Firſt*, that by the making this *objection*, or drawing any *argument* againſt any *member* of the *Church* of *England* from the *preſent occaſions*, or *improſperous circumſtances* of affairs, It muſt be ſuppoſed, that *twenty years* ſince, this perſon, the *ſuppoſed ſubject* of diſcourſe, living regularly in this *Church*, under his *ſuperiours*, was not then chargeable with this crime of not *communicating* with a *viſible Church*.

Sect. 3. This *conſequent* I ſhall not be ſo much my own flatterer as to think it will be allowed me by the *Romaniſt*, who will, I know, at another time *accuſe* the whole *Church* of *England* (ever ſince the *Reformation*) of *Schiſm* from the *Catholick Church*, and make the *communicating* with it twenty years ſince, as *dangerous* as now the not *communicating* with any: But the *reaſon* of my laying this *foundation* is, to ſhew the vanity of the *preſent objection*, For if the *Church* of *England* twenty years ſince, were *not* a *Church*, but a *ſociety* of *Schiſmaticks*, not a *particular Church* (which, if ſo, muſt be a *part*, or member of the *Univerſal*, and ſuch it is not, if it be truly *ſeparated* from that *body*, in the *unity* of which it is obliged to *remain*) but a *ſeparated*, and *torn off*, and ſo a *liveleſs ejected branch*, then whatſoever hath now befallen us, and the *conſequence* of that, the ſuppoſed *impoſſibility* of *communicating* with the *Church* of *England*, will but leave us where we *were*, the *impoſſibility* of *communicating* with a *ſchiſmatical ſociety*, being not chargeable on us, as a *crime*, by them, who make the *communicating* with all ſuch *ſocieties* ſo *damnable*; And therefore I ſay, to the making this any *objection*, 'tis neceſſary, that that be ſuppoſed, which I have for that cauſe laid as my *foundation*, that twenty *years* ſince a *member* of the *Engliſh Church* was not under this guilt of *not communicating* with ſome one *viſible Church*; And if then he were not, (or, for diſcourſe ſake, be by the *objectour* ſuppoſed not to have been) then it *infallibly*, and irrefragably follows (which is the *ſecond propoſition*) that he that twenty *years* ſince was *not* under this *guilt* of *not communicating* —— is either not *guilty* of it *now*, or elſe hath *voluntary committed* or *omitted* ſomewhat, which *commiſſion* or *omiſſion* hath been the contracting of this *guilt*. For that ſomewhat, which hath not been his *choice*, ſhall become his *crime*, that what hath been his *ſaddeſt* part of *infelicity*, the *evil* againſt which he hath moſt induſtriouſly *contended*, ſhould be accounted his *offence*, when it is his *puniſhment*, I ſhall not fear will be affirmed by any.

Sect. 4. *Thirdly* then, the buſineſs is brought to this iſſue, that that perſon, which is the ſubject of our diſcourſe (he that twenty *years ſince* was a member of the *Church* of *England*) be now proved by ſome *commiſſion* or *omiſſion* of his, *voluntarily* to have contracted this *guilt*, or elſe be abſolved, and *freed* from it; If he have contracted it, it muſt be by ſome *irregularity* of actions, contrary to the ſtanding *rule* and *Canons* of this *Church*; or by *diſobedience* to ſome *commands* of his *Eccleſiaſtical Superiours*; And as in neither of theſe I ſhall *excuſe* any that hath been *guilty*, ſo if, being not fallen under the *actual Cenſures* of the *Church* for it, he now *timely* and *ſincerely* return with *contrition*, and *reformation*, I ſhall hope it will not be *imputed* to him; But however this cannot be inſiſted on by the *objectour*, becauſe I ſpeak, and ſo muſt he, of him that hath lived *regularly* (not of him that hath not) And of him 'tis apparent, that all that he hath done, is, to *adhere* to his *former principles*, when others have *not*, to have *teſtified* his *conſtancy* with (not onely *venturing* but) *actually loſing* either *poſſeſſions*, or *liberty* (and the benefit of *Eccleſiaſtical aſſemblies*) rather than he would *joyn*, or *appear* to joyn with *Schiſmaticks*, when others have made all *worldly* advantages by the *rupture*; In a word, that he hath been *patient*, and *not fainted*; and never *departed* from his *rule*, though it have coſt him *dear* to ſtick *faſt* to it; And I hope no body will be ſo *uncharitable*, as *to grieve*, and gall him, *whom God hath thus ſuffered* to be *chaſtiſed*, upon no other *provocation*, but this, his having been thus *afflicted* and *perſecuted*. This is too clear a truth to need *confirming*, and yet this is the utmoſt, that it can be driven to *ſuppoſing* the moſt that the *objection* can be imagined to *ſuppoſe*, *viz.* that the *Church* of *England* is now *inviſible*.

Sect. 5. But then in the *fourth* place, it muſt be added, that as yet, *Bleſſed be God*, the *Church* of *England* is not *inviſible*; It is ſtill *preſerved* in *Biſhops* and *Presbyters rightly ordained*, and multitudes *rightly baptized*, none of which have fallen off from their *profeſſion*; And the onely thing imaginable to be *objected* in this point, being this, that the *ſchiſm* hath ſo far been *extended* by the *force*, that many, if not *moſt*

Churches

Churches Parochial are filled by thoſe, who have ſet up a *new*, or a *no-form* of *worſhip*, and ſo that many men cannot any otherwiſe, than in *private* families, *ſerve God*, after the *Church-way*, that ſure will be of little weight, when the *Romaniſts* are remembred to be the *objectours*, who cannot but know, that this is the *onely* way, that they have had of *ſerving God* in this *Kingdom*, theſe *many* years, and that the *night-meetings* of the *Primitive Chriſtians* in *dens* and *caves* are as pertinent to the *juſtifying* of *our* condition, as they can be of *any*, and when 'tis certain, that the ἐγκατάλειψις τῆς ἐπισυναγωγῆς, *the forſaking of the aſſemblies*, Heb. 10. 25. is not ἑκούσιον, *our wilfull fault*, ver. 26. but onely our *unhappy lot*, who are forced either not to *frequent* the *aſſemblies*, or elſe to *incourage* (and incur the *ſcandal* of ſeeming to *approve*) the *practices* of thoſe that have *departed* from the *Church*. That we do not decline *order*, or *publick communion*, and conſequently are not to be charged for not *enjoying* thoſe *benefits* of it, which we vehemently *thirſt* after, is evident by the *extenſive* nature of our *perſecution*, the ſame tempeſt having with us thrown out all *order*, and *form*, *Biſhops*, and *Liturgy* together, and to that *curſtneſs* of theirs, and not to any *obſtinateneſs* or *unreconcileableneſs* of ours (which alone were the *guilt* of *non-communion*) is all that *unhappineſs* of the *conſtant ſons* of the *preſent Engliſh Church* to be imputed, in which alone this whole *objection* is founded.

Sect. 6. I cannot diſcern any farther appearance of *difficulty* in this matter, and therefore ſhall no farther lengthen this *Appendage*, than by offering it to the conſideration of the *indifferent Reader*, whether this *objection* can ever in *future* times be improvable into a *charge* againſt us, or our *poſterity*, as long as either *Biſhops* ſtand, and continue to *ordain* among us, or it is not *our faults* that they do not *ſtand*. To which purpoſe it may be remembred, what befell the *Jews* whether under the *Zelots* fury, or the *Romans* yoke; The *former threw* out the *lawfull ſucceſſive High Prieſts*, and *Prieſts of the ſons of Aaron*, and put into thoſe *ſacred* offices the moſt *ignorant ruſticks*, ſome ſo void of all degree of *knowledge*, ſaith *Joſephus*, that they knew not what the very word [*Prieſt*] ſignified. The *Roman Conquerours* by their *Procuratours* put in *annually* whom they pleaſed to *chuſe* (without conſideration of the *Aaronical line*) into the *Chief Prieſts Office*; I ſhall here demand of any, Whether (ſuppoſing and granting it as *undeniable*, that the *Zelots* were formally *Schiſmaticks*, or with ſome *improvement*, in *Joſephus* his ſtyle στασιασταὶ, *ſeditious*) there can be any ground of *reaſon*, or equity, to involve, or *conclude* under the ſame *guilt* thoſe that lived *under* thoſe *impoſed*, uſurping *High Prieſts*, ſuppoſing thoſe *inferiours* to have been as far from *conſenting* to the *continuance*, as to the *beginning* of ſuch *uſurpation*, and that the *circumſtances* were ſuch, that they lay not under the *appearance* of doing, what they did not, and ſo had not the *ſcandal*, any more, than the *reality* of that *guilt*. The *Reader*, I ſuppoſe, will be able to anſwer this *Quere* to himſelf, and ſuperſede all neceſſity of making up the *Parallel*.

What this may come to in the future.

Sect. 7. And then I have at this time no farther *exerciſe* for him, but that he will joyn in *ardent prayers* with me, that *God* will *reſtore* that which is *loſt*, *reduce* that heavenly *grace*, and *incomparable bleſſing* of *Chriſtian peace* and *holy communion* among all that have received the *honour* of being *called* by his *name*, that we may all *mind the ſame thing*, fix the *ſame common* deſigns, *love*, and *aid*, and *promote* one anothers good, unanimouſly *glorifie* him here with *one tongue*, and *heart*, that we may all be *glorified* with him, and ſing joynt *Hoſannahs*, and *Hallelujahs* to him to all *eternity*. *Amen*.

A PA-

A PARÆNESIS:

OR,

Seaſonable Exhortatory

TO ALL

TRUE SONS

OF

The Church of England.

Wherein is inſerted a Diſcourſe of

HERESY

In Defence of

OUR CHURCH

Againſt the

ROMANIST.

The Contents.

CHAP. I. *An Introductive reflexion on our present condition.*

CHAP. II. *A first Objection, or Argument of our guilt, drawn from our present condition; answered in the former branch of it; The judgment apportioned to our sins.*

CHAP. III. *A view of the second part of the Objection. The perishing of the righteous.*

CHAP. IV. *A second Objection answered. Where is now the Protestant English Church?*

CHAP. V. *Of the nature of Heresie. Our Church secured from the guilt of it.*

SECT. I. *The use of the word in Scripture.*

SECT. II. *Of matter of Faith.*

SECT. III. *The two ways of conveying the Faith to us.*

SECT. IV. *The testimony from which we receive the Faith.*

SECT. V. *The qualifications of such Testimonies.*

SECT. VI. *Where these qualifications may be found. Of the consent of ancient Doctours, and definitions of Councils truly general.*

SECT. VII. *The benefit from general Councils. Reverence due to them. To the first four especially.*

SECT. VIII. *Of the subsequent General Councils. The Romanists deference to them.*

SECT. IX. *Our Reverence to all General Councils. The Fifth and the Sixth.*

SECT. X. *Of the Seventh General Council.*

SECT. XI. *Of the Eighth General Council.*

SECT. XII. *Of the rest of the Councils which the Romanists call General; particularly that of Trent.*

SECT. XIII. *Of the inerrability of a General Council. That it is no matter of Faith.*

SECT. XIV. *That it is one of the* Piè credibilia, *That a general Council shall not err.*

SECT. XV. *A Recapitulation and Conclusion of this matter concerning Heresie.*

CHAP. VI. *A third difficulty, raised from Acts* 4. 19. *and* 1 Cor. 9. 16. *satisfied.*

CHAP. VII. *The beneficial uses of our present condition.*

SECT. I. *First, Contempt of the world.*

SECT. II. *Secondly, Universal Reformation.*

SECT. III. *Thirdly, Fruits of Repentance. Among them, First, Perfect contentment: Discernible by two trials.*

SECT. IV. *Secondly, Peace with all men.*

SECT. V. *Thirdly, Frequency of Synaxes.*

A PA-

A PARÆNESIS:

OR,

Seaſonable Exhortatory to all true Sons of the *Church* of *England.*

CHAP. I.

An Introductive reflexion on our preſent condition.

Sect. 1. IN this *ſad* conjuncture of affairs, when thoſe whoſe *Office* it is to ſpeak to the *People* from *God*, and to *God* from the *People*, are ſolemnly forbidden all publick diſcharge of theſe, and all other Branches of that *Sacred Function* ſo uſefull to make up the *breach*, to reconcile the *enmity* betwixt an *angry God*, and a *ſinfull Land*; It *may* not, I preſume, and I hope it *will* not, be deemed by any, either *impertinent* or *unſeaſonable*, to make ſome attempt to *ſupply* thoſe wants, and remove thoſe *preſſures*, which may otherwiſe lie too heavily *unſupportable* on thoſe our weak *Brethren*'s Souls, towards whom the example of *Chriſt's bowels*, and *bloudſhedding* may reaſonably expect to be anſwered with our utmoſt *compaſſion*.

Sect. 2. In *obedience* therefore to *opportunity*, which may poſſibly be a *duty* incumbent on us, (ſince, *Rom.* 12. 11. the *Greek* Copies of greateſt authority reade καιρῷ δουλεύειν *ſerving the ſeaſon*, inſtead of κυρίῳ *the Lord*) I ſhall now, though the *unworthieſt* of all my many *Brethren*, aſſume this *venerable* Office of being a *Remembrancer* to the people of God, even to all thoſe who have been brought forth unto *Chriſt* by our pretious dear perſecuted *Mother*, the *Church* of *England*, and remain ſtill conſtant to that *faith*, which from her breaſts they have *ſuckt*, and are *not* yet *ſcandalized in her*.

Sect. 3. And for the *firſt* ſtep of my addreſs, it cannot be more *regular*, than by beholding and *repreſenting* a while the *peculiarity* of our *preſent* condition, conſidered onely in the ſad *matter* of it (without any unkind *reflexion* on the inflicters) that no one of us may miſs to diſcern the nature of that *judgment*, that by *God's juſt* vengeance, and all-wiſe *Providence*, is permitted to fall, and lie upon us, even the ſaddeſt addition to the former weight that our *unparallel'd ſins* and provocations could ſolicite *God* to *tolerate*, or ſuggeſt to *others* to *inflict*, or to the *patients* to *fear*, or expect in this life.

Sect. 4. Some *images* we have of it in *ſacred Writ*. As firſt the expulſing of our *firſt Parents*, and in them of all *God's people*, at one interdict, out of the *Garden* of *God*, that lively embleme of a pure *Reformed Church*; and a *flaming ſword*, ſent to back that *interdict*, to *guard* the *way of the tree of life*, to keep thoſe, who moſt deſired, from *taſting* of it: And the ſad *poſitive penalties*, which attended that, the *ſweat* and *agony* of their *combat* with the *Briers* and *Thorns*, were nothing in *compariſon* with the vaſt diſmal *privation*, and *interciſion* of thoſe *bleſſed* advantages, all which were deſigned the daily *fruits* and *enjoyments* of that *Paradiſe*.

Sect. 5. Add to this the *captive Ark*, with *Ichabod* inſcribed on it, the departure of the *Schechina*, the *Majeſtick preſence* of the *Lord*, and with it the *glory* from *Iſrael*; the very news whereof was, in *God's* own judgment, ſuch, as that the *ears of every one that heard it ſhould tingle*, and the effect yet more direfull to *old Eli*, whoſe but *mildneſs* and want of due *ſeverity* had ſomewhat *contributed* toward it: The greatneſs of which puniſhment to the *diſcomfited Iſraelites*, is much more *agreeable*, and *uſefull* matter of *meditation* to us at this time, than the *inauſpicious conſequents* thereof to thoſe who took it *captive*, the *Emerods* and the ruinous *proſtration* of their *Dagon*, and the weight of *God's hand* on the men of *Aſhdod*, and *Gath*, and *Ekron*, who were any way guilty of *taking*, or *acceſſory* to the withholding it.

Sect. 6. Beſide theſe, the *Prophets* both of the *Old* and *New Teſtament* have yielded many diſmal *adumbrations*, their Pencils advancing as high as to the *Sun's being turned into darkneſs* and *the Moon into bloud*, the *caſting down of the Hoſt*, and *of the Stars* to the *ground*; ſome in calmer ſtyle to repreſent the *deportation* of the *worſhippers* into a *ſtrange* Country, from the *Garden* of *Eden* into a *deſolate Wilderneſs*, from *Sion* unto *Babylon*; others in the *ſharper* accent of the *threefold woe* in [a] *Joſephus* and the [b] *Apocalyps*, to ſet out the *captivity* of the very *worſhip* and *Temple* it ſelf; *deſtroying* the *Sanctuary*, cauſing the *Sacrifice* and *Oblation to ceaſe*, baniſhing even their *eyes* and *thoughts* from the wonted *joy* and *delight* of both (the καλὴ ἁγία, *the holy convocation*, and the *beauty of that holineſs*) and of this the concluſion is but *equitable*, this *is a lamentation, and it ſhall be for a lamentation.*

[a] See *Euſeb.* l. 3. c. 13.
[b] Rev. 8. 13.

Sect. 7. *Laſtly*, to come nearer home, to the moſt flouriſhing, once *pureſt*, *Chriſtian* Aſſemblies, we have in viſion from S. *John* in his exile, predictions of *Churches*, and their *Angels*, both threatned a *deportation*, of *removing Epheſus* her *Candleſtick out of the place*, putting the *Lamp* thereof (fitly qualified to have

inlightned the whole room) under the narrow bounds of a *Bed* or *Buſhel*, of *delivering up* whole *Aſſemblies* to *Satan*, that he may *caſt them into priſon*, ſentencing them to *black* and *dark* reſtraints, the ſins of *Profeſſours* being the *Forges* or *Moulds* of ſuch more than *Iron Fetters*, whereby even the *Word of God* is taught to be *bound*, when the *free* uſe of it hath been *abuſed* by them.

Sect. 8. That theſe are the very *lines*, that make up the *face of ſorrow*, that is at preſent on this *Church*, is none of the advertiſements, that we can ſtand in need of at this time, the *matter it ſelf ſpeaks* too loud, to be news to any of us.

Sect. 9. The *doubts* that are more apt to exerciſe mens thoughts are founded in the *acknowledgment* of it, and every one hath borrowed his *Objection* or Argument from one of *Job's friends*, to add ſome weight of *ſorrow* to her whom *God* hath *afflicted*. A few of theſe it may be *pertinent* to examine a while, inſtead of farther *inlarging* on our *Sylvodia*.

CHAP. II.

A firſt Objection, or Argument of our guilt, drawn from our preſent condition; anſwered in the former branch of it; The judgment apportioned to our ſins.

Sect. 1. IT is firſt made matter of *Argument* againſt our *Church*, and *eſtabliſhment*, that *God hath found us out*, that it is *becauſe of tranſgreſſions, that an hoſt hath been given againſt the daily Sacrifice*, and therein *hath practiſed, and proſpered*, and that *proſperouſneſs* interpreted to be *God's* own *deciſion*, as *ſignal*, as any *reſponſe* from the *Ephod*, a *ſentence* by *Urim* and *Thummim*, that it is no other than the *quarrel* of *God*, which he hath thus *ſignally* managed againſt us.

Sect. 2. This *Argument* thus propoſed hath ſomewhat which muſt be *granted*, and by no means *denied* by us; and for the other part, wherein it is *fallacious*, it brings ſufficient *light* with it, to aſſiſt us in the *diſcovery* of the *Paralogiſm*. And it may be worth the while diſtinctly to conſider it, in theſe *two* branches of it.

Sect. 3. *Firſt* I ſay, it muſt not be *denied*, but that *our ſins have found us out*, all the *puniſhments* we have undergone, being but the *juſt*, and withall *merciſull* reward of our *ſins*.

Sect. 4. For although we are by our *Saviour's anſwer*, *Luke* 13. 3. reſtrain'd from making ſuch inferences of *other* men, to conclude their *guilts* by their *ſufferings*, though *Job's* friends are *rebuked* for this kind of *Logick*, arguing his *unſincerity* from the *preſſures* that fell upon him, yet ſuch *methods* are very ſafe to be uſed by *our ſelves* toward *our ſelves*. We are now *obliged*, and never more loudly called on to *judge* our ſelves, though it be not *allowed* to any man *elſe* to *judge* us upon *theſe* premiſſes.

Sect. 5. It is, I ſay, true beyond all *contradiction*, and never more *applicable* to any, than to us, that all *God's puniſhments*, eſpecially his *ſpiritual*, and heavieſt ſort of them, are brought upon men by their *ſins*. The *lover of ſouls*, the patient and *long-ſuffering Father of all conſolations and mercies*, never puts on the guiſe, or armature of an *enemy*, but when our *methods* have ſuggeſted this, and our *unreformed ſins* made it doubly *neceſſary*, to *vindicate* himſelf, and to *chaſtiſe* us. And herein how bitter ſoever our *portion* prove, though to have our lot with *Admah* and *Zeboim*, to be *thrown away as ſtraw to the Dunghill*, or *unprofitable ſervants into utter darkneſs*, yet our *hands are on* our *mouths*, the *honour* of a moſt perfect *righteouſneſs belongeth unto* our Judge, *and to us confuſion of face, as at this day.*

Sect. 6. And we ſhall be foully to blame, if theſe ſo *generous medicaments* do not, in ſome *proportion* to the wiſedom and *deſign* of our great *Phyſician*, prove effectually *operative*, beyond all the former *gentler* methods, if the ſins that have lain *diſguiſed* in their *cloſeſt concealments*, kept ſo ſtrictly from the eyes of *men*, and, in our deſign, of *God* himſelf, that they have even been *unknown* to our ſelves, do not now, upon this *ſcrutiny*, *give God the honour*, come forth and offer themſelves to *juſtice*.

Sect. 7. This is indeed but our *juſt* return to our *ſins finding us out*, for us to *find out* our *ſins*, to act this one *revenge* on them, to *deliver* thoſe up to wrath, which have ſo ſignally *delivered* up *us*. And inſtead of *ſhaking* off, or taking *leave* of this part of the *Argument* too *haſtily*, I ſhall deſire to give it its full *ſcope*, to reap as much *benefit* by it, as we may, and take notice of *ſome* (at leaſt) of thoſe *guilts*, which the *ſignatures* we diſcern in the *judgment*, the *lines* in this *hand* of *God*, do, according to the rules of the ſteadieſt *augury*, point out and diſcover to us.

Sect. 8. And 1. The *deep*, though moſt *cauſleſs diſpleaſure*, under which the *Liturgy* of our *Church* is fallen, is a ſhrewd indication of the great *coldneſs* and *indevotion*, ſo ſcandalouſly frequent among us, of the *formal perfunctory performance* of our *offices*, nay, of the many foul *profane mixtures*, which have ſo frequently interpoſed, and by a kind of *faſcination* converted the moſt *ſpotleſs Sacrifice* into the *very lame and the ſick*, the pureſt *unleavened offering* into *bitter polluted bread* upon *God's Altar*, and then no marvel that *God* ſhould *have no pleaſure*, and at length refuſe to *accept an offering from* ſuch *myſtæ*.

Mal. 1. 8. 7. 10.

Sect. 9. We know the *unwaſht hands* that brought it, defamed the *Sacrifice* of *God's* own ordaining, blaſted the very *incenſe* and *fat of fed beaſts*, the *Sabbaths* and *calling of Aſſemblies*, and turned them into mere *abominations*; and then what wonder that what he *deteſts* and cannot *away* with, he ſhould permit to be *deſtroyed?* lay down that *weight*, which he is *weary to bear?* ſuffer that to be deemed an *abomination*, and uſed accordingly, which our *unſanctified* uſage hath made ſuch?

Iſai. 1. 13. 11. 14.

Sect. 10. To deſcend to ſome *particulars*; Our continued *obſtinate* unreformed *ſins* have made forms of *confeſſion* and *contrition* unfit to be taken into our mouths; thoſe cannot be repeated by ſuch, without groſs *hypocriſie* and *belying* our ſelves before *God* and Men, and then what poſſibility is there, that the *Miniſterial Abſolution* ſhould with any *juſtice* be applied to us?

Sect. 11.

Sect. 11. And for that *sacred form of words*, which *Christ commanded* us to use in our addresses to our *Father*, [*When ye pray, say, Our Father*——] there needs no other argument for the *discountenancing* of it (and *Hell* it self can yield no *other*, though search hath been made into all *Topicks* to find some) this one is sufficient for the *rending* it from us, our *unqualifiedness* for the rehearsing the several *petitions* of it.

Sect. 12. We that are so far from our due *charity* to others, that we are not at *unity* within our selves, that live so unlike *children*, that we have not so much as the *livery* of the *servants* of *God*, with what face can we hourly and solemnly invoke *our Father?* We that do actually with horrid *oaths* defile, and *reproach* the *name* of *God*, cannot be thought to be in *earnest*, when we require it *may be hallowed*. We that like *Rebels* have dethroned *God* out of our *hearts*, cannot without the same *mockery* that the *Souldiers* were guilty of in the *crown of thorns* and *purple robe*, and *ironical salutation*, instyle him *King*, or pray for that *coming of his Kingdom*. And as long as we *murine*, and repine at the execution of *God's will* in *Heaven*, it is not possible we should heartily beg that honour of *transcribing* the *Angels pattern* of *chearfull* diligent *obedience* to his *will on earth*. Our wants may seem indeed to *qualifie* us for an ardent *address* of the fourth *Petition*; but our *surfeiting* on *Manna* makes us of all others the least fit to go out to *gather* it: And the *bread* that *came down from Heaven* being so neglected by us, with what face can we ask that *other*, which we mean but to *consume* upon our *lusts?* But beyond all, we are most *unqualified* for that *Petition* wherein we set our *forgiving of trespassers*, as the *pattern* for *God* to copy out in *forgiving us*. 'Tis but just that they which are *implacable* to *enemies*, should be *excluded* from, if they will not voluntarily *renounce* all part in this *Prayer*, this *Legacy* of *Christ's* to the *mercifull:* Why should they be inclinable to use a *form*, which is so ill fitted to their *constitutions*, an *imprecation* on those whom they tender most *dearly?* And yet those which are most unwilling to lose their *right* in this *donative*, have not been, to that degree they ought, mindfull of the *condition*, without which they do but call for *vengeance* upon their own *heads*, when they are most *importunate* for *mercy* and *forgiveness*. In a word, they that *solicite* and even court *temptations*, invade *sin* and *Satan* in his own *territories*, not to *subdue*, but to be *subdued* by him, how can they pray *not to be led into temptation*, or be reconciled to themselves for hoping *deliverance* from those *evils*, which *themselves* have brought down upon themselves? John 13. 3.

Sect. 13. As for the *Sacraments*, they also may deserve to be reflected on a while by us.

Sect. 14. The *Baptism* of Infants is well known to have of late found great *opposition* among us, many with some *earnestness*, as it were their *solid* concernment, *denying* their *tender* years the enjoyment of this *privilege*, whereby the *benefits* of the *death* of *Christ* (of which the *Catholick Church* against the *Pelagians* defined all that are *born in sin*, to stand in need) are, according to his *institution*, *sealed* unto them.

Sect. 15. And for others which retaining *kindness* to the *Directory*, do in obedience thereto, maintain *Infant Baptism*, yet have they taken away the *form of abrenunciation*, though such as hath been *universally practised* in the *Church* of [a] *all Ages*, and that as *delivered to* them by the [b] Apostles themselves, and in every word almost of that form which is retained in our [c] Liturgy, and that extended to the tenderest [d] Infants: Onely instead of this the people are appointed to be *taught*, [e] *That all that are baptized do renounce, and by their baptism are bound to fight against the Devil, the World, and the Flesh,*] Which yet cannot with any truth be affirmed of those, that neither doe it by *themselves*, nor by their *proxies*. And 'tis not sufficient to say, they doe it *interpretatively*, for unless it have been the *constant* custome of the *Church*, that they who are *baptized* should use forms of *abrenunciation*, they that are *baptized*, without using them, cannot be pretended to doe it *interpretatively*, and if it have been the *constant custome*, then how can they be excused, that have resolvedly *omitted* it? And besides, the *condition* of *Covenants* (such is *abrenunciation* here) ought to be *expresst*, and so the *Church* from the *Apostles* hath always *exacted* the *expressing* it, before the *sealing* of this *Covenant*. And yet, I say, this, though it be such an *Apostolical Rite*, containing no unconsiderable, *supervacaneous condition*, and qualification in the person *baptized*, is by *interdicting* the *administration* of *Baptism* according to the *ancient* order of our *Church*, or by those which have continued constant to that order, endeavoured to be *superseded* and removed from among us.

[a] Tertul. *de Coron. Mil.* c. 3. *Aquam adituri ibidem, sed & aliquanto prius* (viz. in the preparing the *Catechumenus* for *Baptism*) *in Ecclesia sub antistitis manu contestamur, nos renunciare Diabolo & pompæ & Angelis ejus, amplius aliquid respondentes quàm Dominus in Evangelio determinavit.*

So the Authour *de Eccl. Hierarch.* very ancient, *cap.* 2. *Edit. Par.* ap. *Morel.* p. 116. Ἐμυσήσω μὲ αὐτῶ τὸς διακελδόμθς τῷ Σατανᾷ, καὶ ἀφησόμ τὰ ὑποταγῆς ὁμολογήσω, καὶ τὸς αὐτῶ πᾶν ὑποταγὼ μαρτυρήσω, ὁμολογήσαντα τὸς τότο μετάγω—καὶ κελδόμ σωτάξαδζ τῷ Χριςῷ καὶ πάσης τ θεοπρεπδότης ἱερολογίας. So *Chrysost.* Edit. Eton. T. 6. p. 606. l. 31. Διὰ τότο κελδόμθα λέγειν, Ἀποτάσσομαί σοι Σαλαγᾶ, ἵνα μηκέτι πρὸς αὐτὸν ὑπαγάλθωμεν, and p. 609. l. 41. Ἂν ἀναμνησθῆς τ φωνῆς ἐκείνης, ἣν ἀρτίως μυσταγωγθμέν, Ἀποτάσσομαί σοι Σαλαγᾶ καὶ τῇ πομπῇ σῦ, καὶ τῇ λατρείᾳ σῦ; adding p. 610. l. 2. αὐτὰ γὰρ ἡ φωνὴ, σωθῆναι πρὸς τ διαβόλω δεῖ (making it the Covenant on our part) καὶ καθάπερ ἡμᾶς οἰκέτας ἀγοραζόντες αὐτὰς——πρίαμεθ ἐρωτῶμθ, εἰ βέλονται ἡμῖν δελεῦσαι, ὅπω καὶ ὁ Χριςὸς ποιεῖ——ἐρωτᾶ εἰ βέλει τ τύραννον ἐκεῖνον ἀπᾶναι—— So *Augustine de Nuptiis & Concupiscent.* l. 1. c. 20. (in *Basil.* Froben. Ed. T. 7. p. 822.) *Potestas diabolica exorcizatur in parvulis, eique renunciant, quia per sua non possunt, per corda & ora gestantium.* So *Ambrose* in *Col.* 2. and l. *de iis qui Myster. initiantur*, c. 2. *Repete quid interrogatus sis, Recognosce quid responderis, Renunciasti Diabolo & operibus ejus.* And *Hexaem.* l. 1. c. 4. *Deserit qui abluitur——Principem istius mundi, dicens, Abrenuncio tibi, Diabole, & Angelis tuis, & operibus tuis, & imperiis tuis.* And *Hierome* ad *Matt.* 5. *Renuncio tibi & pompæ tuæ & vitiis tuis, & mundo qui in maligno positus est.* And *Salde Prov.* l. 6. *Quæ est in baptismo salutari Christianorum prima confessio? Quæ scil. nisi ut renunciare se Diabolo & pompis ejus atque spectaculis & operibus protestentur?* [b] S. *Basil* de Spiritu Sanct. ad *Amphiloch.* c. 27. T. 2. p. 210. *B.* Giving many instances. Τῶν ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ πεφυλαγμένων δογμάτων, καὶ κηρυγμάτων ὰ τ ἔγγ Ἀποστόλων παραδόσεως, p. 210. c. mentions this among them, Ἀποτάσσεδζ τῷ Σαλαγᾶ, καὶ τῆς ἀγγέλοις αὐτῦ, ἐν ποίᾳ, saith he, δεῖ χαρᾷ; ὃν ὰ τ αἰσχυσιδότα πάντες καὶ ὑποῤῥήτε διδασκαλίαις, ὧν ἐν ἀπολυπραγμονήτῳ καὶ ἀπερισκέπτῳ σιγῇ οἱ πολέμιοι ἡμῶν ἐφύλαξαν; And before him *Origen.* Hom. 5. in *Num. Eorum quæ geruntur in baptismo verborum——atque interrogationum & responsionum quis facilè explicet rationem? Et tamen omnia hæc operta & velata portamus super humeros nostros, cùm ita implemus ea & exequimur, ut à magno Pontifice atque ejus filiis tradita & commendata suscepimus.* And so *Tertullian* ubi *suprà. Hanc si nulla scriptura determinavit, certè consuetudo roboravit quæ sine dubio de traditione manavit. Quæramus an & traditio non scripta non debeat recipi——ut à baptismate ingrediamur——* [c] So *Cyril* of *Jerusalem* in his μυσταγωγία, or ἱερ. Κατηχ. α'. Ὑμῶν ἕκαστος ἐξὸς ἔλεγεν, Ἀποτάσσομαί σοι Σαλαγᾶ——ἔντα καὶ πᾶσι σοῖς ἔργοις σε——ὅντα λόγοις, καὶ πάσῃ τῇ πομπῇ αὐτῦ,——καὶ πᾶσι τοιαύτη μαλαύτη—— [d] The Authour *de Eccl. Hierarch.* c. 2. Τῦτον ὧν ὁ ἱεροφάντης ὁμολογοῦντα καθ' ἑαυτὸν ἱερὸν ἀνδρῶν καὶ παῖδα ζωλὼ ἀπαλοῖ τὰς ὑποτάξεις ὁμολογῆσαι, καὶ τὰς ἱερὰς ὁμολογίας, ὑκ ἂν ὡς ἐκείνου γελῶντες φαῖεν ἄλλον ἀντ' ἄλλα τὰ θεῖα μυεῖν, ἀλλ' ὃ τότο φησιν, ὡς ὑπὲρ τῦ παιδὸς ἐγὼ τὰς ὑποτάξεις, ἢ τὰς ἱερὰς ὁμολογίας πεπίσμαι, ἀλλ' ὅτι παῖς ὑπολάσσεται καὶ σωτάσσεται, τ. ε. ὁμολογῶ τ παῖδα ποίσειν εἰς τὸν ἱερὸν ἰόντα τᾶς ἡμᾶς ἐνθέοις ἀναγωγαῖς, ὑποτάξαδζ μὲ ὁλικῶς τοῖς ἐναντίοις, ὁμολογῆσαι δ καὶ ἀνεργῆσαι τὰς θείας ὁμολογίας. So *Augustin.* ubi *suprà.* [e] *Direct. of Bapt.* p. 42.

Sect. 16. And the *wisedom* and *justice* and *mercy* of *God* is remarkable in this, thereby *branding* our *infamous* repeated innumerable *breaches* of this *vow*, our *perjurious* acting of all those sins, with *confidence* and without *regrets*, which we did so solemnly *renounce* and defie in our *Baptism*.

Sect. 17.

Sect. 17. The greatneſs of that crime of *reſcinding oaths*, and *renouncing abrenunciations*, was that which made the *ancient diſcipline* of the *Church* ſo ſevere againſt every *preſumptuous* act of ſin after *baptiſm*, in reſpect of the *heightning* circumſtances of ſuch, drawn from the *ſolemnity* of that *vow* againſt which they were *committed*, and of that *preſence* in which that *vow* was made, and of [f] that *weight*, which is ſet upon it by *God*, and of that *judgment* which attends every breach of it. And our *ſcandalous negligence* in this kind is by this *interdict*, *ſignally* pointed out to us; 'tis pity we ſhould ever want any more *admonitions*, or venture again upon one ſuch provocation, *leſt a worſe thing yet happen to us*, this being, if rightly conſidered, *bad* enough already.

[f] Παλιν φησιν ἰδου ὁτι δυο λίχνοι μαλιστα καθ' ἑαυτὸν τὸν φειδωλοτατον ἄρχειν ἐγχειρουσι τῆς τῶν ὅλων βιβλου· ἐπιδειν τουτων ἑκατερον η διαπεπιδυρω τόπος ἦν, ὡς ἐξελεσθαι κελευον. Cyril. *Hieroſ.* Katηχ. μυσταγ. 2. p. 510.

Sect. 18. In like manner and upon the ſame grounds of our *unreformed ſins*, it is, that the *Sacrament* of *Chriſt's body* and *bloud* ſhould be in all *juſtice* withdrawn from thoſe, who have no way *approved* themſelves for the *eating of that bread and drinking that cup*, this greateſt *ſeverity* being by our *unprepared* hearts converted into the onely *ſeaſonable mercy*; it being little for the *advantage* (or even the *ſenſuality*) of the *Swine*, to have the *trampling of Pearls under their feet*, and as little for the *unworthy receivers* to deal after the ſame manner with the *bloud of the Covenant*.

Sect. 19. And why ſhould the *Sacramentals* eſcape better, than the *Sacraments*? *Marriage* we know is become ſo *deformed* among us, ſo extremely *unlike* the *union betwixt Chriſt and his Church*, by which S. *Paul* thought meet to *reſemble* it, the band is ſo frequently and ſo ſcandalouſly *torn* aſunder, the deſigns of it ordinarily ſo very unlike what they *ought* to be, ſo more than *polluted* by either *earthly* or *ſenſual* conſiderations; that the *myſterious* band is in danger to become ὅλη σὰρξ, *all Fleſh*, nothing but *luxury* and *brutiſhneſs*, and in proportion thereto the very *Rites* of it ſo wholly *transformed* from the γάμοι or *nuptial Feaſts* in *Scripture* (*honoured* by *Chriſt's preſence*) into the *Saturnalia* or *Heathen Riots* in *Macrobius*, that it were even a *reproach* to the *Churches Service*, eſpecially to the *offertory*, and *Sacrament* of *Chriſt's body* (which our *Rubrick* exacts indiſpenſably from the *married couple* at the time of their *eſpouſals*) to bear part in ſuch kind of *ſolemnities*. And to theſe, and the like *provocations* we may reaſonably *impute* it, that the *binding* and *bleſſing* thoſe *bands*, and rendring them truly *ſacred*, to which the *Biſhops* or *Presbyters* hands were [g] always thought *neceſſary* from the *Apoſtles* days through *all* ages of the *Church* over all the *World*, is now ſolemnly laid aſide, and no image of it reſerved to the *Church*, the *Presbyterian* Miniſter, as well as the *Prelatiſt* (which in other particulars have not the like *fellowſhip*) not onely the *Liturgy* but the *Directory* deemed *ſuperfluous*, and equally *impertinent* in this matter.

[g] Πρέπει τοῖς γαμοῦσι καὶ γαμουμένοις μετὰ γνώμης τὴν ὁμοκοινωνίαν γίνεσθαι ἕνωσιν πιστὴν. Ignat. *Ep. ad* Polycarp. *Quod Eccleſia conciliat, & confirmat oblatio, & obſignat benedictio, Angeli renunciant, &c.* Tert. *ad Uxor. l.* 2. *c. ult. Conjunctiones non prius apud Eccleſiam profeſſa juxta mœchiam——judicari periclitantur. Idem de Pudic. c.* 4. *Sponſus & ſponſa cum benedicendi ſunt à Sacerdote, Concil. Carthag.* 4. *Can.* 13. *Qui in toto orbe ſunt Sacerdotes, Nuptiarum initia benedicentes, conſecrantes, & in myſteriis ſociantes. De Hær. Prædeſtinat.*

Sect. 20. And ſo the *Office* for *Burial*, which is now under the like *preſcription*, may well be our *ſeaſonable* admonition, and memorative of the *ſublime* and *ſacred* uſes, to which our living *bodies* were by *God* deſigned, even to the ναοὶ ἔμψυχοι, *the animate walking temples* of his *Spirit*, and to bear their parts with the ſoul in all the *devotions* it offers up (the *eye*, the *hand*, the *knee*, the *tongue*, being thus obliged, as well as the *heart*) but are commonly ſo obſtinately withdrawn from all *holy offices*, and ſo profaned and polluted with our *unſanctified* practices, that as to ſo many *felo's de ſe*, ſo many *ſacrilegious*, *anathematized* perſons, the *burial* of an *Aſs* or *Dog* is but fitly apportion'd, and upon that account all more decent *ceremonies* or *regard*, all *offerings* for the *dead*, though but for a *joyfull reſurrection*, withdrawn from us.

Sect. 21. And even the *Creeds* of the *Catholick Church*, that great *depoſitum*, which the *Apoſtles* in their *ſeveral plantations* left as the *ſummary* of all that was to be *believed to our ſouls health*, and foundation of all *Chriſtian practice*, and *reformation*, together with the *Nicene* (or *Conſtantinopolitan*) and *Athanaſian* inlargements of that, for the *ſecuring* that *depoſitum*, and for the *expulſing* all *Hereſies*, riſen up againſt it. All theſe now being fallen under the ſame *oſtraciſm*, with the other parts of the *inheritance* of the *Church*, muſt ſerve to advertiſe us, that a *pure faith* attended with *impure* lives, *foundations of reformation* laid by *God*, without any *conformable ſuperſtructures* of ours, are like *the talent laid up* in a *Napkin*, ἀπολελαχέναι, *teſtifications*, and *ſelf-confeſſions* of an *unprofitable wicked ſervant*, and ſo very fit to be taken away from them, who have made ſuch *unchriſtian* uſes of them.

Sect. 22. The *Solifidian* that muſt be ſaved by his *Faith without works*, and hath found out artifices to elude Saint *James's* exhortation and reſolution, that ſuch a *faith will* never *ſave* or *juſtifie* any, well deſerves to have his *amulet* taken away from him, to be deprived of the *inſtrument* of his deſtructive *ſecurity*, as the *Jews* were of the *Temple* of the *Lord*, when that was become the great *Sanctuary*, and *reſerve* of ſafety for all their *unſanctified* practices.

Sect. 23. As for the *contempt* of the *perſons* of thoſe that have been ſet apart to that *venerable* office of waiting on *God's Altar*, and at length the *interdict* that is fallen upon them, there be many matters of *ſeaſonable* admonition, which ſeem to be deſigned us thereby. Firſt, It may mind us of a conſiderable *defect*.

Sect. 24. For though the *four Ember weeks* were according to *ancient* cuſtome preſerved for *faſting* and *praying*, and that in order to that buſineſs of greateſt weight, *Praying to the Lord of the harveſt that he would ſend forth fit labourers into the harveſt* (therein tranſcribing the example of the *Apoſtolick Church*, Acts 13.3.) yet there being no ſpecial ſervice appointed in our *Liturgy* for thoſe times, 'tis too probable, that duty being left to every man's *voluntary*, *private* devotions, hath been very much *neglected*, which neglect was therefore thus to receive its *chaſtiſement* from *God*.

Sect. 25. Secondly, The admiſſion of ſome men into that calling which were not duly *qualified* for it; and the *negligent* and unworthy performances of the *offices* of ſo *ſacred* a function, and the many *profane* mixtures, the ſeeking our own *wealth*, and *eaſe*, and *praiſe*, &c. qualifying us for that *contempt*, and ruine,

ruine, which is now fallen upon us; and laſtly the *unprofitableneſs* of the people in the midſt of very *plentifull* means of inſtruction, were all fit to be thus *diſciplin'd* with a *famine* of the word, or *unwholſome* food in exchange for that ἄδολον γάλα, *ſincere* and *unmixt*, which began to be *nauſeated*. And many other ſad *reflexions* this may ſeaſonably ſuggeſt to us.

Sect. 26. And ſo in like manner for *holy times*, and *places*, which are fallen under ſo great *diſpleaſure*, and *contempt*, even thoſe that have been *conſecrated* not onely to the honourable *memory* and *imitation* of the *Apoſtles* and *Saints* and *Martyrs* of *God*, but even to the commemoration of the moſt glorious *myſteries* of our *redemption*, the moſt *ſignal* mercies of *Chriſt* himſelf, the deprivation of theſe bleſſed *ſeaſons* and *advantages* cannot but mind us how they have been formerly *neglected*, and even *deſpiſed*, and ſo either way *profaned*, and *ſacrilegiouſly* handled by us, inſtead of being inſtrumental to the *inciting* and *advancing* (as they were ſure deſigned) the works of *holineſs* in us.

Sect. 27. In a word (to cut off, and *omit* many particulars in this *large*, and *vaſt* field of uſefull *meditation*, beſeeching every man to examine his guilts by *ſuch* reflexions as theſe) when the *characters*, or diſcriminative marks of the *Engliſh Reformation* are principally two, one the *conforming* all our *Doctrines* to the *Primitive Antiquity*, receiving all *genuine Apoſtolical Traditions* for our rule both in matters of *Faith* and *Government*; the other in uniting that καλὴ συμμετρία *fair*, *beautifull pair* of *Faith* and *Works*, in the ſame degree of *neceſſity* and *conditionality* both to our *juſtification*, and *ſalvation*, and to all the good works of *juſtice* and *mercy*, which the *Romaniſt* ſpeaks of, adjoyning that other moſt eminent one of *humility*, attributing nothing to our *ſelves*, when we *have done all*, but all to the *glory* of the *mercy*, and *grace* of *God*, purchaſed for us by *Chriſt*; 'Tis but juſt that they which have walkt unworthy of ſuch *guides* and *rules* as theſe, lived ſo contrary to our *profeſſion*, ſhould at length be deprived of both, not onely to have our *two ſtaves* broken, *Beauty* and *Bands*, the ſymbols of *order* and *unity*, both which have now for ſome years taken their *leaves* of us, but even to have the *whole Fabrick* demoliſhed, the *houſe* to follow the *pillars* fate, and ſo to be left; and abide *without a Sacrifice, and without an Image, and without an Ephod, and without Teraphim, deprived* of all our *ornaments*, left *naked and bare*, when we had miſuſed our *beauty* unto *wantonneſs*. Thus when the Devil was turned out of his *habitation*, and nothing followed but the *ſweeping and garniſhing* the houſe, and keeping it *empty* of any better gueſt; the iſſue is, the *Devil* ſoon *returns* again, from whence he *came out*, and brings *ſeven ſpirits worſe than himſelf*, and the *end of that ſtate is worſe than the beginning*. Hoſ. 3. 4.

Sect. 28. And ſo ſtill the *taking* of the *Ark*, and the *breaking* the *High Prieſt's neck*, and the *ſlaying his Sons*, and many more, in that *diſcomfiture*, are all far from *new* or *ſtrange*, being but the proper natural *effects* of the *profanations*, which not the *Ark* it ſelf (that was built every *pin* of it according to *God's* direction) but the *Sacrificers*, not the *Religion*, but the *worſhippers* were ſo *ſcandalouſly* guilty of.

Sect. 29. Thus we that are taught by *Chriſt* to *love our enemies*, and by *Nature*, and natural *kindneſs* to our *ſelves*, to receive all *profit* we may, by their *oppoſitions*, muſt make our advantage of the *firſt* part of the *objection*, diſtinguiſhed betwixt the *innocence* or *guiltleſneſs* (nay more than ſo, *fruitfulneſs* and *goodneſs*) of the *land*, and the *barrenneſs* and *wickedneſs* and *provocations* of them *that dwell therein*, for whoſe ſake it is regular with *God*, to make that *fruitfull land barren*, to convert the *Milk* and *Honey* of *Canaan* into *Gall* and *Wormwood*, to leave it to *imitate*, and copy out the temper of the *inhabitants* (whom yet his own hand of tranſcendent ſpecial *mercy* had once *plantèd* there) to ſuffer it to *petrifie* and *degenerate* (as *Geographers* tell us of that once *good Land*) into *Rock* and *Mine*, at once to *puniſh* and reproach their obdurate *impenitent* hearts: And yet ſtill diſcerning the *bleſſedneſs* of that *Canaan*, both in it ſelf and to us, as long as we were thought worthy to *enjoy* it, and indeed judging by this one κρεῖττον (if we wanted all others) that it was a moſt *pretious eſtabliſhment*, becauſe ſuch *provokers* could not in the *juſtice* and *wiſedom* of *God*, be longer allow'd the *fruition* of it.

Sect. 30. Herein our *puniſhment* conſiſts, that that which we are *deprived* of, was truly *valuable*: 'Tis not a *vengeance* but a *boon* to have *poiſonous* drugs ſnatcht from us, and caſt out into the *ſink*, *Ordinances that are not good*, aboliſhed and *nailed to the croſs*; and in like manner 'tis but proportionable to our *merits* to have even the *kingdom of heaven* taken from us, that *initial* part, the *Suburbs* and *Confines* of it here, and beſtowed on them that are more *worthy*, and ſo capable of receiving *benefit* by ſuch *jewels*.

Sect. 31. Let us therefore here ſtop a while to doe our duty upon our *knees* to this firſt part of the *Objection*, by reflecting on thoſe *ſins which have thus found us out*.

A Prayer fitted for a day of Humiliation.

O Juſt and righteous Judge, who didſt once for the iniquity of thy people Iſrael give up thy Ark into the hand of the Philiſtines, we ſinfull creatures that are now under as great a degree both of guilt and puniſhment, do here caſt our ſelves down before thee, acknowledging that we are not worthy any longer to * receive the honour of Chriſtian profeſſion, that have ſo long defamed it by enormous practices; and that we who loved darkneſs more than light, deſerve to have our Candleſtick removed, and to be given up to that inundation of Atheiſm and profaneneſs, which now invades this gaſping Church: Yet, O Lord, deal not with us after our ſins, but turn thee again, thou God of Hoſts, look down from Heaven, behold and viſit this Vine; do not abhor us for thy Name's ſake, do not diſgrace the throne of thy glory: Behold, ſee, we beſeech thee, we are all thy people; though a rebellious and ſtiff-necked generation, yet thy Name is called upon us, leave us not, neither forſake us, O God of our ſalvation; but though thou feed us with bread of adverſity, and water of affliction, yet let not our teachers be removed into a corner, but let our eyes ſtill ſee our teachers, let not Sion complain that ſhe hath

* f. retain.

hath none to lead her by the hand among all the ſons that ſhe hath brought up, but provide her ſuch ſupports in this her declining condition, that ſhe may ſtill have a ſeed and a remnant left; and in what degree ſoever thou ſhalt permit this ſtorm to increaſe upon this poor Church, be pleaſed proportionably to fortifie and confirm all thoſe, that are members of it, that no man may be ſhaken or moved with theſe afflictions, nor pervert that glorious advantage of ſuffering for thee, into an occaſion of apoſtatiſing from thee, but that we may all run with patience the race that is ſet before us, and chearfully partake of the afflictions of the Goſpel; that ſuffering for Chriſt here, we may reign with him for ever hereafter; and all this for Jeſus Chriſt his ſake our onely Lord and Saviour. *Amen.*

Another.

* bitterer.

O Thou King of Nations, who doeſt according to thy will in all the Kingdoms of the Earth, who haſt made us drink deep of that cup of trembling, and yet ſeemeſt to have * bitter dregs behind for us, we thy wretched creatures that have highly contributed to that common weight of ſin under which the Land ſinks, humbly proſtrate our ſelves at thy feet; deſiring with all ſincere contrition to confeſs that thou art righteous in all that is hitherto come upon us, all that we have yet ſuffered being but the ſad arrear of the ſins of our peace, when we waxed fat, and kicked; and that thou ſhalt likewiſe be moſt juſt in the utmoſt of thy future inflictions, which whatſoever they prove, cannot exceed the ſins of our calamitous days, who in the time of our diſtreſs have ſinned yet more againſt the Lord, who have even paſſed through the fire to Moloch, with an undaunted obſtinacy ſuffered all the flamings of thy wrath, rather than we would renounce any of our deteſtable things. Nay, as if our old were too infirm, we have made new leagues with Death, new agreements with Hell, proceeding from evil to worſe, and making every new calamity thou ſendeſt to reclaim us, the occaſion of ſome freſh impiety. And now, O Lord, wilt thou not viſit for theſe things, ſhall not thy ſoul be avenged on ſuch a Nation as this? We are they, O Lord, that have perverted all thy diſpenſations toward us, grown wanton under thy mercies, and deſperate under thy judgments, and is there yet any third method left for thoſe that have fruſtrated both theſe? Behold, O Lord, theſe deſperate, theſe gaſping patients at thy feet, who have loſt ſenſe and motion to all things but the reſiſtence of their remedy. O give us not utterly over, but continue to adminiſter to us, whatever may remove this ſtupefaction, and bring us to a feeling of our condition; and what ſharpneſs and ſeverity ſoever thou diſcerneſt neceſſary for that purpoſe, forbear not, O Lord, to give us thoſe wounds of a friend. O ſay not concerning us, why ſhould ye be ſmitten any more? But rather caſt us into the place of Dragons, and cover us with the ſhadow of death, if by ſo doing we may be brought to remember the name of the Lord our God. Lord this is the one great neceſſary wherein we are principally concerned to ſolicite thee, that our eyes may be opened, that we may ſee every man the plague of his own heart; that ſo inſtead of thoſe Atheiſtical diſputes we make of thy providence, we may all joyn in an humble adoration of thy juſtice, and confeſſing that our deſtruction is of our ſelves, abhor our ſelves, and repent in duſt and aſhes. And when by this greater deliverance thou haſt put us in capacity of a leſs, then be thou pleaſed to be jealous for thy Land, and pity thy people, and whatever other judgment we muſt groan under, Lord deliver us not up to that barbariſm and irreligion, which hath already made too great a breach in upon us. We cannot but confeſs it moſt juſt in thee to permit us, who have ſo long reſiſted the power of godlineſs, to proceed now to caſt off even the very form, and that we who would not receive the love of the truth, ſhould be given over to ſtrong deluſions, to believe lies: And this ſaddeſt effect of thy wrath hath already overtaken many among us, and doth univerſally threaten the reſt. For ſince thou haſt laid waſte the wall of thy Vineyard, what can we expect, but that it ſhould be troden down: thou haſt broken our two ſtaves, Beauty and Bands, all order and unity, the neceſſary ſupports of a Church, at once periſhing from among us. The ſolemn Feaſts are forgotten in Sion, her Elders ſit upon the ground and keep ſilence, whilſt they, whom thou haſt not ſent, run; whilſt thoſe to whom thou haſt not ſpoken, propheſie. We, O Lord, who might once have gone with the multitude to the houſe of God, are now interdicted the more private exerciſes, and celebrations of thy ſervice. This, this, O Lord, is the inſupportable part of our afflictions, the ſting of all our miſery; if we had been onely ſold for bond-men and bond-women, we could have held our peace; but thine abhorring thine Altar, and caſting off thy Sanctuary, this is for a lamentation, and muſt be for a lamentation. Thy ſervants think upon the ſtones of Sion, and it pitieth them to ſee her in the duſt: O let not all thoſe tears and prayers that are poured out for her, return empty: and becauſe thou haſt thy ſelf recommended to us the efficacy of importunity, be thou pleaſed to give us that grace, to excite and ſtir up all that make mention of the Lord, that they may give thee no reſt, till thou eſtabliſh our Jeruſalem again a praiſe in the earth. To that end, O Lord, give us Paſtours after thine own heart, ſuch Prieſts whoſe lips may preſerve knowledge, and make us diligently to ſeek the Law at their mouths; and grant that we being by this deprivation taught the value of ſuch pretious advantages, and the ſin of our former contemning them, may unanimouſly contend for the regaining them, by a cordial forſaking thoſe ſins, which have turned away theſe good things from us. Grant this, gracious Lord, for his ſake whom thou haſt ſet forth to be our propitiation Jeſus Chriſt our Lord. *Amen.*

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

A view of the ſecond part of the Objection. The periſhing of the righteous.

Sect. 1. I Now proceed to the *ſecond* and more *principal* part of the *Anſwer* (in reference to the *latter* part of the *Objection*) which on the *grounds* premiſed muſt be this, That the *improſperouſneſs* and *perſecutions*, and even *ſubverſion* and *eradication* of a *particular Church*, is no way-an evidence, nay, not ſo much as a *probable argument*, that that was *nocent*, which thus *periſheth*, but onely that they were *unworthy*, which are thus *deprived*, and that *too good* to be *enjoyed* by them.

Sect. 2. An *indication* of this the Text referred to in the propoſal of the *Objection* doth expreſly afford us; The *whole verſe* runs thus, *An Hoſt was given him againſt the daily Sacrifice by reaſon of tranſgreſſion, and it caſt down the truth to the ground, and it practiſed and proſpered.*

Sect. 3. Here indeed *tranſgreſſion* is the one *procatarctick, external impulſive cauſe*, moving *God* to give that *deſtroying Hoſt* to the *little Horn*: and to continue ſo *prodigious* a *ſucceſs*, and *proſperity* to it, and this *tranſgreſſion*, not that of the *Horn*, or *Hoſt*, (which yet oft *provokes God* even in *judgment*, to give them ſuch kind of *deſtructive proſperities*, whether to be preſently out of their *debt* (to pay *Nebuchadnezzar* that hire, which is due to him for being *inſtrumental* to ſome of *God's purpoſes*) or to allow them, like *Dives*, their *good things* in *this life*) but I ſuppoſe the *tranſgreſſion* of thoſe, againſt whom the *Hoſt proſpers*, juſt as in our caſe it is.

Sect. 4. But then ſtill it is the *daily Sacrifice*, and *the Truth*, which it is thus *impowered* to *caſt down*. The *Sacrifice* we know of *God's* own *preſcribing*, and ſuch as was an *act* of his *ſpecial favour* to that above any other *Nation*, that he ſo preſcribed it; and this *worſhip* ſo *true*, ſo *acceptable* to *God*, that as he exacted it *daily*, *loved* to have it *always before him*, came conſtantly to *meet* with them at the *ſeaſons* of *offering* it, and was *propitiated* thereby; ſo 'tis there, by way of *excellence*, and in the *abſtract*, ſtyled *truth* and *the truth* it ſelf. And this the fitteſt as for that *Hoſt* to *caſt to the ground*, ſo for thoſe *tranſgreſſours* to be *deprived* of, ſuch as for whom no *ill* thing being *too bad*, any *good thing* was too *pretious* to be *continued* to them.

Sect. 5. In like manner, when the *Temple* was kept from being *re-edified*, when the *Sanctum Sanctorum* was *prophaned*, will any man affirm that theſe *proſperities* and great *ſucceſſes*, whether of *Tobiah* and *Sanballat*, or of *Pompey*, were a *deciſion* of *God's*, a *verdict* of *Heaven* brought in againſt the *Temple*, and *Services*?

Sect. 6. If there were need of more *inſtances* to evince this, the whole *Hiſtory* of the *Turkiſh ſucceſſes* and *victories* over the *Chriſtians* would not miſs to do it, that great *Volume* would croud together, and *condenſate* into one *undeniable argument*; the *ſum* whereof is this, that *Chriſtianity* hath been foiled, and *Mahomediſm* ſet up in many hundred Cities and Regions; whereſoever that falſe *Epileptick Prophet's Banners* were diſplayed, the *Enſigns* of *truth* and *God* himſelf ὀιχονται, were preſently *baniſhed*, or put to *flight*. And yet ſure *God hath* not thus *decided* the *controverſie* againſt *Chriſtian Religion* (to which his promiſe was long ago ſealed, that the *gates of Hell ſhould never prevail againſt it*) If he have, he hath alſo yielded the *Great Sultan* the honour of his *own* throne; for to that he hath as juſt a title, that of long, peaceable *poſſeſſion*, and *preſcription*, having put it *ſucceſsfully*, and as *proſperouſly* maintained it among his *titles*, to be *King of Kings and Lord of Lords*: *God's verdict* was herein *intelligible* enough, againſt the *factions*, and *diviſions*, and *inteſtine broils* of the *Chriſtians* among themſelves, too buſily and ambitiouſly ingaged in *wars* againſt one another, to attend the *deſigns*, and *obviate* the motions of that *common* Enemy. And many other *ſins* there were that fitted them for thoſe *deprivations*.

Sect. 7. If this be not *ſufficient*, I ſhall then aſcend but *one* ſtep farther in this *argument ab exemplo*, and demand whether *Satan*, that great *Adverſary* hath not ſometimes been *proſperous* in his attempts againſt the *Church*, and true *Faith*: and whether that be not the meaning of this being [a] *looſed a little ſeaſon*, after the determining of the *thouſand years*, and his *deceiving the Nations* before the *commencing* of them, and whether in both thoſe periods of time, wherein he had his deſired *ſucceſs* in the πλάνη ἐθνων, *deceiving the Nations*, *God* have *decided* the *queſtion* for him, and given *judgment* againſt the *truth*? If ſo, then was *Simon of Samaria* no longer a *Magician*, but a *God*, and all the powers of Heaven it ſelf *ſubmitted* to him, when he prevailed with the *Emperour* to have a *Statue* ſo inſcribed to him, *Simoni ſummo Deo, to Simon the higheſt God*: and the Strumpet *Helena* transformed from the *ſtray ſheep* into the *Queen of Heaven*, when once ſhe obtained to be *adored* as his *prima* ἔννοια. And [b] then did *Arianiſm* commence *Orthodox* (and *Apoſtolical* truth become the onely *Hereſie*) when by the favour of the *Emperour Conſtantius* it triumpht through all the *Eaſt* over the *Catholick Doctrine*; it being known in *ſtory*, how upon that *Emperour's* great *proſperities* and *ſucceſſes*, particularly upon the overthrow of *Magnentius*, and joyning the *Weſtern Empire* to the *Eaſtern*, which formerly he poſſeſt, he frequently [c] boaſted, *Probatam divino calculo ſuam fidem*, That *God himſelf* by thoſe *victories* decided the controverſie on the *Arians* ſide againſt the *Fathers* of *Nice*, and determined [d] their belief to be the *true*, (which preſumption *Lucifer Calaritanus* confuted in a *Treatiſe* for that purpoſe, and entituled *De Regibus Apoſtatis*.) And then (in brief) *proſperity* is not, as the *Romaniſt* but *modeſtly* pretends, one of his many marks [e] of the *true Church*, but like *Aaron's* rod, in the midſt of thoſe of the *Magicians*, *devours*, and *ſupplies* the place of them all, neither *antiquity*, nor *purity* ſhall any longer ſignifie any thing, nor *Chriſt* himſelf, if he have ever been ſo *improſperous*, as to be *crucified*, the *Jews*, and *Judas*, and *Pilate* muſt have been in the right for *three* days, till he *conquered*, and ſo *confuted* them again at his *Reſurrection*.

[a] Rev. 20.

[b] See *Maximian's* ſpeech in *Baronius Ann.* 301. 8. confuted by thunder and lightning.

[c] *Vid.* Baron. *An.* 353. *n.* 10, 11, 12.

[d] *Niſi Catholica eſſet fides Arii, hoc eſt, mea, niſi placitum eſſet Deo quod illam perſequar fidem quam contra me ſcripſerunt apud Nicæam, nunquam profecto adhuc in imperio florerem.*

[e] *Divinæ providentiæ conſilia in bonis diſtribuendis & malis infligendis ad ſolius Papatus rationes adſtringit Cæſar noſter Soranus.* Sarpius *ſapiens Italus in Ep. Mſ. ad* Caſaub. *de* Baronio, *quam à* Dallæo *tranſcriptam* Smithæus *mihi communicavit.*

Sect. 8. These few I suppose may serve for some competent *Topicks* of reasoning, to repell all the force of this Objection, though if there could be need of it, the whole *Christian Religion* it self, which bears the *Cross* for its *Standard*, and hath no assurance of *conquest*, but by *constancy* in *suffering*, and gives us no *promise* of this life, but *cum mixtura crucis*, with the *exception*, or *mixture of the Cross*, would abundantly demonstrate such *Objections* as this to be perfectly *unchristian*.

CHAP. IV.

A second Objection answered. Where is now the Protestant English Church?

Sect. 1. THe next *Objection* is prepared and aimed against us from another coast, and will be, most for their *advantage*, put into this short question [*Where is now your Protestant English Church*] when your *Church doors*, and even *Parlors* themselves are shut up against those of you, which are the *ancient* remaining *Bishops*, and *Presbyters* of the *Church* of *England*, *Officers* regularly *entred* into, and *continuing* in that *Function*.

Sect. 2. To this (not to examine the *truth* of the *suggestion*, which I suppose to *fail* in many *respects*) the *answer* will be the same, as if the *Heathens* should ask, as once they are supposed to have askt the *Psalmist*, in a state of the like *captivity*, [*Where is now your God*] *viz.* that as our *God*, so our *Church* is now, where it was before, e'er this *interdict* came out against us.

Sect. 3. Or if it may tend to the *satisfaction* of any that I should a little *inlarge* on this *theme* also, I shall then as before first demand, where the *Church* of the *Israelites* was, when the *people* were *carried* into *Assyria* or *Chaldea*; were they not then removed as far from their own *solemn* place of *worship*, the *Temple* at *Jerusalem*, and from all their numerous *Synagogues* erected in *Palestine*, and that by the very same means, (a *visible force*) by which we are discharged from the *Publick*, and even more *private* exercise of our *functions*? and consequently was not the lot of that *people* the same with the worst, which can be suggested, or affirmed of ours, *viz.* to be *sheep* kept out of their *pastures* upon the *interdicting* of their *shepherds*?

Sect. 4. Secondly, Whether in the most *prosperous* times of *Arianism* when the *Catholick Bishops* were driven out of their *Churches*, banished out of *Constantius's dominions*, and forced to fly to the *West*, as to a *hiding place*, a *refuge* from those sad *Calamities*, it be by the *Objecters* imagined, that there was no *Catholick* or *Orthodox Church* in those regions, wherein the *Arian Emperour* thus persecuted the truth?

Sect. 5. Thirdly, Whether in the time of *Anastasius* the *Emperour*, who was an *Eutychian Heretick*, and a bitter *enemy*, and persecutor of the *Orthodox*, through the *whole Eastern Empire*, the *Goths* and *Vandals*, *Arian Princes*, mean while *domineering* in *Italy*, *Spain* and *Africk*, and *Pagan Kings* bearing *rule* in *France*, *England* and *Germany*: Whether, I say, in this space there were not yet an *Orthodox Church* remaining, though *persecuted*, in all those *places*, or whether there were at *that* time any part of the *Church* which enjoyed the ἀυδία, *exempt* from that *black* persecuted *condition*? Much might be added of the *particular state* of the *African Church* under the *Vandals*, out of *Victor Uticensis*, but the Argument is too *copious*.

Sect. 6. Fourthly, whether when the *Othoman race of Mahometan Emperours* subdued so great a part not onely of *Asia*, but *Europe* also, and therein so many eminent *Christian Churches*, setting up *Mahomedism* for the *publick worship*, yet permitting *Christians* to live, though but as under *Saws* and *Harrows* and *Axes of Iron*, instead of utterly depopulating their *Cities*, it can with truth be suggested, that these *Christian Churches* were all destroyed? I speak not of *later* times, wherein some liberty of *Assemblies* is at a dear rate *sold* to them: But before they came to purchase, or find so much *mercy* at their *conquerours* hands, whilst all *exercise* of *Christian* Religion was under close *interdicts*, all their *Churches* filled with their false *worshippers*; yet even then hath not this sad *captivity* been deemed sufficient to *unchurch* all the *Christians* under those proud *Tyrants* dominions.

Sect. 7. Lastly, What will these *Disputers* pretend, as to the *Romanists* themselves, who have continued for some years in this *Kingdom* without *publick assemblies*, and acknowledge willingly, I suppose, that their state hath been all this while a state of *persecution*, that no *Priest* of theirs is allow'd to *celebrate Mass* among them, that they can have no *Bishop* or *Ordinary* residing here, and (as is supposable at least) do not all receive *influence* either *immediately* or *mediately* from their *Supreme Bishop*? Will not their *union* with the *Catholick Church* over the World, and their *sincere* desire to enjoy the *liberty* of *Assemblies*, *&c.* preserve them within the *bosome* of the *Church*, though they do not enjoy these *felicities*?

Sect. 8. 'Tis vain to pay any larger, or more solemn *attendance* to this *Objection*, to which I have[a] elsewhere spoken more punctually, and do now onely suppose, that all that hath since been added to our *pressures* hath infused no *fresh virtue* into the *Arguments*.

[a] *Tr. of Schism. Ch.* 11.

Sect. 9. The truth is, these and the like ways of their *demurest* arguings, or *suggestions* at this time, are but acts of diligent *observers* of *opportunity*, which think to gain more by the *seasonable* application, by addressing their *Fumes*, or *Medicaments*, *tempore congruo*, when the *pores* are *open*, or the body in any special manner *receptive*, than by the *intrinsick* virtue, or *energy* of them.

Sect. 10. The *Argument I suppose*, the very same, which *threescore* years since was frequently prest against us of this *Nation*, that ever since our *departure* from the *Romish yoke* we have ceased to be a *Church*; onely now the *darkness* of our present condition makes them hope that their *Sophistry* shall uot be so easily *seen* through, as formerly it hath been, and that either we shall he found less *diligent* or less *dextrous* to defend a *persecuted* profession, or else more *inclinable* to part with it.

Sect. 11.

Sect. 11. It is meet therefore we ſhould be *inſtructed* by them, and learn *warineſs* from their *wiles*, and as *Antidotes* and *Prophylactick* methods, which are at all times of like power and *virtue*, are yet moſt *neceſſary* to be produced in time of a *general diſtemper*, ſo I ſuppoſe a more particular diſcourſe on this matter, though it will not now have more real force, or conſequently hope for better *ſucceſs* upon thoſe that are *imperſwaſible*, than formerly it had, may yet be more *ſeaſonable* to the wants of ſome *weak ſeductible* members of our perſecuted *communion*, in tenderneſs to whom it may not be amiſs more diſtinctly to conſider the *argument* it ſelf, that was now onely to be new *dreſt*, and *furbiſhed*, and receive ſome *aid* from the condition of our *preſent* preſſures, and to begin with examining, what, and how many things there are, which may by the *Diſputers* be thought ſufficient to *unchurch*, or *deſtroy* any *particular Church*.

Sect. 12. And I ſuppoſe them reducible to theſe *four*: *Apoſtaſie*; 2. *Hereſie*; 3. *Schiſm*: 4. *Conſumption* and utter *vaſtation*.

Sect. 13. For the *Firſt*, that of *Apoſtaſie*, or *renouncing* the whole *Faith* of *Chriſt*, I hope of that we ſhall not be deemed guilty, who are by our greateſt enemies acknowledged to retain many branches of that *Faith, which was once delivered to the Saints.*

Sect. 14. For the *Fourth*, that of *utter conſumption*, it can as little be pretended, as long as ſo many *Biſhops, Presbyters*, and duly *baptized Chriſtians* among us remain *alive*, and conſtant to their *firſt faith.*

Sect. 15. For the *Third*, that of *Schiſm*, the *Fathers* which aggravated the ſin of it to the *higheſt*, do not yet allow it the force of *unchurching*, but call them *brethren*, i. e. *fellow Chriſtians*, which were moſt obſtinately *guilty* of it: But howſoever it be, of that I have in a *diſcourſe* on that ſubject, and in a firſt and ſecond *defence* of that *diſcourſe* ſaid as much as yet appears *neceſſary* to be pleaded in *defence* of our *Church.*

Sect. 16. There remains then onely the *ſecond*, that of *Hereſie*, to which alſo ſome *preparative matter* hath been laid down in the *Tract of Fundamentals*, but not in ſo *particular* a relation to the *preſent queſtion*, as will excuſe the Reader from all *addition* of trouble at this time.

Sect. 17. I ſhall therefore on this account, and to *perfect* the *anſwer* to the preſent *objection*, tranſgreſs the bounds of my firſt *deſign*, and inlarge a while upon this *inquiry*, What may be defined the *Formalis ratio*, wherein *hereſie*, properly ſo called, muſt neceſſarily conſiſt, and without which no perſon or *Church* can juſtly be deemed guilty of that *dangerous* ſin, that piece of *carnality.*

CHAP. V.

Of the nature of Hereſie. Our Church ſecured from the guilt of it.

SECT. I.

The uſe of the word in Scripture.

1. AND firſt to prevent *miſtakes*, which may ariſe from the *ambiguity* of the *word* αἵρεσις, even in *Scripture* it ſelf; It is certain that this is ſometimes uſed more looſely in an *indifferent* ſenſe, for any conſiderable *diſtinction* betwixt men of the *ſame* profeſſion, as when ſeveral *Schools* of *Philoſophers*, and the courſes they took in them, are [a] called αἱρέσεις καὶ ἀγωγαὶ their *Hereſies* and ways of *diſcipline*, eſpecially when any [b] *great number* of men of ſuch or ſuch a *denomination*, do hold and keep together in *maintenance* of ſuch a way.

[a] Ἰππόσ[ο]θ· ἕνεκά φησιν αἱρέσεις τῶν φιλοσόφων καὶ ἀγωγὰς, πρώτῳ μαχαιρικῷ —— *Phavorin.* p. 74. l. 14.

[b] Ἡ δέξα πλειόνων ἀνθρώπων πρὸς ἀλλήλους μὲν συμφωνούντων πρὸς ἄλλους δὲ διαφερόντων, ἢ αἵρεσις δέη. *Phavor.* ibid.

2. Thus when the *Sadducees* were indeed the moſt eminent *falſe* teachers in the *Jewiſh* Church, yet not onely their *falſe* doctrine is ſtyled αἵρεσις their *hereſie*, *Acts* 15. 17. but even that of the *Phariſees*, *Acts* 15. 5. and that by Saint *Paul*, even when he looks on it ὡς ἀκριβεστάτην, *as the ſtricteſt*, and *moſt exact Sect* of the *Jewiſh Religion*, *Acts* 26. 5.

3. And thus I ſuppoſe *Chriſtianity* is called by the *Jews* at *Rome*, *Acts* 28. 22. *This hereſie*, without any evil *character* ſet upon it, as into which they deſired then to make *inquiry*, and be *inſtructed*, knowing no more of it at preſent, than by the *partial* and paſſionate *rumours* of men, by which they paſt no *judgment* of it, but onely ſaid *that it was every where ſpoken againſt.*

4. But of this notion of the word we do not now ſpeak; If we did, it is viſible that the ſtyle would belong to the *way* of the *Romaniſts*, were they never ſo purely *orthodox*, as well as to any other ſort of either *true* or *erroneous Chriſtians*, the conſideration of the *verity* or *falſity* of the *doctrines* being no ingredient in this uſage any more than in the *origination* of that word.

5. But the *Scripture* more frequently uſeth the word in an *ill* ſenſe, with connotation of ſome *Fault* either really inherent, or by them that uſe the word *thought* chargeable on that *way*, which they expreſs by it.

6. Thus *Acts*, 24. 5. in *Tertullian*'s ſpeech, the αἵρεσις *Hereſie* of the *Nazarenes* is lookt on as an *erroneous*, dangerous, puniſhable way, and ſo *v.* 14. in *Paul*'s reſuming of the accuſation, where he acknowledges himſelf guilty of *that which they* thus *called Hereſie*, *i. e.* deemed to be ſuch.

7. Thus in the *Epiſtles* it conſtantly ſignifies *infuſions* of *ill*; ſometimes *diviſions* and breaches of *Charity* and *Chriſtian Communion*, as 1 *Cor.* 11. 19. where αἱρέσεις *Hereſies* are but the *interpretation* of σχίσματα,

Schiſms or *Practices*, verſe 18. and ſo *Gal.* 5. 20. where in the midſt of *uncharitable* breaches, *hatred*, *variance*, *emulations*, *wraths*, *ſtrifes*, *ſeditions*, before, and *envyings*, *murther* after, αἱρέσεις, *Hereſies* are incloſed, and ſo muſt receive their *Tincture* from the *Society*, wherein they are found, and ſo denote *Schiſmatical diviſions* peculiarly, in a very ill ſenſe indeed, as unqueſtionable *works of the fleſh*, verſe 19. yet not preciſely thoſe, that *now* we are to treat of, but, as *Hereſie* and *Schiſm* are ſometimes *promiſcuouſly* uſed the one for the other.

8. As for the ſtrict, *ſeparate* notion of the word, wherein it hath from the *Apoſtles* times come to ours, and is generally underſtood among men, that ſtill remains to be fetcht from one *ſingular* uſe of it, 2 *Pet.* 2. 1. whereof the *falſe Teachers* among the *Chriſtians* bearing, ſaith he, a proportion with the *falſe Prophets* among the *Jews* (thoſe two words διδάσκαλοι and προφῆται, *Teachers* and *Prophets* without any connotation of *predicting future events*, ſignifying in ſacred *dialect* one and the ſame thing; and ſo likewiſe *falſe Teachers* and *falſe Prophets*) he foretells them παρεισάξουσιν αἱρέσεις ἀπωλείας, *that they ſhall bring in*, either by the bye, or (as παρὰ oft ſignifies) in *contrariety* to *ſound Doctrine*, *Hereſies of deſtruction*, or *deſtructive ruinous Hereſies*, *deſtructive* of that *foundation* laid by the *Apoſtles*; for ſuch the *Doctrines* appear to be of which he there ſpeaks, being the *denial* of the *great Article* of our *belief* concerning our *Redeemer*, and ſuch the *Gnoſtick Hereſie* is confeſt to be, which is evidently there ſpoken of by Saint *Peter*.

9. That all *Hereſies* ſhould be equally *deſtructive* with this, we have no *indications* from that Text, nay ſeveral *inhaunſing circumſtances* are there *diſcernible* (if now that were any part of the *inquiry*) which may juſtly make a *difference* gradual both in reſpect of *turpitude* and *danger* betwixt that there ſpecified, and ſundry other *Hereſies*. Thus much onely muſt be thence concluded, that all the *Hereſies* that can be deemed *proportionable* or *parallel* to that *Character*, which, in that ſingular place, the *Scripture* gives us of αἱρέσεις, are *doctrinal breaches* or *ſeparations* from the faith as that ſignifies the *true Chriſtian doctrine*, by *Chriſt* or his *inſpired* and *impowered ſervants*, the *Apoſtles*, *once* or at *once delivered to the Saints*. Αἵρεσις ἐστὶ περὶ πίστως ἀπ ἀλλοῖας δόξα, *Hereſie is an untrue or falſe opinion* or *doctrine concerning the Faith*, was duly and fully reſolved by *Phavorinus*, meaning by περὶ πίστως any part of the *Faith* truly ſo called, the *difference* betwixt *Hereſie* on one ſide, and *Infidelity* or *Apoſtaſie* on the other ſide, being viſibly *this*, that the *two* latter are the *denying* or renouncing the *whole Faith* of *Chriſt*, but the *former* of any *ſingle part* of it.

SECT. II.

Of matter of Faith.

1. HErein then the *definition* of *Hereſie* (in our preſent notion) being completed, *viz.* in its *oppoſition* to the *faith* of *Chriſt* in any *one* or *more* branches of it, and the *diſpoſition* of the perſon guilty thereof, being but *extrinſecal* to the *nature* of the thing it ſelf (as whether it be cauſed barely by *ignorance*, or whether it have in it ſome mixture of *obſtinacy*, *pride*, or any other kind of *carnality*, whether it be onely in the *heart*, contrary to *believing* with that, or elſe proceed farther to *profeſſion* with the *tongue*, as *Faith* alſo doth, *Rom.* 10. 10.) theſe, I ſay, and the like being *preſcinded*, and taken off from our preſent inquiry, as they muſt be from the examination of the *Formalis ratio* of every other ſin (which being once found out what formally it is, is allowed to be capable of many *aggravating* or *extenuating* circumſtances, and *degrees*, without *varying* of the *Species*) All that can now remain to be eſtabliſht in this *firſt* part of the *inquiry*, is, to diſcern how far the *faith* of *Chriſt* may duly be extended, to what *ſorts* of things it can properly belong, that ſo by the law of *Contraries* we may ſafely conclude, to what ſorts of *errours* it is, that the word *Hereſie* is to be extended.

2. And 1. we muſt diſtinguiſh between matters of *Faith* and *rites* or *practices* or *cuſtomes* of all, or any of the *Apoſtles*; For theſe latter being *prudentially* deſigned to ſome *perſons* at ſome times, for ſome particular, *occaſional*, and thoſe *mutable* ends, as they are not founded in any *univerſal precept*, or *doctrine* of *Chriſt*, ſo neither are they *obliging* to all *future* times, but onely ſo far as they that ſo *ordered*, did *deſign* them.

3. Thus we know the *Canon* of the *Apoſtles*, and the *Church* aſſembled at *Jeruſalem*, concerning things *ſtrangled* and things *offered to Idols*, Acts 15. are promulgate to the *Gentiles* at that time of *Antioch*, *Syria* and *Cilicia*, from whom the occaſion of that *Council* and *Canon* was taken; but when they paſs farther, they *promulgate* them not, as appears by 1 *Cor.* 8. 9. where, in that of *Idolothyta* he acknowledges the *Corinthians* liberty not retrenched, ſave onely in caſe of *ſcandal*.

[c] *An.* 51. *n.* 58. 4. And [c] *Baronius* extends this *obſervation* to the *Theſſalonians* alſo (though the evidence be not ſo *convincing*) upon force of that Text, 1 *Theſſ.* 4. 2, 3. where repeating what *Commandments he had given them by the Lord Jeſus*, he ſpecifies onely *ut abſtineatis à fornicatione*, *that ye abſtain from fornication*, without any mention of the *other* parts of the *Canon*.

5. But without relying on ſuch *arguments* as this laſt of his (*negative*, and ſo *unconcludent*) ſuch *ordinances* as theſe, accommodated to particular *times*, and *places*, and *perſons*, are in the nature of them, *temporary* and *variable*, nay, not always the *ſame* at the *ſame* time. The *Church* ſtories give us little reaſon to doubt, but the controverſie concerning the time of keeping *Eaſter*, which at laſt brake out into ſuch a *tempeſt* in the *Church*, had its original in the *different traditions* of the *Apoſtles*, Saint *John* and Saint *Philip* produced by *Polycrates* for the *Aſiatick*, as Saint *Peter* and others by *Victor* for the *other* ſide.

6. And from thence as *Polycarp* and *Anicetus*, though each reſolutely adhering to their ſeveral ways, did yet *communicate* one with another (as *Irenæus* tells *Victor* in his *Epiſtle* to him, concerning this matter) ſo 'tis evident that ſuch *ritual* differences diſturb not the *faith*, nor infer *Hereſie* on either ſide; The

[d] *Epiſt. ex Reg. l.* 1. *Indict.* 9. *Ep.* 41. words of [d] *Pope Gregory* the firſt are expreſs for it, *In una fide nihil officit ſanctæ Eccleſiæ conſuetudo diverſa*, *Difference of cuſtoms is reconcileable with the unity of Faith*, and no *detriment* comes to *holy Church by this difference*. This might be much more largely evinced, if there were need of it.

7. *Firſt*

7. *First* then, confining our ſelves to the *Faith* onely, It's granted on all hands, that by *Faith* here is meant the *Object* or matter of a *Chriſtian's belief*; not the *belief* it ſelf: ſo it is viſibly uſed in that eminent place of *Jude* 3. ἡ πίστις παραδοθεῖσα, *the faith delivered to the Saints*, i. e. the particular *doctrines* which all togegether made up the *Saints belief*.

8. *Secondly*, that this *object* of *belief* is nothing but the *revealed doctrine* of *God*, actually propoſed by him, and preached to men, on purpoſe that they that have ſo much *reverence* to *God*, and confidence of his *veracity*, that they queſtion not the truth of any of his *affirmations*, may by *faith* receive, and *believe*, and *act* according to them.

9. For this *belief* being a duty of the *firſt Commandment*, and ſo as all other parts of *divine worſhip* terminated *ultimately* in *God* (or elſe it is not *divine*, but at the moſt but *humane faith*) as it truly comprehends all that is, or ſhall ever be thus conveyed to us by *divine revelation*; ſo can it not be any farther extended, ſo as to compriſe thoſe things, even of *God*, which are *unrevealed*.

10. Many *verities* no doubt there are in *God's* ſecret *Cabinet*, which though moſt *true* in themſelves, and moſt worthy of *belief*, in caſe they were *revealed* to us, yet are never like to come out from under that *veil*, and ſo can never be *Objects* of our *belief*.

11. *Thirdly*, that even of thoſe things that have at any time been *revealed*, all are not *incumbent* on us, ſo as to lay *obligation* on every man to comprehend, or *believe* them; many paſſages of *Holy* Writ, though, when they are propoſed to us *convincingly* as ſuch, they may not be *diſ-believed*, may yet ſafely be *unobſerved*, or not *underſtood*, or eſcape out of our memory. Ἡ πίστις παραδοθεῖσα, *The Faith* by way of *emphaſis* and *excellence*, *that was once delivered to the Saints*, and ought by all ſuch to be *contended* for, is that which was ſet out by *Chriſt*, or his *Apoſtles* from him, to be by all men *believed* to their *righteouſneſs*, and *confeſt to their ſalvation*. Rom. 10. 10.

SECT. III.

The two ways of conveying the Faith to us.

1. THis then being the *adequate object* of the *Chriſtian's Faith*, thoſe *verities* which have been *revealed* to us by God to be thus *believed* to *righteouſneſs*, called therefore ὑγιαίνοντες λόγοι, *words* not onely *true*, but *wholſome*; the *belief* whereof is required in order to our *ſoul's health*: the next *inquiry* is, how we that live in the ſame *diſtance* from *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles* in reſpect of *time*, that we are *ſituate* from *heaven*, which now *contains Chriſt*, in reſpect of *place*, may come within any reach of theſe *revelations* of *Chriſt*, or to any competent undoubted *aſſurance*, that thoſe are ſuch indeed, which are *pretended* to be ſo. 1 Tim. 6. 3.

2. And to this alſo my *conceſſion* ſhall be as *liberal* as any *Romaniſt* can wiſh, that there are [c] *two* ways of *conveying* ſuch *revelations* to us; one in *writing*, the other by *oral tradition*; the former in the *Goſpels* and other *writings* of the *Apoſtles*, &c. which makes up the *ſacred* Writ, or *Canon* of the *New Teſtament*; the latter in the *Apoſtles preachings* to all the *Churches* of their *plantations*, which are no where ſet down for us in the *ſacred Writ*, but conſerved as [f] *Depoſita* by them to whom they were *intruſted*.

[c] Basil. *de Spir. Sanct.* c. 27. Τῶν ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ πεφυλαγμένων δογμάτων καὶ κηρυγμάτων, τὰ μὲν ἐκ τῆς ἐγγράφου διδασκαλίας ἔχομεν, τὰ δὲ ἐκ τῆς τοῦ Ἀποστόλου παραδόσεως διαδοθέντα ἡμῖν ἐν μυστηρίῳ. [f] 1 Tim. 6. 20. 2 Tim. 1. 14.

3. And although in ſundry reſpects the *former* of theſe be much the [g] more *faithfull*, *ſteady* way of conveyance, and for want thereof many things may poſſibly have *periſhed*, or been changed by their paſſage through many hands, thus much being on theſe grounds confeſt by *Bellarmine* himſelf, that [h] *The Scripture is the moſt certain and ſafe rule of belief*; yet there being no leſs *veracity* in the *tongues*, than the *hands*, in the *preachings*, than the *writings* of the *Apoſtles*; nay, *Prior ſermo quam liber, prior ſenſus quam ſtylus*, ſaith [i] *Tertullian*, the *Apoſtles preacht* before they *writ*, *planted Churches* before they addreſt *Epiſtles* to them: On theſe grounds I make no ſcruple to grant, that *Apoſtolical traditions*, ſuch as are *truly* ſo, as well as *Apoſtolical writings*, are [k] *equally* the *matter of that Chriſtian's belief*, who is equally ſecured by the *fidelity* of the *conveyance*, that as *one* is *Apoſtolical writing*, ſo the other is *Apoſtolical tradition*.

[g] ὅτι πέφυκαν ἀπιστίαις εἶναι ὀφθαλμῶν. Palladius Laufiac. *Hiſt.* p. 966. B.

[h] *S. Scrip. regulam credendi certiſſimam tutiſſimámque eſſe. De verbo Dei, lib.* 1. *cap.* 2.

[i] *De teſtim. an.* c. 5.

[k] Ἀμφότερα δὲ αὐτὼ ἰσόν ἔχει πρὸς τὴν εὐσέβειαν, καὶ τοῦτο ἁδεὶς ἀντερεῖ, ὅστις κἂν κατὰ μικρὸν γεύσεται θεσμῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν πεποίηται. Basil. *de Spir. Sanct.* c. 27.

SECT. IV.

The teſtimony from which we receive the Faith.

1. NExt then the *inquiry* muſt proceed by *examining* what is this *equal* way of *conveyance*, *common* to both theſe, upon ſtrength of which we become *obliged* to receive ſuch or ſuch a *Tradition* for *Apoſtolical*.

2. And this again is acknowledged not to be any *Divine Teſtimony*; For *God* hath no where affirmed in *Divine Writ*, that the *Epiſtle*, inſcribed of *Paul the Apoſtle to the Romans*, conſiſting of ſo many *periods* as now it is in our *Bibles*, was ever written by that *Apoſtle*, nor are there any inward *Characters* or *Signatures*, or *beams* of *light* in the writing it ſelf, that can be *admitted*, or pretended for *teſtimonies* of this, any more than

than the like may exact to be *admitted* as *witneſſes*, that the *Creed* called the *Apoſtles*, was indeed, in the full *ſenſe* of it, *delivered* to the *Churches*.

3. It remains then, that herein on both ſides we reſt content with *humane teſtimonies* of *undoubted authority*, or ſuch as there is not any *rational* motive to diſtruſt, and of which *alone* the matter is capable. For as in caſe of *queſtion* concerning the *Epiſtle* to the *Romans*, whether this be it, which was addreſt by Saint *Paul* to that *Church*, the onely regular way of ſatisfying the *queſtion*, is 1. By *devolution* or *appeal* to the *authority* of thoſe *Fathers* and *Councils*, to whom it was *de facto* ſufficiently teſtified, and approved (*viz.* by examination of the *Records* of that *Church* to whom it was written, and by whom received, through the hands of ſome truſty *meſſenger* of that *Apoſtle*, ſuch as *Phebe* that *miniſtred* unto him, and by other *creditable* ways of confirmation) and Secondly, and by that conſequence, to thoſe very *original records* and proofs of *undoubted* fidelity: So the way of *trial* of any *tradition*, pretended to be *Apoſtolical*, whether it be ſuch or no, is by devolving it to thoſe ſame, or the *like Fathers*, and *Councils*, which having occaſion and commodity to examine the truth of the matter by the *Records* or *Teſtimonies* of thoſe *Churches*, to which it was delivered, found it ſufficiently *teſtified* by them, that it was in truth according as is pretended.

4. And from hence it follows, that as we of this age have no other way of judging of the *Canon* of *Scripture*, or of any *Book*, or *Chapter*, or *Period* contained in it, but by the *affirmation* and *authority* of thoſe *teſtifiers* in the *firſt* ages of the *Church*, either by their *writings*, or by the unqueſtioned *relations* of others, brought down and made known to us; ſo are we as unable to judge of *Apoſtolical traditions unwritten*, whether this or that *doctrine* be ſuch or no, unleſs it be thus by the undoubted *affirmations* of the *ancients* (who are preſumable by their *antiquity* to know the truth, and by their *uniform* conſent, neither to *miſtake* themſelves, nor to *deceive* us) *communicated* and *conveyed* to us.

5. 'Tis not poſſible for any man or men of the greateſt underſtandings or integrity, to ſee or know what is not done within the reach of their *faculties*, unleſs either they be *inſpired* by God, or otherwiſe informed either *mediately* or *immediately* from thoſe, who had really knowledge of it. *Stories* of former times are not wont to be written by the ſtrength of mens natural parts, *invention*, or *judgment*, but onely by conſulting of thoſe *Records*, either *dead* or *living*, by whoſe help ſuch matters of *fact* have been *preſerved*. Every thing elſe is but *conjecture*, and that very *uncertain*, the utmoſt *probability* in ſuch matters being little worth, that being oft-times done which really was (and much more to us, who know not the *motives* of *actions* far *removed* from us, is) of all things *leaſt probable* to have been done. Onely a *creditable* witneſs, ſuch as no prudent man hath reaſon to *diſtruſt* either as *neſcient* or *falſe*, is worth conſidering, or able to *found* belief in this matter.

SECT. V.

The qualifications of ſuch Teſtimonies.

1. NOW then comes the *upſhot* of the *inquiry*, what *qualifications* there are of a *teſtimony*, or *teſtifier*, without which, it or he may not be thus deemed *creditable*, or ἀξιόπιστον, *worthy to be believed* by a *ſober Chriſtian*: and where theſe *qualifications* are to be found: which when we have once reſolved, it will alſo be poſſible for us to paſs ſome judgment of *Traditions* duly ſtyled *Apoſtolical*, which as ſuch muſt be allowed to be the *object* of our *Faith*.

2. And herein I ſhall hope alſo that the *reſolution* will be *unqueſtionable*, if it be bounded by thoſe *three* terms to which [1] *Vincentius Lirinenſis* in his *defence* of the *Catholick Faith* againſt *Hereſies* and *innovations* hath directed us, *Univerſitas*, *Antiquitas*, *Conſenſio*, *Univerſality*, *Antiquity*, *Conſent*, *viz.* That the *Teſtimony*, we depend on, be the reſult of *all*, the *ancients*, *conſenting*, or without any conſiderable *diſſent*. Or, in yet fewer words, a *Catholick Teſtimony*, *truly ſuch*, i. e. *univerſal* in all reſpects; 1. Of *Place*, 2. Of *Time*, 3. Of *Perſons*.

[1] *Cont. Hær. c. 3.*

3. For *firſt*, If it be not *teſtified* from all places, it is not *qualified* for our *belief*, as *Catholick* in reſpect of *place*, becauſe the *Faith* being *one*, and the *ſame*, and by all and every of the *Apoſtles* preached, and *depoſited* in *all* their plantations, what was ever really thus taught, by *any* of them in any *Church*, will alſo be found to have been taught, and received in *all* other *Apoſtolical Churches*.

4. To which purpoſe the words of *Irenæus* are expreſs, *lib.* 1. *cap.* 3. [m] *The Church diſſeminated over all the world, having received this preaching and this Faith, preſerves it diligently, as the inhabitants of the ſame houſe, believe them alike, as having the ſame ſoul and heart, and teach and preach and deliver them alike, as having the ſame mouth, for though their languages are unlike, the virtue of Tradition is one and the ſame, and neither do the Churches which are founded in Germany believe or deliver otherwiſe than thoſe which were conſtituted in Spain, in France, in the Orient, in Egypt, in Africk, in the middle of the world, but as one and the ſame Sun ſhines through the whole world, ſo doth the light and preaching of the truth in every place, where it is received, diſperſe it ſelf.*

[m] *Hanc prædicationem cum acceperit & hanc fidem Eccleſia, & quidem in univerſum mundum diſſeminata, diligenter cuſtodit quaſi unam domum inhabitans, & ſimiliter credit his quaſi unam animam habens, & unum cor, & conſonanter hæc prædicat & docet & tradit, quaſi unum poſſidens os. Nam etſi in mundo loquelæ diſſimiles ſunt, ſed tamen virtus traditionis una eſt & eadem———*

5. So [n] alſo *Tertullian de Præſcript. c.* 20. *Preſently therefore the Apoſtles having firſt in Judæa teſtified the Faith and inſtituted Churches, and then taken their journey over all the world, made known to the Nations the ſame doctrine of the ſame Faith, and ſo planted Churches in every City, from which the reſt of the Churches afterward borrowed their ſeeds of Faith and Doctrine, and ſo daily continue to doe and are formed into Churches.*

[n] *Statim igitur Apoſtoli——primum per Judæam conteſtatâ fide in Jeſum Chriſtum, & Eccleſiis inſtitutis, dehinc in orbem profecti, eandem doctrinam ejuſdem fidei nationibus promulgaverunt, & proindè Eccleſias apud unamquamque civitatem condiderunt, à quibus traducem fidei, & ſemina doctrinæ cæteræ deinde Eccleſiæ mutuatæ ſunt, & quotidiè mutuantur ut Eccleſiæ fiant.*

6. From

6. From which *premiſſes* his *concluſion* is juſt that, which I here *deduce*; ° *If ſo, then 'tis evident that every doctrine muſt be deemed true which conſpires with the Apoſtolical Churches, which are the wombs and Originals whence the Faith came out, as maintaining that without any queſtion, which the Churches received from the Apoſtles, the Apoſtles from Chriſt, and Chriſt from God: and that all other doctrine is under the prejudice of being falſe, which is contrary to the truth of the Churches of the Apoſtles, of Chriſt, and of God.*

° *Si hæc ita ſint, conſtat proinde omnem doctrinam quæ cum illis Eccleſiis Apoſtolicis matricibus & originalibus fidei conſpiret, veritati deputandam, id ſine dubio tenentem quod Eccleſiæ ab Apoſtolis, Apoſtoli à Chriſto, Chriſtus à Deo ſuſcepit; reliquam autem omnem doctrinam de mendacio præjudicandam quæ ſapiat contra veritatem Eccleſiarum, & Apoſtolorum, & Chriſti, & Dei.* Ibid.

7. 'Tis true indeed that whatſoever one *Church* profeſſeth to have received from the *Apoſtle* that planted it, is of it ſelf ſufficient, without the *confirmation* of all others, to beget and *eſtabliſh belief* in him, to whom it thus teſtifies: whereupon P *Tertullian* refers the inquirer to that *Apoſtolick Church* that is *next* him, be it *Corinth, if he live in Achaia, Philippi or Theſſalonica, if in Macedonia, Epheſus, if in Aſia, or if he be near Italy, Rome.* But this is no farther to be extended, than while we *ſuppoſe* without *inquiry*, that other *Apoſtolical Churches* have *received*, and are ready to *teſtifie*, the ſame; which *preſumption*, or *ſuppoſal* muſt then ceaſe, when upon *inquiry* we find the *contrary*; there being then none of this firſt kind of univerſality, *viz.* of *place*, and ſo far, no *validity* in the *Teſtification.*

P *Age jam qui voles curioſitatem melius exercere in negotio ſalutis tuæ, percurre Eccleſias Apoſtolicas; proxima eſt tibi Achaia? habes Corinthum; Si non longè es à Macedonia, habes Philippos, habes Theſſalonicenſes; ſi potes in Aſiam tendere, habes Epheſum; ſi tamen Italiæ adjaces, habes Romanam.* De Præſcrip. cap. 36.

8. *Secondly*, for the *univerſality* of *time*, that muſt be *cautiouſly* underſtood; not ſo as to ſignifie it a prejudice to any *doctrine*, if in ſome one or more ages it have not been *univerſally* received; for then there could be no *Hereticks* at any time in the *world*: but ſo as to extend to the *firſt* and *pureſt*, and not onely to the *latter* ages of the *Church.*

9. That which was delivered by the *Apoſtles* was certainly *received* in that *firſt* age, wherein they *lived*; and by carefull inquiry will be found from their *monuments* to have been then among them. And that which by this *trial* is diſcerned to be of later date, not to be deſcried in the *firſt* times, nor *teſtified* by ſufficient *authority* to be derived from thence, falls ſhort again of this *ſecond* part of *univerſality* in reſpect of time.

10. *Thirdly*, for the *conſent* of *Teſtifiers*, that is alſo neceſſary to the rendring it a *Catholick* and *authentick teſtimony*; any conſiderable number of *diſſenters* being of *neceſſity* to weaken our *belief*, and infuſe reaſons of *doubting*, and a *preponderancy* of *diſſenters* the other way, to weigh down (at leaſt to *incline*) the *belief* to the *contrary.*

SECT. VI.

Where theſe qualifications may be found. Of the conſent of ancient Doctours, and definitions of Councils truly general.

1. THis therefore being thus *eſtabliſht*, and the *conjunction* of all the *three ſorts* of *univerſality* being in all reaſon required to the *authentick teſtifying* of *tradition*; It is ſoon defined, where theſe *qualifications* are to be lookt for, and where they may be found.

2. Queſtionleſs not in any *one Biſhop*, or *ſucceſſion* of *Biſhops* in any *See* for many latter *ages*, not including the *Apoſtles*; for whatever his pretenſions may be to *authority* and *Supremacy* over all other *Churches*, this can never convert a *particular* whether *Man* or *Church*, into the *Univerſal*, nor make his *Teſtimony* authentick according to thoſe *rational* and *Chriſtian* Rules, which we have learn'd from *Lirinenſis.*

3. There are many *Apoſtolick Churches* beſide that of *Rome*: Great difference of *Rome* in theſe *latter* ages from the *Primitive Apoſtolick Rome*, to which the *Depoſitum* was intruſted. And there are many *diſſenters* to be found, who have always lived and flouriſhed in the *Catholick Church*, which never acknowledged thoſe doctrines to be *delivered* to them by the *Apoſtles*, which the *Church* of *Rome* hath of late aſſumed to be ſuch. And for any privilege annexed to that *Biſhop*'s Chair, or to that *ſociety* of men, which live in *external communion* with him, that he or they can never define any thing to be *(de fide)* part of the *Faith*, which is not ſo, as that is, beyond all other their pretenſions, moſt denied by us, and leaſt attempted to be proved by the *Romaniſt*, and not ſo much as conſented on among themſelves; ſo muſt it in no reaſon be ſuppoſed in this *diſpute*, or taken for *granted* by them, but is rejected with the ſame eaſe that it is mentioned by them.

4. As for other *pretenders*, I know not any, ſave onely that of the *Univerſal conſent* of the *Doctours* of the *firſt ages*, or that of an *Univerſal Council.* And both theſe we are willing to admit with ſuch *cautions* onely as the matter exacts, and the grounds of *defining* already laid.

5. The *Univerſal conſent* of the *Doctours* of the *firſt ages*, bearing *teſtimony* that ſuch or ſuch a *Doctrine* was from the *Apoſtles* preachings delivered to all *Churches* by them planted, or their *General conform teſtimony* herein, without any conſiderable *diſſenters* producible, is, I acknowledge, ἀξιόπιστος, *authentick* or *worthy of belief*, and ſo hath been made uſe of by the ᵠ *Orthodox* of all times, as *ſufficient* for the rejecting of any *new doctrine.*

ᵠ Πίστιν ἣν ἐξ ἀρχῆς παρελάβομεν καὶ ἔχομεν διδαθεῖσαν, καὶ παραδοθεῖσαν ἐν τῇ Καθολικῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ μεχρὶ τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας ἐκ διαδοχῆς ἀπὸ τῶν μακαρίων Ἀποστόλων. Epiſt. Orthodox. Epiſc. Synodi Antioch. Paul. Samoſat. Miſſæ. Bib. Gr. Pat. Tom. 1. pag. 30. &c. ὅπως ὁμολόγησαν οἱ ἅγιοι πατέρες, καὶ παρέδωκαν ἡμῖν ὁμολογῆν καὶ πιστεύειν· Δέδεικται ἐν τῷ σοφισμα ἀδύνατον, &c. Dionyſ. Alexand. *Epiſt contr.* Paul. Samoſat. *in Bibl. Pat. Gr. To.* 1. p. 275. E.

6. So likewiſe is the declaration of a *General Council*, *free*, and gathered from *all* quarters, and in ſuch other reſpects, truly ſo called, founded in the examination of the *monuments* of the *ſeveral Apoſtolical Plantations*,

tations, either produced in *Council*, or authentically confirmed from the *Letters* of the ſeveral *Churches*, either formerly prepared in *Provincial* and National *Councils*, or otherwiſe ſufficiently confirmed to them, and this *Declaration* conciliarly promulgate, and after the promulgation *univerſally received* and *accepted* by the *Church* diffuſive; Or elſe 'tis evident all this while, that it is not a *Catholick* (*truly* ſo ſtyled) Teſtimony.

7. For that any *Council* of *Biſhops*, the moſt numerous that ever was in the World (much leſs a but *major* part of thoſe *few*, that be there preſent) is not yet really the *Univerſality* of *Chriſtians*, is too evident to be doubted of.

8. It can onely then be pretended, that it is the *univerſal Repreſentative*, or ſuch an *Aſſembly*, wherein is contained the *virtue* and *influences* of the whole *Univerſal Church*. And thus indeed I ſuppoſe it to be, as often as the *Doctrines* there eſtabliſhed by *univerſal conſent* (founded in *Scripture* and *Tradition*) have either been before *diſcuſs'd* and reſolved in each *Provincial Council*, which have ſent their *Delegates* thither from *all* the parts of the World, or elſe have *Poſt factum*, *after* the *promulgation*, been accepted by them, and acknowledged to agree with that *Faith* which they had *originally received*.

9. That the former of theſe is a conſiderable ingredient in a *General Council*, appears to be Saint *Auguſtine*'s judgment in l. 7. *de Bapt. contra Donatiſt.* c. 53. [r] *'Tis ſafe for us not to proceed raſhly to thoſe things which have not been begun in any Catholick Provincial Council, and determined in a plenary* or *Univerſal. That we muſt, if we will be ſafe in our pronouncing, take care to affirm that which in the Regiment of our God and Chriſt Jeſus our Saviour is confirmed by the Confeſſion of the Univerſal Church.* Where as the *Confeſſion of the Univerſal Church* (or their *Teſtimony* that ſuch a doctrine hath been delivered to the *Church* by the *Apoſtles*) is that which gives *validity* to a *doctrine*, ſo this *univerſal confeſſion* is then truly ſuch, when it is the determination of a *General Council* prepared for in the *Provincial Councils*, of which that *General* is made up. And what hath not been according to this courſe eſtabliſhed, or the truth whereof (as he † elſewhere ſpeaks) is not firſt *Eliquata*, *ſtreined* out, or *extracted* by *Provincial Councils*, and ſo *Solidated or put together by a General Council*, may very ſafely be *disbelieved*; for ſaith he, [t] *How could that obſcure controverſie be brought to a clear declaration and confirmation of a general Council, if it were not firſt throughly handled and cleared by the conferences and diſputes of Biſhops through all the regions of the World?*

[r] *Nobis tutum eſt in ea non progredi aliqua temeritate ſententiæ, quæ nullo in Catholico religionali Concilio cæpta, nullo plenario Concilio terminata ſunt. Id autem ſit cura ſecuræ vocis aſſerere, quod in Gubernatione Domini Dei noſtri & ſalvatoris Jeſu Chriſti univerſalis Eccleſiæ confeſſione roboratum eſt.* † Ibid. *l.* 2. *c.* 4. [t] Ibid. *Quomodo potuit iſta res——ad plenarii Concilii luculentam illuſtrationem confirmationémque perduci, niſi primo diutius per orbis terrarum regiones multis hinc atque hinc diſputationibus & collationibus Epiſcoporum pertractata conſtaret?*

10. And this ſeems to be acknowledged by [v] *Baronius*, who ſpeaking of the *Provincial Synods* called in the *Weſt*, before the meeting of any *Univerſal Synod* in the *Eaſt*; not onely affirms it to be *Uſus priſtinus*, the *ancient cuſtome*, but withall takes notice of this end or deſign of it, that thoſe *Biſhops* of the *Weſt*, which could not all reaſonably take ſuch a *journey*, *might yet by ſome means give their ſuffrages*, ſuppoſing, as it was reaſon, that the *Council* could not be truly *Univerſal*, in which all the *Regions in the World* did not ſome way give their *votes*; and farther, that this was the *way* by which the *Pope* was inabled to ſend his *Legates à latere*, not onely in his *own name*, but of the *whole Weſtern Church*, *viz.* by the *Metropolitans* in the *Provincial Synods* ſending *Letters* to the *Pope*, which contain'd their ſenſe in that matter which was to be debated in the *General Council*.

[v] *Tom.* 6. *An.* 451. *n.* 20.

Aliquo tamen modo ſuum ferrent Suffragium.

11. Many evidences of this *cuſtome* and *reaſons* of the obſerving of it, in order to the rendring a *Council* truly *General*, might be farther added; but this is, I ſuppoſe, ſufficient.

12. Onely by the way, I add, That by this expedient the want of *General Councils* might in ſome degree be ſupplied, the *concordant declarations* of each *Provincial Council* compared and *communicated*, being (for the *teſtifying* of *Apoſtolical Tradition*, or the *Catholick* ſenſe of the *Church*) equivalent to the voice of a *General Council*.

13. So we find the practice in [x] *Euſebius*; where, upon the riſing of *Novatus* a *Roman Presbyter*, firſt a *Provincial Council at Rome*, ἰδίως τε καὶ τοὺς λοιποὺς ἐπαρχίας ἅμα καὶ χώρας, *and ſeverals in the ſeveral Provinces in every Region*, the *Paſtours* or *Biſhops* conciliarly conſidering of the matter, δόγμα πεποίηται τοῦτο πᾶσι, *the reſolution was made by all of them againſt Novatus*. Then follow the *Letters* of *Cornelius Biſhop of Rome* to *Fabius* of *Alexandria*, giving him the relation both of the *Roman Synod*, and of the determinations of all the *Biſhops* through *Italy* and *Africk*, and *thoſe Regions*; and others of *Cyprian*, and thoſe with him in *Africk*, declaring τὸ κοινὸν αὐτῶν συνευδοκεῖν, the *concordance of their judgment herein*. But this by the way in paſſing.

[x] Euſeb. *Eccl. Hiſt.* l. 6. κεφ. μγ'.

14. And for the *latter* of theſe there can be as little doubt, there being no *poſſibility* without it, that the voice of a *Council* never ſo *general*, ſhould be the *teſtimony* of the *whole Church*.

15. When a *doctrine* is conciliarly agreed on, it is then *promulgate* to *all*, and the *Univerſal*, though but *tacit approbation* and *reception* thereof, the no conſiderable *contradiction* given to it in the *Church*, is a competent *evidence*, that this is the *judgment* and *concordant Tradition* of the *whole Church*, though no ſuch reſolution of *Provincial Synods* have preceded.

16. But if that be alſo wanting, if the ſentence of a *major* part of *Biſhops* in a *Council* be not (when it comes to be declared to the world) *admitted* or received in the *Church*, as *conſonant* to the doctrine of the *Apoſtles*, *written* or *unwritten*, if the grounds whereon it hath been by the *Council* defined, (for ſo the *ſuffrages* are conciliarly to be delivered together with their *grounds*, and reaſons of them, out of *Scripture* or *Tradition*) be by others which ſate not in that *Council*, found to be *falſe* or *vain*, and are as ſuch *contradicted* and *proteſted* againſt; This evidently prejudiceth the *authority* of that *Council*, and ſhews their incompetency for the work (in hand) of *Univerſal teſtification*.

17. On which grounds it is, that [y] S. *Hilary* in his *Tract* of *Synods* againſt the *Arians*, ſetting down all the *Creeds* which after the *Nicene Council* had been ſet out in ſeveral times and places, deſires all the *Biſhops* of *France* and *Britain*, &c. to whom he writes, to give their *judgment* whether they be *Catholick* or *Heretical*.

[y] *Siquid rectum atque ex doctrinis Apoſtolicis deprehendetur——vos an Catholica, an hæretica ſunt, fidei veſtræ judicio comprobate.* p. 220.

SECT.

SECT. VII.

The benefit from General Councils. Reverence due to them. To the first four especially.

1. FRom these *premisses* thus briefly deduced, it now appears 1. What it is that we owe to the *Councils* of the *Church*; I shall most safely express it in the words of [z] *Vincentius*, *What hath the Church ever brought forth by the Decrees of Councils, save onely that what was before simply believed, the same should after be believed more diligently; what was before less vigorously preacht, that same should after be preacht more instantly; what was before more securely observed, that same should after be more solicitously dreſt or cultivated? This, I say, and nothing but this hath the Catholick Church, stirr'd up by Hereticks new doctrines, done by the decrees of Councils; what before it had received from the Ancestors by Tradition onely, it hath after committed to writing, and as an obligation under its own hand consigned to posterity.*

[z] C. 32. *Quid unquam aliud Conciliorum decretis enisa est, nisi ut quod antea simpliciter credebatur hoc idem postea diligentius crederetur? quod antea lentius prædicabatur, hoc idem postea instantius prædicaretur, quod antea securius colebatur, hoc idem postea solicitius excoleretur. Hoc, inquam, semper, neque quicquam præterea hæreticorum novitatibus excitata Conciliorum suorum decretis Catholica perfecit Ecclesia, ut quod prius à majoribus solâ traditione susceperat, hoc deinde posteris etiam per Scripturæ chirographum consignaret.*

2. In a word, that which was before the *constant belief* of the *whole Church* received from the *Apostles* times and preaching, and by *conciliar discussions* and *search*, found to be so, is thus *delivered* down to us by those *Councils*, and *testified* by them to be that which they found in the *Church Universally*. This I suppose the meaning of the ἀναχειρότονον ἀλλὰ λέγειν τὰ δόγματα τῆς εὐσεβείας, in the thirty seventh *Apostolick Canon*; *Let them in their Councils discuss, and examine the doctrines of piety*, enquire, and discern what have been *delivered* to them as such, and then τὰς ἐμπεσούσας ἐκκλησιαστικὰς ἀντιλογίας διαλύσασθαι, *let them answer or* satisfie *the incidental objections which shall happen to be made to them in the Church.* And so no *new doctrine* ever received from their *authority* or power of *defining*, but the *ancient Apostolical Catholick pious doctrine* testified to us.

3. Secondly, It is hence manifest also, what is the ground of that *reverence* that is by all *sober Christians* deemed due and paid to the *four first General Councils*, which *Vincentius* looks on, as the great *Conservatories of tradition*, wherein he might fitly instance, and which [a] *Pope Gregory* the *Great* professeth to *believe as he doth the four Gospels*, and *Theodosius Cenobiarcha* so much commended by [b] *Cyril* and others, [c] *anathematizeth* all, who are not of that *opinion*, *viz.* because 1. As *Theodoret* Hist. l. 1. c. 8. out of *Athanasius declares* of the *Nicene*, that they set *down and convinced* the truth of their *doctrine* ἐξ [d] ἐγγράφων μόνων εὐσεβείας ἐννοουμένων λέξεων, *out of the Scripture words understood with piety, i. e.* so as the *pious Orthodox Fathers* had *always* understood them, οὐκ ἰδιωτικῶς εὑρόντες τὰς λέξεις, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῶν πατέρων ἔχοντες μαρτυρίαν, *not inventing words or phrases for themselves, but having testimony from the Fathers* for what they wrote, (for, saith he, the *Bishops of Rome* and *Alexandria* for almost CXXX. years had *found fault* with them, who affirmed the *Son to be* τέκτημα a *creature*, καὶ μὴ ὁμόσιον τῷ πατρὶ, *and not of the same substance with the Father*;) so it was true of all the other *three*; they fetcht their *definitions* regularly from *Scripture*, and that sense thereof, which the *several Churches* had received down from the *Apostles*; and so were approved and received *universally* in all *Churches*, not as those which had formed any new *Articles*, but which *conserved* the *Depositum* intrusted to the *Churches*, and in time of need brought them forth and *discovered* them, to the securing of the truth against *Hereticks*.

[a] l. 1. *Ep.* 24.
[b] *In Saba.* Suidas *in verb.* Ἀνάσασις. *quis sit Saba, vide præf. ad Moschi Prat. Spir. & c.* 3. c. 80.
[c] See *Baron. An.* 511. *n.* 33. *Siquis quatuor sanctas Synodos non tanti esse existimat quanti quatuor Evangelia sit anathema.*
[d] ἐγγράφων. Thus *Capreolus* Bishop of *Carthage* in his answer to *Vitalis* and *Constantius* (who style him Bishop of the *Catholick Church* of *Carthage*, and *Pope*, and *Sanctus Apostolatus vester, your holy Apostolacy*, and consult him, that they may learn from him *quæ fides Catholica recta teneat*; as high titles and dignities as the Bishop of *Rome* can pretend to) speaking of the *Nestorian* Heresie and the Council of *Ephesus*, saith that it was therein *radio Apostolicæ lucis extincta*, extinguisht by a ray of *Apostolical* light, and for the asserting of the truth, appeals to the doctrine and tradition of *Evangelical* antiquity, *doctrinam confitemur quam Evangelica tenet ac tradit antiquitas, &c.* p. 42, 43.

4. Thirdly, because these being so near the *Apostles* times, and gathered as soon as the *Heterodox* opinions appeared, the sense of the *Apostles* might more easily be fetcht from those men and *Churches*, to whom they had *committed* it, and it was not in the power of *Subtilty* and *Craft* to infuse their *poison* undiscernably into those *Fountains*.

5. This account is also given by *Lirinensis*, where speaking of the way of confuting *Hereticks* * *by producing and comparing the concordant doctrines of the old Fathers*, he puts in this among other *cautions*. [c] *All Heresies are not always thus to be impugned, but onely those that are fresh risen, and have not yet had time to vitiate the volumes of the Fathers, or falsifie the rules of the ancient Faith:* Wisely foreseeing that in this case there is no course of dealing with, or *convincing* of *Hereticks*, unless it be [f] either by the *sole authority of Scriptures*, or by the *Councils of Catholicks*, which were long *ago Universal.*

* C. 39. *Prolatis atque collatis veterum Magistrorum concordantibus sibimet sententiis.*
[c] *Sed neque semper neque omnes hæreses hoc modo impugnandæ sunt, sed novitiæ recentesque tantummodo, antequam insalsarint vetustæ fidei regulas.*
[f] *Aut sola Scripturarum authoritate, aut jam antiquitùs Universalibus Catholicorum Conciliis.*

6. Fourthly, Some consideration may also be had of the special *matter* of the *definitions* of those *four Councils*, which were all spent upon the *Deity* and *incarnation* of *Christ*, and the *Trinity*, the great *Fundamental Doctrines* of *Christianity*; and to that also *Vincentius* directs us, in another caution of his, [g] *The ancient consent of the holy Fathers is not to be sought and followed in all the little questions of the Divine law, but onely, sure principally, in the rule of Faith, those which the Apostles thought necessary* to be believed, and so taught them *universally.*

[g] Ibid. *Antiquorum Patrum consensio, non in omnibus divinæ legis quæstiunculis, sed solum, certè præcipuè, in fidei regula —— investiganda & sequenda est.*

7. And therefore of the *Scriptures*, of the *Creed* (that *Regula fidei una, sola immobilis & irreformabilis, that one, onely immoveable and unreformable rule of Faith*, as *Tertullian* calls it, *De vel. Vir.* c. 1.) and of those *four Councils*, as the *Repositories* of all true *Apostolical tradition*, I suppose it very regular to affirm, that

the *intire body* of the *Catholick Faith*, is to be *eſtabliſht*, and *all Hereſies convinced*, or elſe that there is no juſt reaſon, that any *doctrine* ſhould be condemned as ſuch.

[h] *Reply to Cath. Gent. Ch. VIII. Sect. 2. n. 4, 5, 6, 7.*

8. This I have [h] elſewhere cleared both out of the *expreſs* words of the *Council* of *Epheſus*, the third of thoſe *four, that no man ſhould produce, or offer to any convert whether from Gentiliſm, Judaiſm, Hereſie, any other belief beſide that which was eſtabliſht by the Fathers at Nice*: From the *Greeks in the Council of Florence*, that no man except he *were mad*, would charge that *Faith of Imperfection*. From the *Latines*, who acknowledged there, that all *difference* as well as *contrariety of Faith* was forbidden by thoſe *Fathers*, and that a bare explication of the ſame for the *whole Church* was not lawfull for any to attempt, but an *Univerſal Council*: From the *Epiſtle* of *Celeſtine* there cited, that the *faith* delivered by the *Apoſtles admits* neither *increaſe* nor *diminution*: and *Laſtly* from the *Catechiſm* collected out of *Coſterus*, *Petrus à Soto*, and others, ſet out by *command of the Archbiſhop* of *Triers*, that there was never any *Hereſie* which might not be condemned by the *Apoſtles Creed*. Add to theſe the authority of the *Greek* Church, as we find it teſtified by *Jeremias* Patriarch of *Conſtantinople* in their cenſure of the *Germans*, where having recited the *Nicene* Creed (without the *filióque*) as propoſed by the *Nicene*, confirmed by the *Conſtantinopolitan* Fathers, *p.* 13. he adds, *Hæc eſt illa communis confeſſio omnium ſanctorum Patrum, Hæc eſt illa divina, ſanctiſſima, perfecta, ac univerſalis per orbem terrarum fuſi populi Chriſtiani teſſera. Hic eſt certiſſimus univerſæ Chriſtianæ fidei limes*— and again, *veluti quoddam cœleſte, integrum & incorruptum*—*divino numine afflatorum hominum depoſitum*, p. 15.

SECT. VIII.

Of the ſubſequent General Councils. The Romaniſts difference them.

1. IF after all this it be ſtill farther demanded, what *reverence* is due to all other *Univerſal Councils*, and why not the *ſame* as to theſe *four*? I anſwer, Firſt, that the reaſons of a *difference* have been ſufficiently given already, and ſo as is, *Ad homines*, to the *Romaniſts*, unreprovable, it being moſt evident that among them there is *difference* made between ſome of thoſe, which yet they deem to be all *Oecumenical Councils*.

2. For Firſt, it is certain that they reckon above *eight* of theſe; And even the *Biſhops* of *Rome* themſelves in their *exaltation* to the *Papacy*, who would ſure be ſuppoſed to undertake the maintaining of the whole *Catholick Faith*, do profeſs to *maintain* no more than the *eight firſt* of them. The words of this *profeſſion* we have ſet down out of their own *Day-Book*, in the *Corpus Juris Canon.* in this form, [i] *I profeſs to keep whole to a tittle the eight holy univerſal Councils, the firſt at Nice*—*and to eſteem them worthy of like honour and veneration, and by all means to follow and preach all that they have promulgated and decreed, and with heart and mouth to condemn all that they have condemned.*

[i] Decret. Par. 1. diſt. 16. c. 8. *Sancta octo univerſalia Concilia*, i. e. *Primum Nicenum*—*immutata ſervare & pari honore & veneratione digna habere, & quæ prædicaverunt & ſtatuerunt modis omnibus ſequi & prædicare, quaque condemnaverunt ore & corde condemnare profiteor.*

3. Secondly, it is as evident, that all *Biſhops* of *Rome* in *former* times, have not (at leaſt with *equal reverence*) received *all* theſe *eight*, which theſe *now* thus receive. I ſhall give an inſtance or two.

[k] *Ep. 7. c. 1. Concil. To. 6. p. 496.* [l] *Omnium ſimul ſanctorum atque venerandorum ſex Conciliorum authoritate.*

4. [k] *Pope Nicholaus* the *Firſt*, in the damnation of *Photius*, after the *authority of God* and the *Princes of the Apoſtles Peter and Paul*, mentioning that alſo of all the *holy* and *venerable univerſal Councils*, numbers but [l] *ſix of them*; and this *Anno Chr.* DCCCLXII. that is LXXX years after the *holding* of the *ſeventh Council*.

[m] *Nihil audemus judicare quod poſſit Niceno Concilio & quinque cæterorum conciliorum regulis*—*obviare. Vide Concil. Tom. 6. pag. 690.*

5. And ſo alſo doth [m] *Pope Adrian* II. his *ſucceſſour*, *Epiſt. 26. ad Carolum Calvum.*

[n] *Ibid. p. 496.* [o] *Cur hic Nicolaus, & infra Adrianus ſex tantum Oecumenicas Synodos nominent, dicam infra in notis Conc. Rom. III. Sub.* [p] *Not. in Conc. Rom. III. Tom. 6. Conc. p. 655.* [q] *Tom. 10. p. 275. An. Ch. 863. n. 5. Cur tam Nicolaus hic quàm ejus ſucceſſor Adrianus*—*ſex tantum Oecumenicas Synodos nominet, inferius ab authore alia occaſione dicetur.*

6. And *Binius* that in his [n] *margin* takes notice of theſe two paſſages, and [o] *promiſeth* to render a *reaſon* thereof afterwards, when he comes to the [p] *due place* of performing that *promiſe*, ſpeaks not a word of that matter, unleſs this be it, that *Anaſtaſius Bibliothecarius ſaith of two Archbiſhops*; *Epiſtolas Pontificis ad libitum falſaſſe, that they falſified at their pleaſure the Epiſtles of Pope Nicholaus.* Which if it were granted to be *true*, yet neither concludes it that they thus *falſified* this *particular* paſſage in this *Epiſtle*, which indeed nothing concern'd the cauſe of thoſe *Archbiſhops*, nor can be any-way deemed applicable to *Pope Adrian* doing the ſame, of whom neither *Anaſtaſius* nor *Binius* himſelf ſo much as ſuggeſt any. ſuch thing, and therefore this was certainly a moſt *gainleſs* artifice of *evaſion*, and an *indication* that there was no *better* to be found, to *ſalve* this buſineſs.

7. *Baronius* in his reciting that *Epiſtle of Nicolaus*, hath in effect the ſame [q] *Marginal obſervation*, before *Binius*, and *promiſeth to render the reaſon of it, afterward on another occaſion*, not directing us where that ſhould be lookt for; yet he defers it not long, for he doth it in the very *next Section*, rendring this onely *account* of it. 1. That [r] in all the other *Patriarchal Churches*, but *Conſtantinople*, there were onely *ſix Oecumenical Councils* named in their *publick Confeſſions*, citing *Photius's Epiſtle* for it; and thence concluding that what *Nicolaus* did, was done by the other *Patriarchal* Sees, even by his *enemies* confeſſion. Secondly, that the like cauſe was to be rendred for both, that till *Anaſtaſius* helpt them to a *tranſlation* of the *Acts* of that *Synod* out of *pure Copies*, *they* † *did not give it the title of an Oecumenical Council*, and *accordingly* [t] *Nicolas thus long alſo ſuſpended his judgment.*

[r] *In reliquis omnibus Eccleſiis Patriarchalibus Orientis, Conſtantinopolitanâ exceptâ, ſex tantum Oecumenicas Synodos in publicis confeſſionibus nominari conſuevisſe.* † *Non eodem præconio nempe titulo Oecumenico fuerunt eam perſecuti.* Baro. *an.* 863. *n.* 6. [t] *Nicolaus judicium ſuſpendit ſuum ex dicta cauſa.*

3. But

8. But *Binius* which ſurely ſaw theſe *anſwers* of *Baronius*, could not (though he were much *diſtreſt*, as hath appeared) think fit to make uſe of either of them, or *refer* the reader to them, though he bids *Vide* Baron. *An.* 863. *n.* 20, *&c.* which belongs to *another* matter.

9. And indeed the *firſt* part of the *Cardinal*'s account doth confeſs that no other *Patriarchal See* but *Conſtantinople* did at this time receive this *Council*. And ſo *Photius* then *Patriarch* of *Conſtantinople*, which moſt zealouſly aſſerted it, doth acknowledge, in his [y] *Encyclical Epiſtle* to the *Archbiſhops* of the *Orient*. And theſe *Patriarchal Sees* had great reaſon ſo to *forbear*; for they were none of them *preſent* either in *perſon*, or by *Legates*, or *Proxies*, at that *Council*, as may well appear by the ſame [x] *Baronius* in his ſetting down the *Hiſtory* of it: confeſſing that *Tarafius*'s *Legate could not come* to them, that when they were as far as *Paleſtine*, they heard of the death of *Theodorus Patriarch of Jeruſalem*, and were advertiſed by ſome *Monks*, how *dangerous* it was to *go either to the Patriarch of Antioch or Alexandria*, and conſequently were perſwaded to give *over the attempt*. As for the *pretended Legates* of *thoſe Sees*, they were evidently but *Impoſtours*, *John* and *Thomas* the *Presbyters* were not ſent by the *Patriarchs* of *Alexandria* and *Antioch* (and for the *See* of *Jeruſalem*, it was *void*, as was ſaid, by the *death* of *Theodorus*) but were ſent onely by thoſe *Monks* or *Hermits* of *Paleſtine*, as appears by the *Letters*, which they brought with them, *beginning* thus, Τοῖς Πατράσι, &c. ἡμεῖς οἱ ταπεινοὶ καὶ ἔσχατοι τοῦ κατοικεῖν ἐρημικῶν ἐσταμένοι τόπων, *Having read your Letters, We the mean, and laſt or loweſt of thoſe that have deſired to live in the Deſart*, or the *Hermetick life*.— See [y] *Concil. Nic.* 2. *Act.* 3. And ſo this being moſt *true*, is very far from an *anſwer* to the *objection*; 'tis a large *addition* to the *force* of it, as far as concerns the *authority* of that *Council*.

[y] *An.* 785. *n.* 40.

[x] *Ep.* 2. *p.* 60. Τινες μὲν γὰρ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀνατολικῆς ὑμῶν ἐπαρχίας μοναχοὶ ἐπὶ ἔκπτῳ τῆς οἰκουμενικῆς ἀναστάσεως (so it ſhould be read, not ἀειδημίου) σωτῆρος, τοῦ ἐσταυρωμένου ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν; and αὐτοῦ δὲ ἀναχωρήσαντος ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ὅπου τυχὸν ἐπιβάντος. Ibid.

[y] *Concil. Tom.* 5. *p.* 594. *E.*

10. And for the other part, that the *Latines* as yet wanted *pure* Copies of it, that can as little be pretended ſo many *years* after the holding of that *Council*, eſpecially when the *Acts* of it had now long ſince, immediately after the making them, been diſcuſs'd in the *Council* of *Frankfort*, and by *Pope Adrian* I. defended againſt that *Council*.

11. That which [z] *Bellarmine* adventures on in this matter is yet more *ſtrange*, and unreconcileable with the *confeſſion* of *Baronius*; for *Baronius* had confeſt that *Anaſtaſius* had tranſlated that *Council* out of a *pure Copy*, and ſo brought it to *Rome*; and yet this other *Cardinal* would perſwade us, that long after *Anaſtaſius*, even after the time of *Thomas Aquinas*, and *Halenſis*, the *Acts* of this *ſeventh Council lay hid*, and ſo were not *produced* till that *laſt* age wherein himſelf had lived; which if it were granted him to be *true*, it would ſure be little for the *dignity* and *authority* of that *Council*.

[z] *De Imag.* lib. 1. cap. 22.

12. Farther yet; In the *Corpus Juris Canonici* ſet out *emendate* by the *command* of *Pope Gregory* XIII. there is no mention of any more than *ſix General Councils*, ſave onely in that one paſſage out of the *Day-book* of the *Pope's profeſſion* to maintain the *eight*, which is to me an *argument*, that all *General Councils* are not ſo *revered* by them, as that all their *Canons* are *obliging* among them.

13. I ſhall not need to add more evidences to infer ſo obvious a *Concluſion*, that among the *Romaniſts* themſelves, all *General Councils* have not had the ſame *reception* and *Veneration*, when in their *Corpus Juris Decret. Par.* 1. the 17 *Diſtinction* is thus prefaced; *Generalia Concilia quorum tempore celebrata ſint, vel quorum authoritas cæteris præmineat, ſanctorum authoritatibus ſupra monſtratum eſt, In whoſe time the General Councils have been celebrated, or which of them hath a more eminent authority than the reſt, hath been ſhewed by the authorities of Holy men*, referring to *Diſt.* 16. wherein yet, as I ſaid, there is no mention of any more than the *firſt ſix*, ſave onely that the *Pope* profeſſeth to maintain *Eight*.

SECT. IX.

Our Reverence to all General Councils. The Fifth and the Sixth.

1. THis might make any *ſecond* or farther *anſwer* unneceſſary; yet I ſhall not doubt to proceed ſome ſteps farther, and 1. allow the ſame *credit*, though not the *ſame degree* of *Reverence* (for the reaſons premiſed) to all *Aſſemblies* of *Chriſtians*, which have ſerved the *Church* in this *office* of conveying *Apoſtolical Truths* to us, and which are according to right *reaſon* and by the *grounds* premiſed, qualified for a good *Chriſtian's reception*, or as are not under ſome very *juſt prejudice*: Nay 2. though I make it no matter of *Faith*, becauſe delivered neither by *Scripture* nor *Apoſtolick Tradition*, yet I ſhall number it among the *Piè credibilia*, that no *General Council*, truly ſuch, 1. *duly aſſembled*, 2. *Freely celebrated*, and 3. *Univerſally received*, either *hath erred*, or ever *ſhall err* in matters of *Faith*.

2. The expreſſing my ſelf more fully in which *particulars*, will be a means to bring this whole matter to ſuch an *iſſue*, as I ſhall hope no *adverſary* will with any colour of *reaſon*, or *truth*, be able to gainſay.

3. And 1. for the *Fifth General Council*, it being for the *Doctrinal* part of it, but a *Corroboration* of the *fourth*, *Our Church* makes no more doubt of that, than of the *fourth* it doth. Onely after the example of *Vincentius Lirinenſis*, that famous propugnatour of the *Catholick Faith* againſt all *Hereſies*, and by ſtrength of the *premiſed Epheſine Canon*, we believe the *four firſt Councils* to be the *conſervatories of all truly Catholick*, i. e. *Apoſtolick Tradition*, from whence together with the *Scripture* all *Hereſies* may be oppugned, and confuted, and ſo have no ſuch *need* of, or *benefit* from this *fifth*, as from the *former four Councils*.

4. So 2. for the *Sixth*, as far as that concerns the *errour* of the *Monothelites*, which denied the *two wills in Chriſt*, ſo it is duly founded in *Scripture*, and the ſame *Apoſtolick Tradition*, which had aſſerted the *two natures* againſt *Eutyches*, and we willingly receive it, thinking it unneceſſary to proceed to thoſe other *Acts*, that go under the name of that *Council*, but were written afterward, and which the [a] *Romaniſts* acknow-

[a] See *Corp. Jur. Can. Decret.* 1. *par. Diſt.* 16. *c.* 6. *Nat. Habeo librum. Et Ibid. c.* 7.

knowledge to be *corrupt* and not to *ſavour* of *Apoſtolical Tradition*. [b] *There are, ſaith the Hiſtory of that Council, carried about ſome Canons in the name of that Sixth Synod in Trullo, but they were ſet out without the Legates of the Apoſtolick See, and not approved by them, wherein there be alſo ſome things which ſavour not of Apoſtolical Tradition.*

[b] *Conc. Tom. 5. p. 8. Circumferuntur autem nonnulli Canones nomine ſextæ Synodi in Trullo, veruntamen editi ſine Legatis Apoſtolicæ Sedis, nec ab ea comprobati, in quibus & nonnulla ſunt quæ minus Apoſtolicam ſapiunt Traditionem.* See alſo the Admonition to the Reader prefixt to the Canons of this ſixth Synod, *Concil. t. 5. p. 311, &c.* which abſolutely rejects thoſe Canons.

5. From which words I ſuppoſe I may conclude the *reaſon* of the *Legates* not confirming them, to be *this*, becauſe they *did not ſavour of Apoſtolical Tradition*. And then theſe two *inferences* are clear. Firſt, that 'tis the *Romaniſts* judgment unqueſtionably (and that appears not onely by this, but by many other *inſtances*, eſpecially by that of *Chalcedon*, about the *privileges of New Rome*) that the *Decree* of a *General Council* is not *valid* from it ſelf, or any *innate* authority (for if it were, it would not need the *authority* of the *Pope* himſelf to give it that *validity*) but receives its force from *ſubſequent approbation*, or elſe is not a *Catholick Decree*.

6. And then what *reaſon* can be rendred, why the want of the *approbation* of other *Apoſtolical Churches* ſhould not have the ſame *efficacy* to prejudge the *Univerſality of a Decree*: for ſure they are *Chriſtians* and *Biſhops*, as well as the *Biſhops* of *Rome*, and conſequently their *Negatives* as evident *exceptions* and *prejudices* to, and as utterly unreconcileable with an *Univerſal affirmative* as the *Pope*'s can be; and the ſuppoſing that the *Pope* hath power for the *whole Church*, and that *infallible*, for the *approving* or *repudiating Decrees*, is ſtill the removing all *authority* and *Univerſality* from the *Council*, and placing it in the *Pope*, making *him*, and not the *Council* the *Grand Repreſentative Church*, and ſo is the deſtroying the whole doctrine of the *authority* of *Councils*.

7. *Secondly*, That the *Reaſon* or *Rule* of the *Romaniſts* judgment may certainly be drawn into *example*, and prove *imitable* to other *Chriſtians*, and then it muſt be lawfull for the *Church of God*, as well as for the *Biſhop* of *Rome* to inquire whether the *Decrees* of an *Univerſal Council* have been agreeable to *Apoſtolical Tradition*, or no, and if they be found otherwiſe, to *reject* them out, or not to receive them into their *belief*.

8. And then ſtill it is the *matter* of the *Decrees*, and the *Apoſtolicalneſs* of them, and the force of the *teſtification*, whereby they are *approved* and acknowledged to be ſuch, which gives the *authority* to the *Council*, and nothing elſe is *ſufficient*, where that is not to be found.

9. Agreeable to which is [c] S. *Auguſtine*'s practice, *Contr. Maximin.* l. 3. c. 14. *Neither, ſaith he, do I produce the Nicene Council, nor ſhould you that of Ariminum, neither am I obliged to the authority of this, nor you of that: By the authorities of Scripture, which are not proper to one but common to both, let the matter be debated, reaſon contending with reaſon*——and then devolving all the *authority* of that moſt *ancient and truly General Nicene Council*, as well as of that other of [d] *Ariminum*, to the *Apoſtolical grounds of truth*, and thoſe expreſly in the *written* word of *God* (*I and my Father are one*, as the ground of ὁμούσιον) from whence they framed their *Decrees*.

[c] *To. 6. p. 733. D. Nec ego Nicenum, nec tu debes Ariminenſe——proferre Concilium, nec ego hujus authoritate, nec tu illius detineris, ſcripturarum authoritatibus non quorumque propriis, ſed utriſque communibus, res cum re, cauſa cum cauſa, ratio cum ratione concertet.* [d] *Synod. Arimin. & Seleuc. Tom. 1. p. 873.*

10. To which belongs that ſaying of [e] *Athanaſius* himſelf of the manner of *Subſcriptions* in the *Council* of *Nice*, who though in the matter of *Eaſter* (being not a *Doctrine*, but a *Rite*) they thought good to uſe this form, Τότε γὰρ ἔδοξε παῖται πεῖσαι, *It ſeemed then good to us that all ſhould obey or obſerve that time*, which they had defined; yet concerning the matters of *Faith*, ἔγεγραπται, οὐκ ἔδοξεν, ἀλλ', οὕτως καθόλου ἡ Καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία, *They wrote, not* [*It ſeemed good to us*] *but* [*Thus the Catholick Church Commands*] preſently ſetting down the *Confeſſion* it ſelf, *that they might demonſtrate that their ſenſe was not new but Apoſtolical*, and that *what they wrote was not invented by themſelves*, but *was the very ſame which the Apoſtles had taught*.

[e] Ἵνα δείξωσιν ὅτι μὴ νεώτερον, ἀλλ' Ἀποστολικὸν ὄντων αὐτῶν τὸ φρόνημα, ἃ ἔγραψαν, οὐκ ἐξ αὐτῶν εὑρέθη, ἀλλὰ ταῦτ' ἐστὶν, ἅπερ ἐδίδαξαν οἱ Ἀπόστολοι.

SECT. X.

Of the Seventh General Council.

1. AS for the *Seventh Council*, that *Second* of *Nice*, I have already more than intimated the *Reaſons*, why no *Romaniſt* can blame him that *allows* not the *authority* thereof.

2. Yet becauſe thoſe *Teſtimonies*, though of *Popes* themſelves, are indeed but *Negative Teſtimonies*, and being deſigned onely *Ad hominem*, to the *Romaniſt*, may ſtill ſtand in need of ſome farther *confirmation* to *others*; That alſo is ready at hand, and may be deduced from *two* heads, 1. From the *Council* of *Eliberis*, 2. From the *Council* of *Frankfort*, which preſently after the publiſhing of the *Decrees* of *Nice* for the *worſhipping* of *Images*, oppoſed and *refuted* that *Doctrine*.

3. For the *firſt* of theſe, the *Council* of *Eliberis*, that yields us an *irrefragable* proof, that the *Doctrine* of the *Second Nicene Council* was not *teſtified* by all the *Church* of all *ages* to be of *Tradition Apoſtolical*.

4. The 36th *Canon* of that *Council* lies thus, *Placuit Picturas in Eccleſia eſſe non debere, ne quod colitur aut adoratur in parietibus depingatur*, 'Tis reſolved that *Pictures ſhould not be in the Church, leſt that which is adored be painted on walls*. Which though it be but a *Canon* of a *Provincial Council*, and that in a matter of *Rite*, and ſo hath no power of *obliging all* others beyond that *Province*, and might alſo be there after retracted again; yet being in the *year* of our Lord 305. *twenty* years before the *firſt Nicene Council*, and ſo 482. years before the *ſecond*, is a *convincing* argument, That what was in the *ſecond Nicene* defined, was not the *language* of *Apoſtolical Tradition*, *univerſally* teſtified to be ſuch; for then theſe *Fathers* at *Eliberis*, and among them the great *Oſius*, which ſate after in the firſt *Council* of *Nice*, and *Liberius*, whoſe name we have

have in the *Council* of *Arles*, would never have made this *Decree* ſo directly *contrary* to ſuch pretended *Tradition Apoſtolical*.

5. In this matter 'tis worth obſerving how *Cardinal Baronius* hath behaved himſelf. In his *firſt Volume Ad An. Ch.* 57. *n.* CXIX. being troubled that 19 *Biſhops in a corner of the world*, ſhould *decree* otherwiſe than (as he is concerned to believe) the *Univerſal Church* of all places *profeſt*, he attempts to *annull* this *Council*, rendring his reaſon, *Pleraque enim in eo ſunt quæ fines Novatiani erroris viſa ſunt prope attigiſſe, There were many Canons in it, which ſeemed almoſt to touch upon the borders of the Novatian Hereſie*: and if they were but the *borders of Hereſie*, and theſe *Canons* did onely *touch* upon *thoſe borders*, or indeed but *ſeem*, and that again but *almoſt ſeem*, then *theſe Canons might* be very *Catholick* and *Orthodox* for all that. P. 626.

6. The truth is, thoſe *Canons* that deny onely *Communion* to the *Lapſi*, but *deny* them not *repentance* and *abſolution*, are far enough from *Novatian*, and ſo preſently after he acknowledges, *Ceterum quod ſciamus ejus conventus Epiſcopos fuiſſe Catholicos, de Novatiana Hæreſi nulla ſuſpicio eſſe debet, cùm præſertim hi licèt communionem, tamen pœnitentiam non negarent, ut de eo Innocentius Papa tradit*: But *ſeeing we know that the Biſhops of that Council were Catholick, they muſt not be ſuſpected of Novatianiſm, eſpecially ſeeing though they denied communion, they did not deny repentance, as Pope Innocent affirms of that Council.*

7. Here in the ſame *Paragraph* he hath *freed* them from that *ſuſpicion*, which he was willing to have *affixt* on them; and it ſeems *Pope Innocent* was to be thank't for it, who appeared on their *ſide*, or elſe *Oſius*, &c. muſt have gone for *Novatians*, and then never have been worth heeding in any *other* matter. This farther appears by the ſame *Baronius* in his *Second Volume Ad An.* 305. *n.* 41. Where having the ſame words again, of the *Propemodum viſi* * *S. Novatianorum limites attigiſſe, that they almoſt ſeem'd to touch upon the borders of the Novatians*; he renders that as the *cauſe* that there is no *mention* of this *Synod* by name among the *ancients*, and ſo that it remain'd *almoſt antiquated*, therefore (ſaith he) *he remembred he had ſpoken elſewhere* (in the place forementioned) *paulò liberiùs, a little too freely of that Council*; but ſeeing their *reſolutions* herein were *excuſed* by *Pope Innocent*, *Nemo ſit qui accuſare præſumat, No man may preſume to accuſe that Council.* And then ſure this *Cardinal* had been *too bold* in thus *preſuming*. * *ſunt.*

8. What other *arts* he now *betakes* himſelf to, to *deliver* him from the *force* of that *Canon* againſt *Images*, I ſhall not now *examine*; there being nothing of any force to *ſuperſede* my *concluſion*, that this *Canon* is ſufficient *prejudice* to the *Univerſality* of the *teſtification*, that the *Nicene Canons* for *Images* are of *Apoſtolical Tradition*. And 'tis here obſervable that though this Synod pretend to tradition of all times on their ſide, yet the higheſt teſtimony thereof to which they pretend is that of the *ſixth Council* (See *Act.* VI. *Tom.* 5. p. 732. B.) whoſe Canons they aſſert, and cite the 82. for their turn: And yet, as hath been here ſhewed in this Chapter, Sect. 9. Sect. 4. the *Romaniſts* themſelves reject theſe Canons, and ſo doth the Admonition to the Reader prefixt to them in *Binius*'s Edition of the *Councils*, *Tom.* 5. *p.* 311, &c.

9. As for the *Council* of *Frankfort*, that makes it as plain, that the *Decrees* of theſe *Nicene Fathers* were not *received*, but *rejected* by *other* parts of the *Chriſtian Church* in *France*, in *Germany*, and *Italy*, if not in *Spain* alſo.

10. This *Binius* would fain conceal; and accordingly in the title of that *Council* of *Frankfort*, was willing to *anticipate* the *Reader*'s judgment, by telling him that theſe 300 *Biſhops* there convened [f] *Confirmed the Acts of the Council of Nice in the matter of Images.* [f] *Acta Nicani Concilii II. in cauſa imaginum confirmant. Concil. Tom.* 6. p. 163.

11. For this he * afterwards gives his *reaſons* ſuch as they are, but acknowledges that *both* the great *Cardinals Bellarmine* and *Baronius*, were of the *contrary* mind. To them therefore, and to the *evidences*, whereby they were convinced, I may be allowed to *appeal*. * p. 118.

12. And indeed [g] *Baronius* is ſo far from *doubting* it, that he ſolemnly profeſſeth by *undeniable teſtimonies* to put it beyond all *queſtion*, and ſo he doth, out of *Walafridus Strabo*, *Amalarius*, *Hincmarus*, *Anaſtaſius*, and many others. [g] *Tom.* 9. p. 539. *An. Ch.* 794. *n.* 27. *Tantum abeſt ut negemus Nicænam ſecundam Synodum eandémque ſeptimam Oecumenicam dictam damnatam dici in Francofordienſi Concilio, ut etiam augeamus numerum teſtium id profitentium, & quidem haud dubia fidei aut authoritatis.*

13. What he determineth concerning the *invalidity* of that *Council* of *Frankfort*, is not now pertinent to *examine*; my *concluſion* is ſufficiently evinced without that *inquiry*, *viz.* That *that Council* of *Nice* was no *Univerſal Teſtimony* of *Tradition Apoſtolical*, or indeed of the *whole Church* of that *age*, when it was ſo far from being *received* and *approved* by *all* the *world*, that as ſoon as the *News* of the *Acts* thereof came to the ears of the *Council*, then aſſembled at *Frankfort* (*three hundred Biſhops*, of *Germany*, *France* and *Italy*, ſaith *Surius*, others add, out of *Spain* alſo) the *Council* ſolemnly *oppugned* and *refuted* them.

14. Of this the *Reader* may have the cleareſt proſpect in ſeveral places of the Works of *G. Caſſander*, both in his † *Conſultation*, and eſpecially in his * 19 *Epiſtle*, where he gives *Joh. Molinæus* a full account of the iv. *Books* written by the *authority*, and under the name of *Charles* the *French King*, and approved by that *whole Council* of *Frankfort*, and ſo ſent to the *Pope* againſt the *Decrees* of the *Council* of *Nice* in the matter of *Image-worſhip*, pronouncing both of thoſe *Books*, and that *Synod*, and other eminent perſons of that age, of the *ſame* ſenſe with them, [h] *that they never were condemned, nor*, as he *thinks*, *will ever be by thoſe men that are in their wits.* † Pag. 977. * Pag. 1103. [h] *Qui libros hoſce damnandos aut reprobandos putet, idem neceſſario & ipſam Synodum Francofordienſem, & alios inſignes eâ ætate ſcriptores damnandos eſſe fateatur, quod neque factum eſt unquam; neque futurum certè à ſanis hominibus puto.* Ibidem pag. 1104.

15. Some *queſtion* I know there is made by *others*; whether this *Council* of *Frankfort* rightly *underſtood* the *Decrees* of that *Council* of *Nice*, and whether thoſe iv. *Books* compiled, as it is probable, by *Alcuinus* and approved by that *Council*, did not *confound* the *two Seventh Councils*, the *true*, that at *Nice*, and the *falſe*, that of the *Iconoclaſta* at *Conſtantinople*.

16. But neither are we concern'd in *either* of thoſe *queſtions*. For ſtill it remains *certain*, and *unqueſtioned*, that the *Council* of *Nice* (whether by their *miſtake*, or otherwiſe) was not by *all men* univerſally *received*. The CCC. *Biſhops* at *Frankfort* received it not, but profeſtly *oppoſed* it.

17. And

17. And if the *Canons* of *Frankfort* were not *approved* by the *Pope* (as 'tis again ſuggeſted) yet ſtill this is a *ſufficient prejudice* to the *Univerſality* of thoſe *Nicene Canons* (without the *Pope*'s being one of thoſe that *condemned* them), which cannot be *Univerſal teſtifiers*, whilſt they want *Univerſal conſent*, and are oppugned, and *diſclaimed* by *Charles* the *King*, and the *three hundred Biſhops* which were there convened at *Frankfort*, and by as many, as adhered to the ſentence of thoſe *Biſhops* in oppoſition to thoſe but CCCXXX. which were aſſembled at *Nice*.

18. And indeed we that in this matter approve of the *Doctrine* of the *Frankfort Decrees*, as that is ſumm'd up in thoſe few words, which the [1] *Books* in *Charles*'s name deduce from *Pope Gregory*, in his *Epiſtle* to *Serenus Biſhop of Maſſilles*, *viz.* That *Images are neither to be broken nor worſhipt*, that they be lawfully *uſed* in the *Church*, but muſt not by any means be *adored*, can never be blamed for *rejecting* the Doctrine of any *General Council*. For if that of *Nice*, which is deemed ſuch, define not for *adoration* of *Images*, then it is not *rejected* by us; and if it do *define* for it, then was it *rejected* by *Frankfort*, and if ſo, then was it no *General Council*. The *Dilemma* is concludent herein without any farther *inquiries*, either it is not *rejected* by us at all, as teaching no more than we profeſs to acknowledge, or elſe it may be lawfully *rejected* by us, becauſe we have this evidence on *our ſides* from the *oppoſitions* of the CCC. *Fathers* at *Frankfort*, and of many more, as hath been ſaid, that it was not *Univerſal*.

[1] *Vide* Caſſ. p. 977. *Epiſtolam* Gregorii *ad Sereum adducit* Carolus l. 2. c. 23. *Cujus hoc eſt argumentum. Imagines à B. Gregorio Romanæ Urbis Antiſtite & adorari prohibentur & frangi. Vide* Greg. *Ep. ex. Reg. Ep.* 9. *Quia eas adorari vetuiſſet, laudamus, fregiſſe verò reprehendimus.* And, *Frangi non debuit, quod non ad adorandum.*

SECT. XI.

Of the Eighth General Council.

1. AS to the *Eighth* and *laſt* of that number, to which the *Pope's profeſſion* extends, I deſire the *Reader* will paſs his judgment of it, by that which he will find in the [k] *Sixth Seſſion* of the *Council* of *Florence* in the year of *Chriſt*, MCCCCXXXIX.

[k] *Concil. Tom.* 8. p. 598.

2. There in the paſſages between *Marcus Epheſius*, and *Julian* the *Cardinal* about the *Ancient Councils*, the *Cardinal* deſired a ſight of the *Acts* of the VIII. *Council*, and complains that the *Book* was denied him. *Marcus* anſwers that it was not *eaſie for him to give him the Book*, but if it were, there [l] *was no neceſſity that they ſhould number among the Oecumenical Councils one that was* [m] *not approved, but rather reprobated, or annull'd*; for this *Synod*, ſaid he, *had Acts againſt Photius, in time of Pope John and Pope Adrian*, and after it there was another *Synod* [n] which reſtored *Photius*, and *annull'd* that former *Synod*; that this *Synod* called alſo the *Eighth*, was under *Pope John*, who wrote *Epiſtles for Photius*, and thoſe ſtill *extant* that they (the *Romans*) were not *ignorant* (he believed) either of *that Synod* or of *thoſe Epiſtles*: And ſeeing [o] *the Acts of that Synod were abrogated*, it was not reaſonable that they ſhould ſeek for it, but rather for that which was after it, which from that time to this very *day*, (of the *Florentine meeting*) was read in the *great Church of Conſtantinople*, in theſe words, *Let all that hath been written or ſpoken againſt the holy Patriarchs, Photius, or Ignatius be anathema.* Wherefore, ſaith he, it is not fit that thoſe, [p] *Acts which were abrogated, ſhould be produced.*

[l] Οὐκ ἔχομεν ἀνάλυτα ἵνα συναριθμῶμεν ἢ οἰκουμενικαῖς συνόδοις ἄλλην συνόδον ἥτις οὐδὲ ἀσύγχυτος (it ſhould be, I ſuppoſe, ἐστὶ σύγχυτος) ὅλως ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον ἀκυρωθεῖσα. Ib.

[m] So *Jeremias* Patriarch of *Conſtantinople* in his cenſure of the *Germans*, ſtill mentions but the *ſeven* General Councils, ſee p. 6. *Ex ſanctis & univerſalibus ſeptem Synodis*, &c. and p. 13. *Nicana, & Conſtantinopolitana, reliquæ etiam Univerſales quinque Synodi*——

[n] Ἀνωθῶσι τὸν Φώτιον, καὶ ἀκυρῶσι τὴν πρώτην συνόδον. Ibid.

[o] Ἠκυρώθησαν τὰ τῆς συνόδου ἐκείνης.

[p] Ἅπερ ἀνέλεγκτα οὐδὲ πρέπει ἵνα ἔλθωσιν εἰς τὸ μέσον.

3. To this full *Declaration* and recognition of *Marcus*, appealing to the *Romaniſts* own *knowledge* for the truth of it, the *Cardinal*'s anſwer is very *ſhort*, in theſe words, *I will*, ſaith he, *free you from this fear that any thing ſhall be read from the VIII. Council: We deſire that the Book which we demanded may be brought, that we may conſult ſome paſſages out of the VI. and VII. Council, and of* [q] *the VIII, We ſay nothing.*

[q] Περὶ τῆς ὀγδόης οὐδὲν λέγομεν.

4. Here 'tis evident, 1. That the *VIII. Synod* was ſoon *retracted* again: and ſo not *univerſally received*, or *approved*: 2. That the *Greek Church* from that time to the *Council* of *Florence*, *i. e.* for the ſpace of almoſt DC. *years*, received it not, but the *contrary*, *viz.* that which *abrogated* it. 3. That this being vouched in a *Council* to the *Romans*, could not in any part be *denied* by them, and therefore the matter was wholly *waved* if not *confeſt*. And then ſure I need ſay no more concerning the *no-authority* or *obligingneſs* of that *Council*.

5. But then to this I ſhall add, that this *Council* being convened on purpoſe for the *cenſuring* and depriving of *Photius Patriarch* of *Conſtantinople*, not for any *heretical departure* from the *Faith*, ſo much as *pretended* againſt him, but for ſome other (as they are called) *exceſſes*, of which his *enemies* deemed him guilty, eſpecially becauſe from a *Senatour*, and ſo a *Lay-man*, he was [r] *immediately* advanced to that *Patriarchate* (though very much againſt his *will*, as his *Epiſtles* ſufficiently teſtifie) the *Faith* of *Chriſt* is little concerned in the *Decrees* of this *Council*, here being no *teſtimony* of the *Church* to be found either for or againſt any *Doctrine* pretended to be *derived* from the *Apoſtles*.

[r] *Vide* Anaſtaſii *Hiſtor. VIII. Synodi, Concil. Tom.* 6. p. 706.

6. The arguments which *Anaſtaſius Bibliothecarius* offers for the proving the *Univerſality* of this *Council*, where, as he ſaith, he was *preſent*, will hardly prevail with any.

7. *Firſt*, ſaith he, 'tis *Univerſal*, becauſe the *Catholick Faith and holy Laws, which ought to be reverenced not onely by all Prieſts, but by all Chriſtians, were in it uniformly defended againſt the enemies thereof*: which if it had any force in it, then ſure every *Orthodox Aſſembly*, were it never ſo *particular*, a *Provincial Synod* of the *Biſhops* of any *one Province*, or a *Dioceſan* of the *one Biſhop* and *Presbyters* of that *Dioceſe*, as long as they be in the right, or are by the *Romaniſt* ſuppoſed to be ſo, (as indeed that VIII. *Council* † profeſſeth to

† Τὰς ἐν τῇ Καθολικῇ καὶ Ἀποστολικῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ παραδοθέντας θεσμοὺς ὄφελόν τι ὑπὲρ ἀγίων καὶ πανσεβάσμων Ἀποστόλων, ὄφελόν τι ὁρθοδόξων συνόδων οἰκουμενικῶν τι καὶ τοπικῶν, ἃ καὶ ἐκεῖς πᾶς ὁ θεοφόρος παρὼν, διδασκάλια τῆς ἐκκλησίας, πρεσβεύειν καὶ φυλάττειν ὁμολογοῦμεν. *Act.* 10. *Can.* 1. *Concil. Tom.* 7. p. 977.

retain

retain and obſerve the *Laws* delivered in the *Catholick* and *Apoſtolick Church*, not onely from the *Apoſtles and all Orthodox Councils both Oecumenical and Provincial, or Topical*, but even *from any divinely ſpeaking Father, Doctour of the Church)* muſt paſs for a *General* and *Oecumenical Aſſembly*, juſt by the ſame *Logick*, that the *particular Church of Rome* doth paſs with them for the *whole Catholick Church of Chriſt*.

8. *Secondly*, ſaith he, *'Tis an Univerſal Council, becauſe ſeeing Chriſt hath in the Church placed as many Patriarchal Sees, as there are ſenſes in man's body, if all thoſe conſent, there wants no more to the Generality of the Church, than there wants to the motion of the body, when all the five ſenſes are intire in it.*

9. To which I *anſwer*, 1. That if this were true, then the *ſecond Council of Epheſus was a valid General Council*, for there were [t] *perſonally* the *Patriarchs* of *four Sees*, and *Julian* as *proxy* of the *fifth*. 2. It muſt then follow that a *Synod* of *five* men (for ſuch are the V. *Patriarchs)* to which no *ſixth* perſon in the world was ever ſo much as *invited* or *ſummoned*, may go for an *aſſembly* of the *whole world*. 3. That when one of the *five Patriarchs* was here depoſed, and never conſented to his own *depoſition*, 'twill be very hard to find the conſent of theſe *five Patriarchs* to all the *Acts* of this *Council*, and conſequently to defend the *perfection* of it from the forementioned *analogy* with that of the *body* of man, unleſs when one of the *five ſenſes* is ſhut out by the other *four*, the remaining *four* be either ſufficient to *repreſent* the *fifth* alſo, which is *caſt* out (and never *conſents* to this Law of *repreſentation)* or to *ſubſtitute* another ſenſe in the place of that *fifth*. 4. That this ſame Authour in his very *next* period tells us, that ſoon after the *exaltation* of this *Photius*, *Solomon* alſo a *Lay-man* was made *Patriarch* of *Jeruſalem*, and then it is no-way probable, that this *Solomon*, or whatſoever other *Biſhop* of that See, which was another of theſe *five ſenſes*, ſhould ever conſent to thoſe *Canons*, which are ſo contrary to that *practice*, and muſt infer the *depoſing* of that *Solomon*, as well as it did of *Photius*.

[t] *Concil. Tom.* 3. p. 61.

10. The truth is, in the *ſubſcriptions* of the ſeventh *Act*, there is no name of any of the *five Patriarchs*, ſave onely of *Pope Adrian*, and the *Archbiſhop* of *Perga* in the name and ſtead of *Ignatius* the *depoſed*, but now by this *Council* reſtored *Patriarch* of *Conſtantinople*. And though in the tenth *Action* we now have the names of *Proxies* to all the reſt of the *Patriarchies*; yet ſure ſomewhat there was in it, that after the naming of them and the *Emperour's Proxy*, *Binius* [v] thinks neceſſary to inſert an *Annotation*, leſt, as he ſaith, the *Reader obſerving the paucity of ſubſcribers ſhould be ſcandalized* at it, and therefore by way of *prevention* he offers an account of it from the *multitude of Photius's favourers*, who, he confeſſeth, were *all excluded from this Council*, and ſo the [x] *Subſcribers fit to be compared to Chriſt's little flock*, which ſure is a competent *prejudice* to the *univerſality* of it.

[v] *Concil. Tom.* 6. p. 853.

[x] *Hac paucitas gregi illi pro ſua juſtitia comparatur cui Dominus dicit, nolite timere puſillus grex.* Ibid.

11. And ſo likewiſe *Anaſtaſius*'s ſage obſervation by which he backs his *argument* in that place, *viz.* That of the *five Senſes* the *Biſhop* of *Rome* is proportionable to *Viſus* the *Sight*, which [y] hath, ſaith he, the *preeminence of all the other Senſes, being acuter than they, and having communion with all as none of the reſt have*] is a ſhrewd intimation of his ſenſe, that it was the [z] *Single authority* of the *Pope*, that both condemn'd *Photius*, and gave the whole *Univerſality* to this *Council*, and then we have a very fair account of a *General Council*, rendred ſuch by the bare *virtue* of *one perſon* therein, and then I doubt not good ſtore of *Univerſal Councils* may be found in the world, even as many as there have ever been *Aſſemblies* or *Conclaves*, wherein *Viſus*, the moſt *eminent Senſe*, *i. e.* the *Pope* hath had any efficacious *influence* by himſelf, or his *proxy*.

[y] *Profecto cunctis ſenſibus præeminet, acutior illis exiſtens, & communionem, ſicut nullus eorum, cum omnibus habens.*

[z] See *Solocovius's Annot.* on *Jeremias* Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, p. 10. *In octavo Concilio evidentius quam in aliis omnibus declaratum eſt quam poteſtatem & autoritatem Rom. Pontifex in Patriarchas Conſtantin. haberet, cum in ipſa earundem urbe Conſtantinopoli, 383. collectis Epiſcopis Adrianus Rom. Pontifex Nicolai* 1. *ſucceſſor, per legatos ſuos, reſiſtentibus primùm & reclamantibus Imperatoribus & quaſi pœnitentiam agentibus, ipſiuſque facti authoribus Photium—— dejecit, &c.*

12. To which purpoſe it may deſerve here to be remembred what *type* or *Copy* of *celebrating* a *Council* the *learned Cardinal Baronius* conceives himſelf to have found in the *New Teſtament* (and [a] requires the Reader of *Annals* to *ſtop and take notice of it, as of a thing moſt worthy of his obſervation.)* Such as wherein [b] S. *Peter* (and from his *example* the *Biſhop* of *Rome* his ſucceſſour) in a cauſe of the *greateſt moment*, ſo *delivers his opinion, that he defines the matter in debate, and teaches and decrees what all muſt think, and conſtitutes a Canon or Rule of Faith which muſt remain for ever, ſo that, as he ſaith, there is almoſt no need to conſult the reſt of the Apoſtles, or ask their ſentiments or opinions, it being ſufficient for Chriſt, that Peter ſpake, and determined what was to be reſolved in point of Faith.*

[a] *An.* 33. *n.* 17. *Hic pedem ſiſtat atque paulum attendat diligens lector rem animadverſione dignißimam.*

[b] *Petrus talem ſert ſententiam, ut cauſam ipſe definiat, & quid ab omnibus ſentiendum eſſet, erudiat atque decernat, ac fidei canonem perpetuo permanſurum conſtituat, ut nihil fermè jam eſſet opus conſulere cæteros tunc Apoſtolos, ac rogare quænam eſſent aliorum de ea re ſententia ac opiniones. Idcirco enim ſatis fuit Chriſto, Petrum fuiſſe locutum, ac quid de fide ſentiendum eſſet, clavum finiſſe.*

13. Here indeed is a fair *foundation* laid of a moſt *Magnificent Structure*, S. *Peter*'s privilege in a *Council* of all the *Apoſtles*, *Ut Sententiam ipſe definiat*; *that he*, without *conſulting* of any *other*, *ſhould give the definitive Sentence*.

14. Onely it was a little unhappy, That *Chriſt* himſelf ſhould be *preſent* there, and one of the *interlocutours* in this *Council* (if ſuch it were) for it is he that *propoſeth* the *queſtion* which *Peter anſwers*, and if in the one 'twere a *type* of *celebrating a Council*, ſo 'twas in the *other* alſo, and then here were *two conciliar Offices*, the one of *propoſing* doubts in *Councils*, the other of *anſwering* them; the *firſt* belonging to *Chriſt*, the *ſecond* to S. *Peter*, and certainly the latter a place of more *eminence*.

15. 'Tis ſtrange, what *ſubmiſſions learned* men are forced to, that are reſolved to *ſerve their Hypotheſis*. I ſhall onely demand why the very next *parcel* of *diſcourſe* betwixt *Chriſt* and his *Diſciples*, wherein again S. *Peter* was the *onely ſpeaker*, v. 21, 22, 23. of this *Chapter*, *Matt.* 16. was not as ſignal a *type* of *celebrating* a *Council*, as the *former*? And yet there, in two very *eminent branches* of the *Chriſtian Faith* the *Paſſion* and *Reſurrection* of *Chriſt*, the ſame S. *Peter*, whoſe *ſucceſſour* the *Pope* pretends to be, *differed* in opinion from *Chriſt* himſelf, *took him and began to rebuke him*, and ſure delivered a very *uncatholick ſentence*, no other than the *denial of both of thoſe grand Articles*, not onely in words of *averſion*, which are not *enunciative*, the

[*Far*

[*Far be it from thee Lord,*] but even in plain form of *definition* or *decree*, ἃ μὴ ἔστω σοὶ τοῦτο, *This ſhall not be unto thee.*

16. What *Chriſt* there *returns* unto him, that he was an *offence unto him*, and *ſavoured not the things of God*, but *thoſe that were of men*, may well ſerve for *concluſion* of this matter, that in an *Aſſembly* where *Chriſt* himſelf was *preſent*, S. *Peter*, and ſo his pretended *ſucceſſour*, may, if he be not very carefull to adhere to the word of *Chriſt*, fall into *errour* alſo, but is not in any reaſon then to be deemed the *repreſentative* of the *whole Church.*

17. This *inſtitution* of *Councils* in the *Church* of *Chriſt*, the great [c] *Cardinal* had ſo *fanſied*, that afterward he refers the *original* of them not to the *Apoſtles Synod* at *Jeruſalem*; but, by all means, to this of *Chriſt*, asking his *Diſciples*, *Whom ſay men that I am?* Onely the *unhappineſs* of it was, he had there *forgotten* the *principal* thing, which had recommended this *pattern* unto him, S. *Peter*'s peculiar *privilege*, *Ut ſententiam ipſe definiat*, for there he is pleaſed to *reſolve* on another form, *viz.* [d] That *every Father*'s Suffrage *ſhould be asked*, and the *decree made in an holy and Canonical manner*, by *the common votes of all*, and not onely of S. *Peter*; which I ſhould hope, *concludes* it his *opinion*, that the former *courſe* of *definiat ipſe*] was neither *legal*, nor *holy.*

[c] *An.* 58. *n.* 119. *Si quis ejus rei ipſum exordium repetat, inveniet non tam ab Apoſtolis, quam ab ipſo Chriſto duxiſſe principium, atque ſumpſiſſe authoritatem, quando ſcilicet, &c.*

[d] *In unum Patres coirent, ſicque ſimul collectis, ſingulorum ſententia rogaretur, ac denique quod ab omnibus ſervandum eſſet, ſanctè ac legitimè communibus ſuffragiis firmaretur.* Ibid.

18. His *third argument* for the *univerſality of this Council*, is becauſe * *Seeing Photius had by his ſo many exceſſes blotted the univerſal Church, an univerſal cure was uſed, that all might be cured where all was blemiſhed.* But ſure there is little force in this *argument*, which renders a *reaſon*, *why* it *was* ſo; but doth not offer at any *evidence*, that ſo it was; and is founded in a *ſuppoſition* that the *cure* (as the *diſeaſe*) was *univerſal*, which was the thing he ſhould have *proved.* And even for the *univerſality* of the *diſeaſe* we have here no farther offer of *proof*, but onely that ſoon after *Photius*'s *aſcending* from the *Senate* to the *Patriarchate*, one *Solomon* a *Laick* was made *Biſhop* of *Jeruſalem.* And ſome *Laicks* at *Conſtantinople* lived *vertuous lives*; onely, as he will have it ſuppoſed, *that thereby they might aſpire to the Patriarchate*: Both which might be allowed to be true, and yet this *eighth Council* of CII. *Biſhops* be far from being thereby concluded to have been a *General Council.*

* *Cum Photius tot exceſſuum ſuorum morbo univerſalem Eccleſiam maculaverit, univerſalis curatio adhibita eſt, ut totum curaretur quod totum fuerat maculatum. Concil. Tom.* 6. p. 706.

19. The ſhort is, *Anaſtaſius Bibliothecarius*, who was, as he ſaith, preſent at this *Council*, and ſo may be allowed to have *kindneſs* to it, doth alſo *dedicate* his *Hiſtory* of it to *Pope Adrian*, who was the *principal Actour* in it, and a bitter enemy to *Photius.* And then his *authority* in this matter will be of as little weight, as his *arguments* have appeared to be, even no more than a *teſtimony* given to an *intereſſed* perſon by a very *partial friend*, and *party.*

20. If there were force in ſuch *witneſſes*, there would be as much credit due to *Photius* himſelf, *Epiſt.* 117. deſiring *Theodoſius* [f] not to wonder that *profane perſons ſit ſuperciliouſly in judicature, and the illuſtrious High Prieſts of God are convented before them, that they judge who are themſelves condemned* (for ſo was *Ignatius* the *depoſed*, but now *reſtored Patriarch*) but that [g] the *innocent were judg'd being incompaſt with Swords, leſt they ſhould dare offer to ſpeak any thing in their own defence*, giving him *ancient examples* of the like *judicatures*, that of *Annas and Caiaphas and Pilate and the Sanhedrim*, by whom Chriſt was condemned; and ſo alſo *Stephen* and *James* the *Biſhops* of *Jeruſalem*, and *Paul.* And ſo in many other paſſages of his *Epiſtles*, which demonſtrate him to have been *another* manner of man, than *Baronius*, *An.* 871. *n.* 24. *pretends* him.

[f] Τί θαυμάζεις, εἰ σεμνόθηλο μὲ ἐξωφρυώμενον τὸ ἀνίερον, παίσαντο δὲ τῶ Ἀγγελρίων διὰ τὸ σπιθῆναι, καὶ κείσθαι μὲ ἐλέγελο τὸ κατέχειν;

[g] Κατεδικάζετο ξίφεσι πεπεδημένος, ὑπὲρ τοῦ μηδὲ φωνὴν ἀφεῖναι, τὸ ἀνδιθιον.

21. But I need not ſuch *fallible teſtimonies* as theſe, to confirm the point in hand, That one of *Marcus* in the *Council* of *Florence*, conteſted to *Cardinal Julian*, and not denied by him, is *ſufficient.*

22. And it was but *neceſſary wiſedom* in *Binius* (that knew it well, and could not but diſcern what a *juſt prejudice* it was to the *Univerſal reception* of this *Council*) that he purpoſely *omitted* to give us any ſtory of that *Council*, as of others he accuſtomed to do, diſcreetly deſigning *Anaſtaſius*'s *Preface* to *Pope Adrian*, to *ſupply*, as he [h] ſaith, the place of it. For as *Anaſtaſius* would not probably *reveal* this *ſecret*, nor could *foreſee* what *Marcus* would ſay in the *Council* of *Florence*; ſo *Binius* that publiſhed one as well as the other, could neither be ignorant, nor yet with any *ſafety* take notice of it, there being no poſſible way left but this of *ſilence*, to ſalve this *Objection*, or ſupport the *reputation* or *univerſality* of that *Council*, which was ſo nearly concerned in it.

[h] *Non proponitur; ut in aliis factum, hiſtoria VIII. Concil. quod eam Anaſtaſii Præfatio complectatur. Concil. Tom.* 6. p. 602.

SECT. XII.

Of the reſt of the Councils which the Romaniſts call General; particularly that of Trent.

1. I Shall not now, as I ſaid, need to *deſcend* to a view of the other *Councils* by the *Romaniſts* ſtyled *Oecumenical*, or defend our *practice* in not *accepting* them as ſuch. And that for theſe few, among many, reaſons;

2. Firſt, Becauſe, as we ſaid, the *Pope's profeſſion*, which muſt in reaſon be ſuppoſed to *extend* to the *whole Faith*, to *every* part of *Apoſtolical Tradition*, duly *teſtified*; yet doth not extend to *all* theſe, or to any more than *Eight* of them.

3. Secondly, Becauſe thoſe parts of them, which agree not with their *pretenſions*, are freely and *Univerſally* diſallowed by them, as is notorious by the *inſtances* of the *Council* of *Conſtance*, and of *Baſil* (and even of the *fourth* great *Council*, that of *Chalcedon*) each ſtyled in their *Collections Oecumenical Councils*, and yet each *ex parte reprobatum, in part rejected and reprobated*; and then why may not the Greek *Church* by the ſame *law* reject the *Council* of *Florence*, and both the *Gallican Church*, and ours, the *Council* of *Trent*, if we find it not a faithfull reporter of *Tradition Apoſtolical?*

4. Third-

4. Thirdly, Becauſe when ever any *Council* hath by them been thought to fail, they have made no ſcruple to affirm it was not a *lawfull Council.*

5. Thus we know it was in that at *Ariminum*, where, as [i] St. *Hierome* ſaith, the *whole world almoſt admired to ſee it ſelf become Arian*, and yet this I hope hath no *authority* with them.

[i] *Dial. cont. Lucif.*

6. So likewiſe the II. *Council* of *Epheſus*, though it were *General*, though *honoured* with the *preſence* of all the [k] *five Patriarchs*, *four* in perſon, the *fifth* by his *Proxie*, and [l] pertinaciouſly maintain'd by the *Emperour Theodoſius*: yet becauſe it confirmed *Eutyches*'s *Doctrine*, it is juſtly *rejected* by them.

[k] *Vide Act. 1. Concil. 1. Chalced. Concil. Tom. 3. p. 61.*

[l] Ὁ Λ Θεοδόσιος ἀντέγραψεν αὐτῷ (*Imperatori Valentiniano*) λέγων, ὅτι ὁ παῖς ἄλλως σύνοδον, καλῶς γὰρ ἔλεγεν ὁ Διόσκορος. Leontius *de Sect.* πρεξ. p. 511. A.

7. And then why may not the ſame reaſon hold for us, and *authorize* our queſtioning the *Legitimacy* of thoſe *Councils*, whoſe *Decrees* with reaſon we allow not? nor diſcern any *teſtimony* of the truth of their *Doctrine*, or *delivery* from the *Apoſtles.*

8. Fourthly, Becauſe in the *Council of Trent* the *Popes* themſelves, as many as lived in the time thereof, would never conſent, though it were earneſtly deſired of them, that that *Council* ſhould be affirmed to *repreſent the Univerſal Church*; foreſeeing prudently, that if that were granted, (as in the *Council* of *Conſtance* it was, to the *Popes* coſt) the *Council*, being the *whole*, would put off its *ſubjection*, and depend no longer on him that was but a *part* of it. From whence I conceive this *Dilemma* muſt have *irreſiſtible* force in it, *Ad hominem*, being produced to a *Romaniſt.*

9. Either the *General Council* before the *Papal confirmation* is the *repreſentative* of the *whole Church*, or it is *not*: If it be the *repreſentative* of the *whole*, then it needs not the *confirmation* of the *Pope* to render it, what it was *before.* And again, whenſoever the *Pope* hath refuſed to *confirm* the *Decrees* of any ſuch, I muſt in *charity* to him ſuppoſe that thoſe *Decrees* have been *erroneous*, and as ſuch *repudiated* by him, and then the *univerſal Church repreſentative* may err. And then who can have any *ſecurity* in *believing* or *relying* on it?

10. But if it be *not* the *repreſentative* of the *whole Church*, then is not the *teſtimony* of an *Oecumenical Council* the *teſtimony* of the *whole Church*, nor conſequently *qualified* for any *belief* upon that ſcore of *univerſality.*

11. Having given the *Romaniſt* this account, which he hath obliged himſelf not to *diſlike*, of our not *obliging* our ſelves to the *belief* of all thoſe *Councils*, which he calls *General*, I ſhall not need add, what hath been ſo fully done by others, the many *eminent nullities* of ſome of them, eſpecially of that of *Trent*, which is moſt *magiſterially* impoſed upon us.

12. The matter is clear, There can be no *colour* of *pretence* that that was an *Oecumenical Council.* It had not ſure, at the *time*, that *integrity* of the *five Senſes*, which *Anaſtaſius* told us of, nor yet after it was promulgate, the *approbation* and *reception* of the *whole Chriſtian World*, not of the *Eaſtern Church*, nor in the *Weſt*, of the *Gallicane* and *Britannick*, and many others. And then how can it be any *univerſal* teſtifier of *Apoſtolick tradition*, or in any other capacity bind all to the *imbracing* of it?

13. This therefore is the *one* (but that very *ſufficient*) *prejudice* to a *Council* pretending to deliver to us *Apoſtolick traditions* and *matters of faith*, and exacting them to be received as ſuch, that it is not indeed what it pretends to be, an *univerſal Council*; and conſequently that it is not duly qualified, by *Vincentius* his rules, to give a *valid teſtimony* of *matters* of *Faith*, or *Doctrines* truly *Chriſtian.* To which it is but *proportionable* and *regular* that we that *imbrace*, and uniformly accept all *Apoſtolical tradition*, ſufficiently, *i. e. univerſally teſtified* to be ſuch, do not think our ſelves obliged to *receive* that, which is not thus *teſtified.*

14. If therefore, as hath hitherto appeared, *Hereſie* be to be thus defined by the *oppoſition* to the *Faith of Chriſt*, ſufficiently *revealed* and *teſtified* to us, if *univerſality* be one *qualification* of the *teſtifier*, and if the *Romaniſts Oecumenical Councils* do evidently fail of that *univerſality*, then cannot our *non-reception* of all their *Councils* thus evidenced not to be *univerſal*, or of thoſe their *Doctrines* which have no other ſurer *Baſis*, than that of the *definitions* of thoſe *Councils*, be any way competent to charge or affix the note of *Hereſie* upon us.

15. Nay on the *contrary*, we that never *disbelieved* any word of *God*, *written* or *unwritten* (by any means made *known* to us to be ſuch) particularly never *queſtioned* any *voice* or *teſtimony* of the *whole Church* concerning ſuch word, but are ready to believe that to be *Apoſtolical*, which ſhall be to us *univerſally* teſtified to come from the *Apoſtles*, and perſwade our ſelves that *God* will never *permit* any ſuch *univerſal Teſtimony* concerning the *Faith* to *conſpire* in conveying *errour* to us, and upon the *ſtrength* of that *perſwaſion*, as we have never yet *oppoſed* any *univerſal council*, nor other voice of the *whole Church*, ſuch as by the *Catholick Rules* can be *conteſted* to be ſuch, ſo for the *future* we profeſs never to do, are by our *grounds* thus far ſecured from all *Heretical pravity*, that unleſs we deſtroy in the *retail* what we have built in the *groſs*, and untill we ſhall be proved, by the *particular view* of our *doctrines*, to have thus failed in ſome *particulars*, we cannot with any *juſtice*, or without great *uncharitableneſs* be accuſed of it.

SECT. XIII.

Of the inerrability of a General Council. That it is no matter of faith.

1. OF the *laſt* part of this our *profeſſion*, it is now meet, that I add ſome few words, *viz.* what our *opinion* is of the *inerrability* of a *General Council*, truly ſo called, and *qualified* as hath been formerly *deſcribed.*

2. And 1. we have learn'd to diſtinguiſh between *Theological verity*, and *Catholick Faith*: ſome things we believe to be true, which yet pretend not to be any part of that *neceſſary Fundamental doctrine*, which *was once delivered unto the Saints*, but are offered to our belief upon grounds of *reaſon*, which, *Suppoſitâ fide*,

carry great weight of *probability* with them, for which yet we neither have, nor pretend any *Divine revelation*. And ſuch, I conceive, this *propoſition* to be, [*A General Council, cannot or ſhall not err.*] For that this is no where either *affirmed* by the *word* of *God written*, or *unwritten*, or regularly *deduced* from thence, may eaſily appear by a view of the very *few places*, which are by the *Romaniſt* pretended to *conclude* it.

3. *Firſt*, thoſe *words* of *Chriſt* are pretended for it, *Matth.* 18. 20. *Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there I will be in the midſt of them.*]. But 1. thoſe words do not in any *peculiarity* belong to *Councils* convened to *define*, but more *generally* to any *Aſſemblies* that come *together* to *hear* or *pray* to *God*, or more particularly in that place, to *excommunicate* an *offender*. 2. If they belong to *Councils*, they would equally belong to the moſt *particular*, as to the moſt *Oecumenical Council*; for none can be more diſtant from *Catholick*, than that where no more than *two or three are met together*. 3. That Text belongs onely to thoſe *Aſſemblies*, which are truly *convened* in *God's* Name, with hearts ſincerely bent to the *honouring* of him; whereas many *aſſemblies* among men have been, and ſtill may be convened with *mixtures* of *worldly* and *carnal* intereſt, and then no part of the promiſed *preſence* belongs to them. 4. *Chriſt* may by his *power* and *illumination*, and even *directive grace* be *preſent*, and in *the midſt* of thoſe, who yet through the *corruption*, and *blindneſs*, and *obſtinacy* of their own *hearts*, do not make *uſe* of his *guidance* to the finding out of truth, but oft reſiſt the *conviction* and light which is offered them by *Chriſt*. And ſo there is not the leaſt colour of force in that *argument*.

4. *Secondly*, That place is produced of *John* 16. 3. That *when the Spirit of truth is come he will guide them into all truth*, and again, that *he ſhall abide with them for ever*. But neither hath that any *propriety* to *General*, or indeed to any kind of *Councils*. Every particular *Chriſtian*, ſince the *deſcent* of the *Holy Ghoſt* is as much rendred *infallible* by theſe *Texts*, as any the moſt numerous *Aſſembly*; for to each of thoſe this *promiſe* made to the *Apoſtles* is as regularly *appliable*, as to *any* of theſe. And the matter is notorious, that before there was ever any *Oecumenical Council* in the world, the *Church of God* was *led into all truth*: The greateſt *foundations* of *Faith* being by the *Apoſtles* preaching, from the very *firſt* plantation, long before the *Council* of *Nice*, *depoſited* in every *Church*.

5. *Thirdly*, They produce the *form* of the *Conciliar Decretal Epiſtle*, Acts 15. 28. *It ſeemed good to the Holy Ghoſt and to us.* But that can be of no force in this matter: 1. Becauſe the *Apoſtles*, that certainly did not *err*, and were ſo *Aſſiſted* by the *Spirit*, that they ſhould not *err* in the diſcharge of their *office Apoſtolical*, can be no *preſident* to every, or *any* other *humane Aſſembly*. 2. Becauſe this *Decree* of theirs belonging to matters of *practice*, not of *belief*, that form of it can no farther be *imitable* to other *Councils*, than that in *like* matters of *practice*, ſuch are *rites* and *ceremonies* and *uſages* in a *Church*, they aſſume *authority* of *defining*, and *commanding*, and deem that backt by the *Holy Ghoſt*, who hath given them their *authority*, but in matters of *Faith* they muſt have nothing from *themſelves*. And accordingly this hath been the *practice* in the *Church*, as hath [m] formerly appeared from [n] *Athanaſius*, to prefix to their *Canons* of *Order* and *Rites* this form [*Viſum eſt*] *It ſeemed good to us*, or ἔδοξε τὰ ὑποτεταγμένα, *theſe things ſeemed good to us*; but for matters of *Faith*, ὅτως πιστεύει ἡ Κ. Θεολικὴ ἐκκλησία, ſo the *Catholick Church believes*; neither inſerting mention of their *own* judgment, nor yet pretending to any other *Revelation* from the *Holy Ghoſt*, than what was from the *beginning* found to have been in the *Church*. To which purpoſe alſo was, I ſuppoſe, the *ſecond Verſicle* in the *Doxology* (the *Orthodoxal form* of acknowledging the *Trinity*) *Sicut erat in principio, As it was in the beginning*, as it ſtood by *Original Tradition Apoſtolical*, is *now and ever ſhall be world without end*. No *new Doctrine* ever to be brought into the *Church* by whatſoever *Council*, but onely that which the *Apoſtles* had *delivered*.

m Sect. 9. n. 10.
n de Syn. p. 873.

6. *Fourthly*, Some places they bring, and apply to *Councils*, which the *Scripture* delivers onely of the *Church* in general, as, that the *Gates of Hell ſhall not prevail againſt it*, — which can no-way belong to this matter, unleſs all the *members* of the *Church* were met together in that *Council*; for if there be any left out, why may not the *promiſe* be good in them, though the *gates of hell* ſhould be affirmed to *prevail* againſt the *Council?* The firſt *Nicene* was by the acknowledgment of all an *Oecumenical Council*, yet was not the *whole Church of God* convened in that *Aſſembly*. In caſe all the cccxviii *Biſhops* which were there aſſembled, had in one minute been taken up to *Heaven*, or by any violence of the *Arian* party maſſacred; could it with any truth be ſaid, that the *whole Church of God* had then been *deſtroyed?* Infallibly it could not; and no more could it be ſaid, in caſe a *major* part of them had *agreed* in any errour, that the πύλαι ᾅδου, the *power* or *gates of hell*, or *death*, or *deſtruction* had prevailed againſt them; becauſe, as it is clear, there were many *thouſands* of *Biſhops* and *Presbyters*, many *Millions* of *Brethren* or *believing Chriſtians*, without the *walls* of that *Council*, which had not been involved in that *errour*. And indeed the very ſuppoſal, that the *Council* aſſembled repreſents the *Church diffuſive*, and was never intruſted by them to define any *errour* at their *convention*, is an *evidence* that there is *without* the doors of that *Council* an *univerſal*, which thoſe *few* there preſent were deſigned to *repreſent*. And thoſe that have given their *Proxies* for certain uſes, are not imagined ſo to have put their *lives* or *ſouls* in the hands of thoſe *Proxies*, as that by the *death* of the *Proxies* they ſhall be ſuppoſed to *die* alſo.

7. And as there is no *evidence* from the *written* word of *God* whereon this may be grounded, as a *matter* of *Faith*, that a *General Council* cannot *err*, ſo neither is there any part of the *Apoſtles Depoſitum* intruſted to the *Church*, from which the *Concluſion* can with any ſemblance of *reaſon* be inferred, or that is by any *Romaniſt*, that I know of, made uſe of to that purpoſe.

8. The main thing that is pretended, is the *Conciliar practice* and *cuſtome* of annexing *Anathema's* to their *definitions*, which it were not reaſonable for them to do, if they did not verily believe their *definitions*, were *infallibly* true. But to this the *anſwer* is obvious, 1, That they may think themſelves *infallible* which are not, and ſo their *own belief* is not *argumentative*. 2. That they that knowing themſelves *fallible*, do yet perſwade themſelves that they have ſucceſsfully ſought out, and found the *truth* in ſome *particular*, may think it uſefull to *propagate* this *truth* to all their *flock*, and ſecure the peaceable *poſſeſſion* of that *doctrine* by *denunciation* of *Cenſures Eccleſiaſtical*; and, that is the meaning of *Anathema's*. 3. 'Tis ſuppoſeable, that in this, or that *doctrine*, the *Council* hath had ſo clear a *diſcovery* (*viz.* from the *uniform conſentient teſtimony* of all *Churches* with which they have *conſulted*) that they do find reaſon verily to *believe* that that particular *definition* is *tradition Apoſtolical*. And ſo in that they may define *dogmatically*, not from any

any opinion of their own *universal inerrableness*, but from a duly grounded *perswasion*, that for this time they are in the *right*. *Lastly*, It may well be noted as an *excess* in many *later Councils*, to be thus forward with their *Anathema's*, or to affix them to any other their *definitions*, but such as are undoubted branches of that *Apostolical doctrine*, which was *preached* to *all*, those δόγματα ἐυσεβείας in the *Apostles* 37 *Canon*, the *disbelief* whereof may *obstruct*, or hinder good *life here*, and *Salvation* hereafter.

SECT. XIV.

That it is one of the Piè credibilia, *That a General Council shall not err.*

1. THis then of the *inerrableness* of *General Councils* being thus far evidenced to be no matter of *Faith*, because not founded in any part of *Scripture*, or *Tradition* (nor consequently the contrary any matter of *Heresie*) the utmost that can be said of it, is, that it is a *Theological verity*, which may piously be *believed*.

2. And so I doubt not to pronounce of it, That if we consider *God's great*, and *wise*, and *constant providence*, and care over his *Church*, his desire that *all men should be saved*, and in order to that end, *come to the knowledge of all* necessary *truth*, his *promise* that he *will not suffer his faithfull* servants to *be tempted above what they are able*, nor permit *scandals*, and false teachers to prevail to the *seducing of the very elect*, his most *pious*, godly servants; If, I say, we consider these, and some other such like *general promises* of *Scripture*, wherein this *question* seems to be concern'd, we shall have reason to *believe*, that *God* will never suffer *all Christians* to fall into such a *temptation* as it must be, in case the *whole Church representative* should *err* in matters of *Faith*, by way of *Ellipsis* (define against, or *leave out* of their *Creed* any *Article* of that body of *Credenda*, which the *Apostles* delivered to the *Church*) and therein find *approbation*, and reception among all those *Bishops* and *Doctours* of the *Church* diffused, which were out of the *Council*.

3. And though in this case the *Church* might remain a *Church* (and so the *destructive gates of Hades* not *prevail against it*) and still retain all parts of the *Apostles Depositum* in the hearts of some faithfull *Christians*, which had no power in the *Council* to oppose the *Decree*, or out of it to *resist* the *general* approbation, yet still the *testimony* of such a *General Council* so received and approved, would be a very *strong* argument, and so a very *dangerous temptation* to every the most *meek* and *pious Christian*, and it is *piously to be believed*, though not *infallibly* certain (for who knows what the *provocations* of the *Christian world*, of the *Pastors*, or the *Flock*, may arrive to, like the *violence* of the *old world*, that brought down the *deluge* upon them?) that *God* will not permit his *Servants* to fall into that *temptation*.

SECT. XV.

A Recapitulation and Conclusion of this matter concerning Heresie.

1. 'TIS time now to draw to a *conclusion* of this whole matter; and from the *premisses* to complete and *abbreviate* that plea, which will, I doubt not, secure the *Church of England* from all colourable charge of *Heresie*: For that

2. *First*, It confestly receives the *whole* word of *Christ*, the intire *Canon* of the *New Testament*.

3. *Secondly*, It retains intire the *Symbol* of the *Apostolick Faith*, as that was delivered to the *Churches* in all the *Apostolick plantations*.

4. *Thirdly*, It understands both *Scripture* and *Creed*, according to that *Traditive interpretation*, which the first *Four*, or, if you will, *Six*, or indeed any of the *Oecumenical Councils*, truly so called, have discovered and declared to be the sense of all the *Apostolick Churches* in the world, and were *universally* received by *all Churches* in such their declaration.

5. *Fourthly*, That we never rejected any *Catholick Testimony* (offered in behalf of any *Doctrine*) nor *Council*, but such as even our *Enemies* grant, or evidence of the matter *proclaims*, not to have been *Oecumenical*.

6. *Fifthly*, That we do not believe that any *General Council*, truly such, ever did, or shall *err* in any matter of *Faith*, nor shall we farther dispute the *authority*, when we shall be duly satisfied of the *universality* of any such.

7. *Lastly*, That we are willing to proceed, and inlarge all this, from the *Church* collected in a *Council*, to the *Church* diffused, or the *principal Pastors* thereof, *out* of *Council*, and are ready to *receive*, and acknowledge as *doctrine* of *Faith* every proposition, which the *Fathers* that lived in any competent distance from the *Apostles*, do *uniformly*, or without any considerable dissent, deliver down to us, as the truths of *God*, *Traditions Apostolical*.

8. Herein I may not now fitly enlarge, by proceeding to a view and defence of all, or any such *particular doctrines*, nor indeed can I without the spirit of *Divination*, not knowing what one *doctrine*, denied by us, any *Romanist* will assume to assert upon these terms (contest by these measures of *universality*, *antiquity* and *consent*) to be *Apostolical Tradition*.

9. As for the *authority* of the *present Roman Church*, which is by them so much insisted on, as we cannot deem that *sufficient* to impose upon all *Christians* any new book of *Scripture*; so neither can we by force of any *Catholick* rules (such as *Vincentius* is confest to have furnisht us with *sufficiently*) receive from that sole *testimony* of theirs (which is but the testimony of *one* part, and of *one* age of the *Church*, and not of the *universal Church* of all *ages*) any part of *Christian doctrine*, though by them never so earnestly contested to be *Apostolical*.

10. The ſure way of *judging* aright in any particular debate, muſt be by *appealing* to the *Fountains*, *Apoſtolical*, *Original Doctrine*, and *Tradition*, and for that, to thoſe that are competent *teſtifiers* in the matter, to *Councils* univerſally received, or to ſuch other *teſtimony* as is truly *univerſal*. And as by this one teſt we profeſs to deal with every adverſary of the *Faith*, whom we ſhall dare thus to *accuſe*, and not to deem any perſon an *Heretick*, whom we cannot demonſtrate to be ſuch by this ſure [illegible], (and therefore are not forward to judge every *Romaniſt* to be ſuch, who maintains the *whole Faith*, and errs onely in his *Superaddition*) ſo we are moſt willing to ſubmit to this way of *judgment* our ſelves, and whatſoever we ſhall be convinced to be *diſagreeable* thereto, we ſhall moſt willingly and explicitly *renounce*, for the *glory* of *God*, and for the reſtoring of the *peace* of the *Church*, and do ſo already *implicitly*, by binding our ſelves to be *judged*, and concluded by theſe *Rules*, by unfeigned prayer to *God* for his light and guidance in his *path*; and by exacting of all *Chriſtians* in the world that *fraternal* debt of neceſſary *charity* to our ſouls, in admoniſhing us, either 1. What *particular* there is, maintained by our *Church*, which is not found to have *truth*: or 2. What *disbelieved*, which is able to approve it ſelf, being judged by *theſe Rules*: or 3. What is *defective* in theſe *Rules*, in order to our *judging* aright, what is by a *Chriſtian* to be believed, or imbraced as *de Fide*, and ſo as the *disbelieving* thereof will be chargeable upon him.

11. And if, after all this, and without the *charity* of any ſuch *admonition*, we ſhall ſtill by unrelenting *adverſaries* be cenſured and condemn'd, as *Hereticks*, (and upon that account caſt out as *refuſe-branches*, and *unchurched* members; and ſo that *unity* and *communion*, which *Chriſt* hath commanded to continue among his *Diſciples*, become *unattainable* by us] herein we complain of great *unkindneſs* and *injuſtice* in the *Church* of *Rome*, and in thoſe that joyn, and adhere to her in that *ſentence*, which by *Papal Bull* was long ſince ſent out againſt us; and upon theſe *premiſed* grounds we reſolve ſtill to retain that degree of *charity* to our moſt *implacable* enemies, as to pray for them, and to *admoniſh* them of the eminent danger of their *uncharitableneſs*, in caſe thoſe *hindrances* be not upon due judgment removed on their part, which obſtruct the *union* and *peace* of *Chriſtendom*. It being moſt unreaſonable that among them which *communicate* in every branch of the *one Apoſtolical Faith*, that ſacred band ſhould yet be violated, upon vain and empty *pretences* of *diverſities* of *opinion* or *uſages* in ſuch matters, which are far removed from the great foundation of *Apoſtolical doctrines*, and *practices*, or which are not ſufficiently *teſtified* to come from them, who yet are juſtly preſumable to have *delivered* carefully (and appointed the *Church* to preſerve faithfully through all ages) all thoſe things, which are *fundamentally* neceſſary for a *Chriſtian* to *believe* or *practiſe* to his *Soul's health*.

12. If *reaſon* herein will not be heard, to the *repairing* of *breaches* and demoliſhing the μεσότοιχον φραγμὸν, that *Sept* or *Wall* of *Separation*, which was once in the *Temple* ſet up betwixt *Jews* and *Gentile worſhippers*, but received its *decretory* ſentence in the death of *Chriſt*, never to be re-edified among *Chriſtians*, If that *enmity* that was *nailed* to his *Croſs*, muſt be *revived*, and quickened to a life *immortal* among his members. If whilſt we faithfully retain *the whole Faith* of *Chriſt*, we muſt ſtill be lookt on, as *Traditours* and *mutilatours* of it. 'Twill yet be *manifeſt* to all that conſider the *premiſſes*, that this is to be numbred among our *calamities*, not our *guilts*, that the *darts* of the *tongue* were not directed at us, with any ſpecial *aim*, or *judgment* (we might have been called *Magicians* as well, and ſo *baniſhed* out of *Rome*, upon the *Old Edict*, *Contra Mathematicos*, with as much [illegible]*riety* as upon the *new*, *Contra Hæreticos*) and in fine, that the *objection* hath received its *anſwer* according to the utmoſt *improvement*, of which it is capable, whether as the *low ebb* of our preſent *perſecuted* eſtate, or as our *pretended departure* from the *Catholick Faith*, is, or can, with any *colour* of reaſon, be ſuggeſted to have *unchurched* us.

CHAP. VI.

A third difficulty, raiſed from Acts 4. 19. and 1 Cor. 9. 16. ſatisfied.

Sect. 1. AFter this ſo large a ſurvey of thoſe *two* ſorts of *Objections* from others, there remains a *third*, which our own breaſts are ready to ſuggeſt, by way of *ſcruple*; whether the words of Saint *Peter* and Saint *John*, *Acts* 4. 19. and of Saint *Paul*, 1 *Cor.* 9. 16. be not of ſome force, to lay *obligation* on us *Miniſters* of the *Goſpel* at this time, and how we ſhall *quit* our ſelves of that *obligation*.

Sect. 2. In the former *Text* verſe 6. and 15. When the *Sanhedrim* called thoſe *Apoſtles*, and *commanded* them *not to ſpeak at all, nor to teach*, verſe 18. their *anſwer* is in theſe words, *Whether it be right in the ſight of God to hearken unto you, more than unto God, judge ye; For we cannot but ſpeak*——where ſure the phraſes of *hearkening unto God*, *obeying* him, and, *we cannot but ſpeak*,—— noted an *obligation* lying upon them from *God* to *ſpeak* and to *teach*, ſuch as no *countermand* from the *Sanhedrim* could take off from them.

Sect. 3. And ſo in the *latter Text* a *neceſſity* is acknowledged by Saint *Paul* to lie upon him, a *moral neceſſity* (and that ſure denotes an *obligation*) and *wo is unto him, if he preach not the Goſpel*.

Sect. 4. For the *anſwering* of this, ſome (of the many) *differences* muſt be obſerved, which at firſt ſight offer themſelves, betwixt the condition of the *Apoſtles* then, and thoſe *now*, which are under this *interdict*. A firſt *difference* may be diſcerned in reſpect of the *matter* of their *preaching*, which was then ſo *indiſpenſably* required of the *Apoſtles*: What that was, will appear by the *Commiſſion* given to the *Eleven*, *Matth.* 28. 19. *Go therefore and teach all Nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt; teaching them to obſerve all things whatſoever I have commanded you.* As for Saint *Paul*, though he were none of this number, yet his *aſſumption* to the *Office Apoſtolical*, expreſt by his being a *choſen veſſel unto Chriſt, to bear his Name before the Gentiles and Kings*——*Acts* 9. 15. and the *command* of the *Holy Ghoſt*, to *ſeparate him to that work*, *Acts* 13. 2. did doubtleſs bind the ſame *bands* on him, and ſo this

ſame

ſame *ingagement* of *publiſhing* the *Chriſtian* Doctrine through *all the world* to thoſe that were *ignorant* of it, of receiving *Proſelytes*, all that ſhould come in to that *Faith of Chriſt*, and of *building* them up in it.

Sect. 5. Here then to thoſe as to a *ſelect* number of שלוחים *Apoſtles*, or *Proxies* of *Chriſt* on earth, was a *commiſſion* given, and therein a *command* to publiſh the *Goſpel* over *all the world*; and had they *neglected* it *willingly*, or by any *terrours* been *affrighted* from it, that meſſage (which *Chriſt* came in ſo ſtupendious a manner from Heaven to *publiſh*) had conſequently never been *revealed* to the world, and then this ſo pretious *talent* depoſited with them, being thus laid up *unoccupied*, would have brought on them regularly the *guilt*, and *wo* of *wicked*, as well as *unprofitable ſervants*. And this is the *ground* of that *obligation*, that lay on them, and is expreſt in thoſe *two* Texts in the *objection*.

Sect. 6. But the *Biſhops* of our *Church*, and the *Inferiour Officers*, the *Presbyters* under them, though they are in ſome degree the *Proxies* of thoſe *Proxies*, the *ſucceſſours* of thoſe *Apoſtles*; yet the *Commiſſion* to *go and preach*, belongs not to them, in the ſame *extent*, as it did to the *Apoſtles*, nor to *all* the ſame purpoſes: Our *Commiſſion* is *limited*, and ſo the *obligation* incumbent on us is *limited* alſo.

Sect. 7. The *Goſpel* being long ago by the *Apoſtles* travels ſolemnly preached over *all the world*, and either received by *Faith*, or rejected by *Obſtinacy*, or caſt off by *Apoſtaſie*, there was a *period*, and *concluſion* of thoſe *travels*, their Doctrine being depoſited in *all* their *plantations*, and in the *written word* conſigned for the *perpetual* uſes of the *Churches*, it was no longer *incumbent ex Officio* on every *ſpiritual* perſon, to trace *all* the *ſteps* of thoſe, that thus *travelled* for the firſt *planting* them. 'Tis ſure the *Indies* and *Chinois* are none of our *Province* now, though they once were of ſome of the *Apoſtles*.

Sect. 8. Nay, even in thoſe *firſt* times we reade of ſome, whom they fixt in *Settled Stations*, παραλιπόντες καταμεῖναι *appointing them to abide*, and καταλείποντες *leaving them* in ſuch or ſuch a *Province*, 1 *Tim.* 1. 3. and *Tit.* 1. 5. beyond which they were not obliged to *journey*, but as the ſame *Apoſtles* directed them upon emergent occaſions.

Sect. 9. Nay, the *Apoſtles* themſelves at length made an end of their *travels*, ſate down, Saint *John* at *Epheſus*, Saint *Peter* at *Rome*—— And after them in the words of the 15. and 16. *Canons Apoſtolical* it was ſoon forbidden, that any man ſhould ἑτέρα παροικία ἐπιπηδᾶν, or ἐπιπηδᾶν, *go or meddle* beyond his own *line*, move out of that *circle*, wherein he was fixt. And yet certainly *obedience* to thoſe *Canons*, though not written by the *Apoſtles*, but by the *firſt Biſhops*, *Apoſtolical* men, and ſo (in the words of that *Text*, wherein the *objection* is founded) a *hearkening unto men*, will never be deemed an offending or *ſinning againſt God*; If it were, all *order* and *unity* would ſoon be baniſhed out of the *Church*, as by this ἀλλοτριεπισκοπία we ſee it in ſome *Churches* at this time.

Sect. 10. Here then is a *firſt difference*, in reſpect of the *matter* of their *preaching*, and their *immediate* miſſion to that work, which brought the *Ve ſi non*; They were by *Chriſt* obliged to promulgate the *Goſpel*; we, that are come into their *labours*, where it is *promulgate* already, are not under the ſame *cauſes*, and ſo neither under the ſame *ſtrictneſs* of that *obligation*. The engagements that now lie upon us ariſe from ſome *other heads*, the *deſignations*, and *truſts* of our *ſuperiours* in the *Church*, the *wants* of the *flock* over whom we are placed, or the *opportunities* of *Charity*, which offer themſelves to us, but not the *Preceptive Commiſſion* of *Chriſt* of *going*, and *preaching* the *Faith* to *all Nations*.

Sect. 11. But if this were the intire *anſwer*, ſome farther objection would lie againſt it. For the *Apoſtles* task being not onely that of *witneſſing the reſurrection* of *Chriſt*, and ſo the whole *Chriſtian Religion*, confirmed by it, but particularly that of *calling* unreformed ſinners to *repentance* (as we ſee their *Sermons* ſumm'd up in the *Goſpel*, as *John Baptiſt*'s and *Chriſt*'s alſo were, *Repent for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand*) it is obvious thus to inforce the *former argument*, that the *ſins* of theſe *Nations*, and our *impenitent continuance* therein are ſufficient to remove this *difference*, there is now as much need of *Sermons* of *Repentance*, as there was then of *preaching* the *Faith* of *Chriſt*; and why then ſhould not the *obligation* lie as *indiſpenſably* upon us, as it then did upon the *Apoſtles*?

Sect. 12. To this *Objection* the *Anſwer* muſt be, not by denying the truth of the *ſuggeſtion* in either of the *premiſſes*, for it is certain, that was the ſtyle of the *Baptiſt*'s, of *Chriſt*'s, of the *Diſciples*, and ſo afterwards of the *Apoſtles* preaching; and 'tis indeed hard to conceive how or when there ſhould be greater *need* of *preaching reformation*, and of employing all our ſpiritual *artillery*, the keeneſt *weapons* of *our warfare* for the *demoliſhing* of *ſtrong holds*, of bringing *down obdurate hearts* to the *obedience of Chriſt*, than there is moſt viſibly in *theſe* Nations at *this* time; But by *examining* the force of the *conſequence*, which from thence infers the *neceſſity* of our withſtanding the preſent *interdict*, and continuing to preach. That this *conſequence* is moſt *irregular*, ſoon appears by ſurvey of the *premiſſes*, which neither *ſeverally* nor *jointly* have power thus to infer, or to make up any *regular Syllogiſm*, of which this ſhall be the concluſion. The *faireſt Syllogiſm* that the *matter* is capable of will be this. The *Apoſtles* by *Chriſt's command* preached *Repentance* to impenitent *ſinners*, But the *people* of this Nation are impenitent *ſinners*, Therefore, the *Miniſters* here are obliged not to give over *preaching*, whatever *interdict*, or *menace* of *violence* reſtrain them from it. But this is far from a *regular Syllogiſm*, not capable of being *reformed*, or *reduced*, to any *figure* or *mould* of reaſoning, *artificial*, or *inartificial*, neither of the *premiſſes* having any *influence* upon the *concluſion*, nor indeed *connexion* within themſelves. *Chriſt's precept* of *preaching repentance* to impenitent *ſinners*, even then when it did *oblige*, did not *oblige* them never to *intermit*, or give it over, whatſoever the *conſequences* were. When they had *preached*, and were not *received*, but *perſecuted*, they were *allowed* to *leave* ſuch *obſtinate impenitents*, to *ſhake off their duſt* againſt them, and ſo to *denounce judgments* by departing from them, to *preach* moſt loudly, by *not preaching*.

Sect. 13. And for *impenitence*, ſure that lays not *obligation*, where *Chriſt's command* had laid none, *i. e.* where it is *obſtinate* againſt *light*, and *means* of *reformation*. It was our *Saviour*'s ſpeech put by him into the mouth of *Father Abraham*, *They have Moſes and the Prophets, let them hear them: And if they hear not them, neither will they repent or be perſwaded though one ſhould come to them from the dead.*

Sect. 14. When ſins have been *committed*, and are gone on in, for want of *light*, there *preaching* of *repentance*, and convincing the ignorant *world of ſin*, is the *Goſpel*-method, and be their ſins the greateſt in the world, and the moſt *unnatural*, ſuch as the *Gentiles* were, yet *God* can ὑπεριδεῖν ſo far *look over*, or *not*

ſee

ſee ſuch rebellions, as to ſend out his *Heralds* of *peace*, and command them *all every where to repent*, yea,
Acts 17. 30. and ſometimes to work *miracles* for the *opening* ſuch mens eyes, who, as Saint *Paul* ſaith of himſelf, being
1 Tim. 1. 13. *blaſphemers, perſecutours and injurious*, yet are diſcerned by him that knows the *ſecrets* of hearts, to *doe it ignorantly in unbelief*.

John 3. 19. Prov. 1. 22. *Sect.* 15. But when it is not thus imputable to *ignorance*, but *reſiſtence* of the *light*, to *loving* and *coveting* of *darkneſs*, to the *ſcorners delighting* in that trade, and the *fools hating knowledge*, it may then be *ſeaſonable* with *God*, and not contrary to *duty* in man, to let them alone, no longer to *importune* them, who will not receive inſtruction.

Sect. 16. And this is too viſibly the *preſent* condition of this people, our ſins have not the *Apology* or extenuation of *ignorance*, our *deeds* of *darkneſs*, that have clothed themſelves in the *thickeſt cloud*, and *deepeſt ſecrecy*, are of all others moſt unqueſtionably *ſins* againſt *light*, and *knowledge*, and *conſcience*. And our *riots*, and *oaths*, and *perjuries*, and *prophanations*, in a word, all our ſorts of *pollutions* both of *fleſh* and *ſpirit*, are certainly ſuch; and thoſe are they that denominate us an *impenitent* people, on ſuppoſal of which the inforcement of that *argument* was founded.

Iſa. 43. 8. Acts 28. 27. *Sect.* 17. And to ſuch *blind people that have eyes*, which βλέποντες ὐ βλέπουσι, *ſee very perfectly*, but will *not perceive*, that have *ſteel'd* their foreheads againſt *reproofs*, it were but *regular*, and that which we learn from the *Apoſtles* practice, as to *ſhake off duſt againſt* them, ſo to *mark* and *avoid*, and not to *have fellowſhip* with ſuch, much leſs to *purſue* them with the *importunity* of more *Sermons*, but rather to *forſake* them, without being *driven* from them; there being no reaſon, why they ſhould *hear*, any more than *preach God's Word*, take his *covenant* into their *ears* or *mouths*, who thus deſpiſe *inſtructions*, and *hate to be reformed*.

Sect. 18. And if it be interpoſed, that ſure all *men* and *women* among us, are not to be put into this *forlorn Claſſis* of *hopeleſs impenitents*, there being many thouſands now, as in *Elias*'s days, that are not ingulft in the *corruptions* of the *times*, I reply by a moſt *willing*, joyfull confeſſion, and onely require it be remembred, that then there was no *ſtrength*, as far as concerns theſe, in that inforcement of the *argument*, which took riſe onely from the conſideration of the *unreformed impenitent ſinners*, which exacted our *Sermons* of *repentance*.

Sect. 19. As for thoſe then, that are in a *middle* and more *improvable* eſtate, to whom the *exerciſe* of our *functions* are, or probably may be, *real charity*; there, I ſhall acknowledge the Miniſters of the Word to lie under *engagements*, not ſuch as ariſe from *Chriſt's command* to his *Apoſtles*, *To go and preach*, wherein the *objection* was founded; but on other heads, eſpecially thoſe of *charity*, and miniſtring to the *wants* of *ſouls*. And though the *example* of [a] *Gregory Nazianzen*, that great and *pious Biſhop*, might juſtifie ſome *other* reſolution, who in ſuch *evil times*, being without any pretence of *crime* removed out of his *Biſhoprick*, [b] *Reſiſted many importunities*, took his leave of the *Emperour*, retired to *Arianzum*, and *in* [c] *reſt* and *divine poeſie* ended his *days*; yet I ſhall not lay hold on that advantage, but in compliance with the *intereſts* of *charity* rather than with any other of any *meaner* allay, I ſhall deem this account moſt *Chriſtian*, that we oblige our ſelves never to be *wanting* to them, that are thus *capable*, in any duty of *neceſſary charity*, that no *fear* of men, or other *worldly* conſideration, deter us from ſuch *performances*, that whenſoever our *Miniſtery* be called for, by the *real* and *preſſing wants* of the *meaneſt* of *Chriſt's little ones*, like *Cræſus*'s dumb Son, in an important *exigence*, we ſtretch the *ſtring* of our *tongues*, *ruſh* through any *obſtacle*, and reſolve with the *Apoſtle* in the *objection*, *We cannot but ſpeak*——.

[a] So *Narciſſus* Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, famous for the miracle of turning Water into Oil (Euſeb. *Eccl. Hiſt.* l. 5. c. 9.) in the vigils of *Eaſter*, being falſely accuſed by three men, each under an execration on themſelves which accordingly befell them, αὐτὸς μὲν πάνυ ἀρχαίων μιμήσεως ὑπομνήσεων μοχθηρίας, καὶ ἄλλως ὢν μακρῷ τῆς φιλοσόφου ἀσκήσεως βίον, διαδρὰς πᾶν τὸ ἐκκλησίας πλῆθος, ἐν ἐρημίαις καὶ ἀνάντεσιν ἀγκῶσι λασιόνων πλείστοις ἔτεσι διήγαγεν. [b] Πολλοὶ τῶν λαῶν συμῤῥέοντες δεκρύοντες, ἱκετεύοντες, ἀντεκολύνοντες ἐλεῆσαι τὸ ποίμνιον, ὁ πόνοις τε καὶ ἱδρῶσι πολίταις ἐξεθρεψάτο τε καὶ ἤυξησι. Greg. Naz. *Vit. N.* 3. [c] Ἀναγκαῖον οὖν ἐν Ἀελαίζοις ἡσυχάζων, μᾶλλον τῶν ὑπερεχόντων καὶ σχολὴν διὰ πραγμάτων ἀπαλλαγὴν ἀγαθὸν τὸ ἄμεινον. Ibid. *N.* 5.

Sect. 20. So that ſtill the reſolution of *conſcience* muſt be by *levelling* the particular *caſe* according to the *Rule* or *Square* that belongs to it, the *command* of our *Great Maſter*, incumbent on us. And though that lay not *obligation* to *preach*, *Ratione Officii*, yet if it lay *oligation* of *charity* to *miniſter* to the *neceſſities* of any *Chriſtian's ſoul*, in whatſoever inſtance, our *love* will prove very *imperfect* and maimed, if it do not *caſt out fear*, ſet about its work, whatſoever the *dangers* be. And ſo generally our *direction* muſt be not by that which is *moſt ſafe*, but moſt *charitable*; and by attending to that, we ſhall have advanced a good ſtep toward the *ſolution* of the *difficulty*.

Sect. 21. But then, ſecondly, a farther *difference* there is obſervable betwixt the *Apoſtles* caſe, and ours, in reſpect of the *occaſions* and *circumſtances* of delivering the words. For the *words* in Saint *Paul*, 'tis evident they lookt not on *perſecution*, but onely *want* of *wages* for his *preaching*, and the utmoſt importance of, or inference from *his* words is, that though he have no kind of ſubſiſtence from his *auditours*, no part of their *offertory*, ver. 13. yet he is (under a *ſad Væ ſi non*) *obliged* to *preach* to them. And then if we by any *outward* diſcouragements, the *no reward* for our *labours*, the not reaping *of carnal things*, be thus cooled in diſcharge of our *duties*, and diſpenſing our *ſpiritual things*, then are we with ſome reaſon to apprehend the *Væ* denounced by Saint *Paul* on this neglect, which that it cannot by *analogy* be extended to this other caſe of *forcible interdict*, appears by the expreſs words of *Chriſt* even while he requires *perſeverance* in his *Diſciples*, *Matth.* 10. 23. *When* they *perſecute you in this City, flee ye to another*, and is exemplified by Saint *Paul*, 2 *Cor.* 11. 32.

Sect. 22. And though ſtill the *other* example of Saint *Peter* and *John* ſeem *contrary*, yet certainly that muſt be capable of ſuch an *interpretation* as ſhall be *reconcileable* with theſe *two*, the *expreſs* words of *Chriſt*, and *practice* of their *fellow Apoſtle*.

Sect. 23. For ſure there is ſome more than ſhew of *difficulty* in this, how thoſe *two Apoſtles* ſhould be under a *command* of *God*, *obliged* not to give over *preaching* in *Jeruſalem*, when they were thus *interdicted* and *threatned* by the *Sanhedrim*, as that ſignifies *perſecuted from that City*, when yet the *Diſciples* are allowed by *Chriſt*, in that caſe of *perſecution* to remove to *ſome other City*, i. e. to obey that *unchriſtian interdict* ſo armed with *force*; and when *Paul* upon the like *occaſions* profeſſeth once to have been *let down by a basket* and,

and by flight (and ſo *preaching* no longer in *that City)* to *have eſcaped their hands*, 2 *Cor.* 11. 33. And at *another* time to have been *for a time withheld*, or *kept* from the *Theſſalonians*, 1 *Theſſ.* 2. 16, 17, 18. by the *violent* oppoſitions, and *interdicts*, of his *adverſaries*. And what *anſwer* ſoever ſhall be thought *ſatisfactory* to this, will, I doubt not, be applicable to our preſent caſe.

Sect. 24. For Firſt, If the *account* ſhould be, that this was an *Heroical* act of *zeal* in thoſe two *Apoſtles* (παῤῥησιάζεσθαι and ῥιψοκινδυνεῖν, to imitate *Chriſt* ſo far as to *adventure* the *utmoſt dangers* for his ſake) yet not under *divine precept*, and ſo not part of *ſtrict duty*, then that *abſolves* us from being under ſuch *duty*, and leaves it onely an *act* of *Chriſtian magnanimity*, when the *circumſtances* of the *action* render it truly ſuch, *i. e.* whenſoever the great *ends* of *Charity* may beſt be ſerved by our *preaching* and *ſuffering*; and thus much is willingly acknowledged.

Sect. 25. But the truth is, this ſeems not to come home to Saint *Peter*'s words of [*hearkning to God*] and [*we cannot but teach* ——] which ſeem to ſuppoſe ſome *command* of *God* binding on their *ſhoulders* an *indiſpenſable* neceſſity of doing what they did.

Sect. 26. *Secondly* then, If the *anſwer* be, that the *threatning* them at that time was viſibly but an *empty terrour*, being joyned with a *releaſing* them out of *cuſtody*, verſe 3. and 21. and ſo but an expreſſion of their *diſlikes*, and their *fear* of them, rather than a *perſecuting* them, and that in that caſe the *duty* of propagating the *Goſpel*, and beginning that at *Jeruſalem*, was in full force incumbent on them at this time, *Non obſtante* the *diſpenſation* granted them, *Matth.* 10. 23. of *flying when* they were *perſecuted*; Then likewiſe will it be in force by *analogy* to us, that we ſhould not be *amated* by *empty terrours*, but purſue the diſcharge of our *functions*, as far as *violence* will permit us; not feigning *Mormoes* to our ſelves, or making the *fancy* or *ſhadow* of the *Lion* in the way, the motive or *excuſe* of our *real ſloth*, or *neglect* of our callings.

Sect. 27. Or *thirdly*, If it be anſwered, that that advice for *flight* in perſecution was given to the *Diſciples*, *Math.* 10. before their receiving their *Apoſtolical Charge* and *Commiſſion*, *Matth.* 28. *Joh.* 20. and ſo that *theſe Apoſtles* might be now under precept of not yielding to this *violence*, though the *Diſciples* were not, Then again, though that will not be made good by any grounds of *Scripture*, nor prove *reconcileable* with the practice of Saint *Paul* at *Damaſcus*, who was an *Apoſtle* alſo (having already queſtionleſs his *miſſion* from Heaven to that *office)* yet will that be of uſe alſo to our *preſent difficulty*, for then all *officers*, howſoever intruſted by *Chriſt*, are not preſently under the ſame *obligations*, that Saint *Peter*, and thoſe other *Apoſtles* were, and ſo their *example* is not farther to be extended, than other *Scriptures*, and *examples*, and the conſideration of all *circumſtances* give reaſon to *extend* it.

Sect. 28. Of one of theſe two *Apoſtles*, Saint *John*, the *Scripture* tells us that he was at length *baniſhed* to *Patmos* an Iſland, *for the teſtimony of Jeſus*: It was not certainly any *fault*, or but πάτμα in him, that he did not *reſiſt* this *Edict*, but yield to that *force* which executed it upon him. And yet when he was there, we find not that he had *opportunity* for any office of his *Apoſtleſhip*, ſave that of *praying* and *communicating in the tribulations* and *patience of the kingdom of Chriſt*, and *receiving and writing of Viſions*; and nothing contrary to *duty* in this, the *violence* that carried him to that *Iſland*, was his very reaſonable *account*, that he *laboured* not now in the *Word and Goſpel*. Rev. 1. 9.

Sect. 29. The like may be ſaid of Saint *Chryſoſtome*, twice *baniſhed* from his *Patriarchate* of *Conſtantinople*, and of many others in all evil *times*, diſ-ſeiſed of their *Chairs* and *Functions*, for no other cauſe, but as *John*, διὰ μαρτυρίαν Ἰησοῦ, *for the teſtimony of Jeſus*, and their *deprivations* were one way of *teſtifying* of *Chriſt*, as their *preaching* had (and if they might have enjoyed that *liberty*, ſtill would have) been another.

Sect. 30. Some *diſparity* there is indeed between theſe *examples* and the caſe, which is *now* before us; *John* was actually *tranſported* to that *Iſland*, and we are onely *interdicted* under the *penalty* of the like *tranſportation*, which being yielded, it yet muſt follow, that either the *whole weight* of the *objection* muſt be founded in this *diſparity*, or elſe that it will receive its full *anſwer* by this *conſideration*.

Sect. 31. This *diſparity*, if it have any *real* weight in it, it muſt be on one of theſe *two accounts*; either, Firſt, That what is now *threatned*, ought not to be *feared*, till it be *preſent*, and that this *remoter fear* is not *Metus qui poteſt cadere in virum fortem*, ſuch as is incident *to a valiant man*; or elſe, Secondly, that thoſe *performances* which will now actuate the *threats*, and bring that *puniſhment* upon us, are, or may probably be of ſome *conſiderable weight*, or benefit, to the *glory* of *God*, or good of *ſouls*.

Sect. 32. For the former of theſe; 1. That is not a *queſtion* of *duty*, but of *prudence*, and ſo lays not *obligation* till the *queſtion* of *prudence* be firſt ſtated: 2. For the *prudential* part, there are no *grounds* on which to eſtabliſh that. 'Tis not (without the *Spirit* of *prophecy)* within our reach to *comprehend*, how *likely*, or *unlikely* it is, that this *puniſhment* will be really inflicted; none but *God* can know the *hearts* of the *interdicters*, or *reſtrain their power*, and he hath not *revealed* to us, either that they *will* not, or *ſhall* not execute their *laws*, and ſo it is neither *cowardiſe* nor *imprudence*, not [d] *puſillanimity* but *rational foreſight*, to expect, that they who have been ſo *ſevere* to promulgate this *interdict*, may not be ſo *kind* as to *reſcind*, or *ſuſpend* the execution of the *penalties* denounced by it. Or if any man have reaſon to think otherwiſe, he may then be *obliged* to act by that *reaſon*, but not to *impoſe* it, *Sub periculo animæ* on every other man, who diſcerns no *cauſe* for ſuch *perſwaſion*.

[d] Οὐκ ἀγεννὲς δὲ τὸ μὴ ὀλιγοψυχίας πεισθῆναι τὸν κινδύνους, μὲ ὁμόσαι αὐτοῖς χωρεῖν. Origen. *cont.* Celſ.

Sect. 33. For the ſecond, It is viſible in the *interdict* on one ſide, that the *firſt* ſingle *exerciſe* of our *functions* brings *impriſonment*; the *ſecond* a *ſecond impriſonment*, and the *third* the *deportation* parallel to that which was Saint *John's portion*: But the advantage on the other ſide is not *viſible*; For 1. There is no *duty* of *piety* in our proſpect, no *confeſſion* of *Chriſt* (which was wont to innoble the *Primitive Sufferings)* our not *preaching* for a while is by no kind of *interpretation* a *denying of Chriſt*. Nor 2. *Obedience* either to any *command* of *Chriſt*'s (as I ſuppoſe hath already been cleared) or yet to the *truſts* or *commands* of thoſe that have committed any part of *God's flock* unto us, for all thoſe *truſts* and *commands* reſerve place for outward *accidents*, for *ſickneſs*, for *urgent avocations*, &c. Nor 3. *Obligation* or motive of *charity*; It is not diſcernible what *real advantage* it will bring to any of our brethren, that he that hath preacht a *thouſand* Sermons already, ſhould preach *two Sermons* more, which may not be equally *provided* for, by ſome *other* ſafer means.

Sect. 34.

Sect. 34. And then as the *Apoſtles* repeated *exhortation* hath its place, ſo that is expreſt to be, in ſuch πονηραὶ ἡμέραι, *evil days*, or *times*, viz. that we ſhould ἐξαγοράζεσθαι καιρὸν, *gain* or *buy out the ſeaſon*: [e] Saint *Chryſoſtome* interprets it by the *contrariety* to περιττοὺς κινδύνους ἀναιτίους καὶ κέρδους οὐκ ἔχοντας, *undergoing unneceſſary* and *gainleſs dangers*, ſuch as no *obligation* exacts nor *charity* invites, and [f] *Plutarch* paraphraſes it by ὠνεῖσθαι τὸν καιρὸν ἐπ' ἀσφαλείαν, *buying the ſafety of the time*, i. e. *avoiding* the preſent *danger*, and *reſerving* our ſelves for opportunities of more *profitable ſervices*.

[e] *Tom.* 4. p. 148. l. 12.

[f] *Apoph. Scipion.*

Sect. 35. Such *opportunities* as theſe, are as *gifts* of *God*, and it cannot be either *wiſe*, or *pious*, or *charitable* to forfeit or ſell them for no *price*: That we ſhould ſet ſome *valuation* upon them we have Saint [g] *Cyprian's example*, and that commended, as a ſpecial act of *generoſity* and *ſelf-denial* in him, that having in his *proſpect* ſome ſervice which he might perform to *God* by *living*, he *made choice of longer life* by ſubducing himſelf in time of *danger*, rather than of the *Martyr's* Crown when it was *fairly* offered him.

[g] *Maluit praceptis Dei obedire, quàm vel ſic coronari.* Pontius Diac. *in Vit.* Cypr.

Sect. 36. Beſide theſe, there is alſo a *competent* number of *preſent employments* for our *Chriſtian* and *Miniſterial talents* ſtill remaining to us notwithſtanding the *preſent interdict*: I ſhall not need *enumerate* them, but onely mind my Brethren, that continual *prayer* for *all men*, and particularly for our unkindeſt *enemies*, is one ſeaſonable part of that *task*; and though that might be performed alſo in *Patmos*, yet others there are, of which a *ſtrange land* or *wilderneſs* is not capable; and between theſe we may *profitably* and comfortably *divide* this *vacancy*, and *buſily* and *charitably*, and to very excellent *purpoſe*, exerciſe our ſelves, till *God* ſhall in mercy return our *wonted* tasks, call us back to the conſtant *labour*, and *full buſineſs* of his *vineyard* again.

Sect. 37. And if herein we be not *ſcandalouſly* wanting to theſe *opportunities*, which how improbably ſoever they look at a *diſtance*, *God* can *convert*, and hath certainly in his wiſedom *deſigned* for the greater *advantages* of his *ſervants*, and to more abundant *fruit to our account*. This will be matter of full *ſatisfaction*, and more than ſo, even of *comfort* and *joy* to *conſcience*, and ſuperſede all neceſſity of farther *anſwer* to this ſcruple.

CHAP. VII.

The beneficial uſes of our preſent condition.

SECT. I.

Firſt, Contempt of the World.

1. THus far I have proceeded by way of *retroſpect*, or *reflexion* on the ſad *matter* of our *preſent* condition, and endeavoured to *foreſee* and *foreſtall* thoſe *ſcandals*, to which it is *principally* liable, that no man may be enſnared, or *offended*, or ſo much as *diſcouraged* by it.

2. 'Tis now time, that I look *forward* on ſome few of the many great *uſes*, we are to make of this ſtate, the *beneficial* exerciſes, which ſeem moſt *peculiarly* apportion'd to it; that ſo we may according to Saint *Paul's* direction τοῖς ἔμπροσθεν ἐπεκτείνεσθαι, *give a ſtretch forward to the things which are before*, and ſo διώκειν, *make* that a *latter ſtage* in our preſent *courſe* toward the great βραβεῖον, the *prize* (of all, and ſo) of our *preſent agones*.

3. And the *firſt* ſtep, that we advance, as it cannot miſs to furniſh us with an *armature* againſt all the vaſteſt *changes* that this *mutable* world can ſubject us to, with an *O paſſi graviora*, giving us an aſſurance, that what next ſhall come cannot be more *ſtrange*, and unexpected, leſs within the *diviners* power to foreſee, or indeed much more *vaſt* and *horrid* at the neareſt approach, than this which we already diſcern that *God* hath *choſen* for us; ſo it may be very proper to *wean* us, and *mortifie* in us all *fondneſs* to that, which hath now nothing left that is *lovely* or *deſirable* in it.

4. We know *David's Unicum petii*, *Pſalm* 27. 4. the *one thing* that he counted worth *deſiring of the Lord*, and without which all the reſt had no *reliſh* in it. And this hath God ſeen fit to rend from us at this time, that we may have never an *hoſtage* left to ingage our *kindneſs* to the world.

5. When all that deſerves to be *rejoyced* in, in this life, is moſt ſtrictly *warded* from us (ſuch ſure are the *fruits* of that *Paradiſe*, from which we are now *exiled*) what *Chriſtian Spirit* of the *courſeſt* mould, that hath moſt of *allay* in his compoſition, can in earneſt *ſolicite* a *reprieve* of the *ſevereſt* ſentence, *court* this world, or *dread* a final parting with it, when by any farther ſummons he that hath caſt him into theſe *briers* and *thorns*, ſhall mercifully *call* and *invite* him *out* of them?

6. The *Eremite* or *Anchoret* that hath paſs'd ſo great a part of his *journey* towards *heaven*, as to be come within a pace of his *non ultra* (like *Simeon Stylita* in *Theodoret*, *immured* in his *pillar*, and become already but his own *Statue* and *monument*, as it were) and hath but the *patience* of *one* ſtep more required of him, to conclude his *travel*, to lodge him in *Abraham's* boſom, were ſurely very unkind to *heaven* and *treacherous* to his own aims and *intereſts*, if he ſhould then *ſtop*, or *ſtart*, or think of a *retreat*.

7. And the like *contradiction* were it to our own greateſt *concernments*, when we are deveſted of all the *vivendi cauſæ*, the *comforts* or *cauſes* of *living* (the chief of which is that *gladſome* news in the *Pſalmiſt*, *when they ſaid unto him, let us go up to the houſe of the Lord*, whereupon he could revive himſelf out of any *dumps* with this one *cordial*, *My feet ſhall ſtand in thy gates, O Jeruſalem*, and *Jeruſalem is as a City at unity within it ſelf*) when, I ſay, we are *caſt* out of this *preſence of the Lord*, this *comfortable*, though but *ambulatory tent* of his, where for a time he hath allowed us an *acceſs* unto him, to *tremble* at the ſight of that *Officer*, which comes but to *return* us to our *home* and *joys*, and to ſecure the *firmneſs* of our *future* abode, that it ſhall be *aſcertain'd* to us for ever.

8. *Scham-*

8. *Schammatha* and *Maranatha* we know were the *significative* titles of the *Jewish excommunications*, and the interpretation of them the *approach* of *destruction* from the *Lord*; The *Sanhedrins* casting out of the *assembly*, was, saith *Josephus*, the frequent *forerunner* of that other out of the *land of the living*. And the like *abode* was thought to attend the *Druids censures*, when they *interdicted* any man the *liberty* of *sacrificing*, *quæ pœna apud eos gravissima est*, saith [a] *Cæsar*, the *heaviest punishment* that could befall the *Gauls* or *Britains*. And though this of ours be no *parallel*, yet it may be usefull thus far to mind us of our *duty*, to prepare us so, as not to be *surprised*, whatsoever *God* shall next send. [a] *De Bell. Gall.* l. 6.

9. Meanwhile one *comfort* this of ours is capable of, above any *real*, though *meekest Censures* of the *Church* (ἐπιτιμίαι and νουθεσίαι the *reproofs* or *admonitions Ecclesiastical*) that it is not *Futuri judicii præjudicium*, in [b] *Tertullian*'s phrase, hath no *inauspicious* influence on our *future* weal, the *binding* us *on earth*, though it never be *rescinded* here, will be far from *interdicting*, or *excluding* us from *heaven*: there was, I hope, never more truth in [c] *Origen*'s resolution, *Qui ante non exiit nihil lædituꝛ, unde interdum fit, ut ille qui foras mittatur, intus sit*, *He that was not gone out before, is not harm'd by this interdict, he that is cast out, is still within.* [b] *Apol.* c. 39. [c] *In Levit. Hom.* 14.

10. Let us by the help of *God*, and in *obedience* to these, and all other his gracious *chastisements*, *retain*, or timely get our *clean nuptial garments* about us, and then though we be gathered up from the *Lanes* and *Hedges*, we shall have no reason to doubt of our *call* to, and *reception* at the *marriage*.

SECT. II.

Secondly, Universal Reformation.

1. BUT then, Secondly, as in the *Censures* of the *Church*, those last methods of *Apostolical* and divine *Charity*, designed for the ransome and *redemption* of the most inthralled *captive*, and *obstinately* bent to bring him home to *God*, though it were by the *ministery* of *Satan himself*, there was no *peace* to be hoped, or *obtained* from this *importunity*, no truce from these *mercifull scourges*, these *wounds* of the perfectest *friend*, whilst there remained one *excess* unhumbled, one *lust* unpurged, one *rage* unmortified, one ὀχύρωμα, be it *high* or *strong hold*, *pride* or *habit* of sin, *unlevelled*, or *unsubdued*; so must we reckon of it at this time, while we are under these *shadows* and false *images* of it.

2. The rebukes of Heaven that are now upon us, are as *inexorable* as his *unwearied love* of *souls* can make them, we must not in *kindness* to our selves beg their *remove*, till they have finish'd the saving work for which they are as surely sent, as *Christ* came into the *world* upon the same errand; and then what an *inauspicious Symptome* must it be, if the *application* shall increase the *Paroxysms*, if the sins that brought these *judgments* to chastise them, should make a shift to *thrive* under them, if the fruitfull *parent* should become also the *incestuous* birth of its own *progeny*.

3. The intimations which *Scripture* gives us of such *charitative severities* (such certainly are *God's* now unto us, designed wholly to ends of *mercy*) all look this way; Bishop *Titus's rebukes* must be *whet*, till they advance to the ἀποτόμως, to be *sharp* and *cutting*, and never lose the *edge*, till they have obtain'd their *design* (ἵνα ὑγιαίνωσιν) till they have by *lancing* fetcht out the very *core* of the *Imposthume*, the *dregs* and sediment of the *disease*. Tit. 1. 13.

4. The *Apostle* elsewhere expresses it by very *comprehensive* phrases, by καθαίρειν λογισμὸς, *subduing* and *bringing* to nothing the *very thoughts*, *disputes*, or *reasonings* in the breasts, πᾶν ὕψωμα, *every elation*, or *unevenness* in the *heart*, that doth but ἐπαίρεται, *lift it self up against the knowledge of God* or *Christian practice*, πᾶν νόημα, *every conceit* or *notion*, and in fine ἐκδικῆσαι, *to act revenge*, to punish *capitally* (so as it never *revive* again) πᾶσαν παρακοὴν, *every not hearkening* or *disobedience*; and till this be done effectually, *Timothy* must not be *too hasty to impose hands*, *absolve*, or *loose* those *censures*, lest he bring upon himself the *guilt* of those sins which it was the *duty* of his *censures* to *reform* in others; the ἐπακολουθοῦσαι ἁμαρτίαι, *consequent sins*, those that are still *continued* in *after* the hand of *discipline* is upon a man; have a *fearfull aggravation* belonging to them, that of *thundering* back against *heaven*, the most *unagreeable* return to the utmost *charity*, the most *prodigious anomaly*, or *irregularity* in the world. 2 Cor. 10. 5, 6. 1 Tim. 5. 22. *Verse* 24.

5. We know the *dress* that belonged to the *excommunicated* person, both in the *Jewish* and *Primitive Christian Church*, the same, that of the *strictest* profoundest *Mourners*, and all the *Assembly* were to *accompany* him in the same *dolefull* habit; Saint *Paul* expresses it by *God's* * *humbling the very Apostle* that *inflicts it*, and his † *coming* ἐν λύπῃ, *in a mournfull guise* unto the *offender*. And in this also the *parallel* may hold, the *mourning* weeds in many respects very well become us at this time. And shall he that is a mourning for *himself*, a celebrating as it were his *own obsequies* (and should in reason begin the θρηνῳδία, the *dolefull Elegy* to others in an accent of *exemplary sorrow*) forget the business in hand so *prodigiously*, as to mistake an *oath* or *execration* for it, to aim that *shaft* against Heaven, that should have been *designed* at his *own breast*, *bewail* his *excesses* in new *riots*, and as the *deluge* to the *old world*, *overwhelm* the *sinner*, instead of *purging* away the *sin*? * 2 Cor. 12. 21. † 2 Cor. 2. 11.

6. Were this tolerably fit to be the return but to *humane discipline*, to *him that speaketh* (though it be *Oracles*, so χρηματίζων signifieth) *on earth*; yet it were most *intolerable madness* thus to *turn away from him that speaketh from heaven*, and that is our case at this time. Heb. 12. 25.

7. 'Tis vain to question the *instruments*, when by its being fallen upon us, we know the *Counsel and hand of God* προώρισεν γενέσθαι, *hath preordained it shall be done*, not onely *permitting* it thus to fall, but also *designing* it *charitatively* to our *greatest* good, the *mortifying* every *sin*, that still lives among us. And if we do not now *qualifie* our selves for our return to this *glorious kingdom* of his on *earth* (into which there is no regular *entrance* for any *thing that defileth*, or *that worketh abomination*, *or lye*, I mean either for *carnality* or *hypocrisie*) just as we would think our selves obliged to doe for our *admission* into the *kingdom of heaven*, that Rev. 21. 27.

viſion which may not be approacht without all kind of *purity*, we are ſtill fitted for *ſeverer* methods, and cannot without a kind of *ſacrilege* covet, or *wiſh* a liberty of *acceſs* to *God's holy things*, which cannot be injoyed without being *defiled* alſo, and *prophaned* by us.

8. What is here ſaid thus *generally*, ought to be as diſtinctly and *particularly* applied to every *leprous* ſpot, or *plague*-ſore in each *unreformed* ſinner's *heart* among us, as if I had delivered by *retail* the moſt perfect *catalogue* of them. *Let us ſearch and try our ways, and now if ever* perfect our vows of *returning* to the *Lord*.

Lam. 3. 40.

9. And this muſt be indeavoured by all the moſt probable remaining means, that may any way be *ordinable* to it, ſure not by mens taking *advantage* of the times, and *caſting off* all even *form of Godlineſs*; this is the ſad *fruit* of the *reprobate Soil*, the forerunner of *curſe and burning*. But the more *deſolate* our condition is, the more ſolicitouſly to endeavour to gain *God* to our *ſociety* and *aſſiſtence*, to keep cloſe to him in conſtant *frequent* returns of converſe on our *knees*, or on our *faces* (to that our *Cloſets* are much better accommodated, than our *Churches*, or more *publick* Aſſemblies, and our *excluſion* from them may well mind us of that *poſture* either of *Chriſt*, *Matt.* 26. 39. or of the θεομαλαίους or *howling penitentiaries* in the *Primitive* times) talking with him, and *receiving* both *aids* and *directions* from him, *handling* him and *ſeeing* him in his *word* (and thoſe much more *faithfull* means of *converting ſpiritual* food into ſpiritual *nouriſhment*, than the *Ear* hath been *experimented* to be) and ſo with more advantage filling our ſelves out of the *Ocean*, without repining that the *drop* of the *bucket* is taken away from us.

Heb. 6. 8.

10. 'Tis poſſible we may be found to have ſomewhat by us in *ſtore*, that may prove *food*, when the *famine* hath *Cookt* it for us; That *Prayer* which *Chriſt* gave us (as once *God* by *Moſes* did *Manna*, *from heaven*) may, when 'tis better conſidered, than our *plenty* ever yet *permitted* it to be, prove an *help* to all our *infirmities*, that one *plate* of pure *Gold* be beaten out into a great deal of *Wire*, increaſe like the *Widow's Oil* and *Meal*, by a *deliberate effuſion* (as I have heard of a *pious* man, that made it his whole *private* office) not by giving it the number of the *Romaniſts Roſary*, but by impreſſing on his own *heart* firſt, and from thence pouring out to *God*, the *weight* and full *Commentary* (as far as his and his brethrens known *wants* ſuggeſted) of every *petition*. And I doubt not but it may prove like *Manna* in that reſpect alſo, agreeable to every good *Chriſtian's taſte*, and proper to his *ſtomach*, if he come now with a *vigorous appetite* to make uſe of it.

11. And if but the ſeveral *Articles* of the *Creed* might be uſed as they were meant, to inforce on us the many great *ingagements* of ſincere *reformation*, and to mind us of the *mercy* of the *ſecond Covenant*, the *merit*, and *example* of his *ſufferings*, and the *power* and bleſſed influence of his *reſurrection*, &c. we ſhould need no more *outward aids* (though there be innumerable ſtill ready at hand for any that could have received *benefit* by thoſe, which are now taken from us) but thoſe which 'tis very hard for us to *miſs*, the ſeveral *branches* of our *duty*, very *legible* in the moſt perſpicuous parcels of *Scripture*, the *Decalogue* and the *Sermon* in the *Mount*, to direct us in that way, wherein, by *God's help*, inſtantly implored, we may be ſecure from *ſtumbling*.

12. However, if a *truſty guide* may add either to the comfort or *ſafety* of this *journey*, there are ſuch now at *leiſure*, that may be had without *hire*, 'tis pity (if they may be employed to thy *benefit*) they ſhould be ſuffered to be *idle*, being indeed never more proper and *profitable* in any caſe, than in this of *overlooking* thy *performances* of this firſt branch of *Repentance*, in the duties of *mortification*.

SECT. III.

Thirdly, Fruits of Repentance. Among them, Firſt, Perfect contentment: Diſcernible by two trials.

1. BUT for the *looſing* of *ſinners*, and *reſtoring* them to the *peace* of the *Church*, the bare *mortification* is not ſufficient. The *reſcuing* from the *jaws* or Gates of *Hell* doth not preſently ſecure us of our right to *Heaven*. There muſt be the building of *Houſes* and planting of *Orchyards* (ſaith S. [d] *Hierome* on *Jer.* 29. 5.) *taking Wives, and begetting of Sons and Daughters, Cum ex Jeruſalem*, i. e. *Eccleſia ejecti fuerimus*, *When we are caſt out of Jeruſalem*, i. e. *the Church*. There muſt be the καλὰ ἔργα πολλὰ, *good works* in the *plural*, (ἐπανορθώσεις the *penitential Canons* uſually ſtyle them, the living in more than one ſingle trade of *goodneſſes*) and thoſe *manifeſt* or *diſcernible* (there being in that caſe no rule given for the *concealing*, but rather *publiſhing* them) before it can be *ſeaſonable* with *God* or *profitable* for us to have his *diſcipline* removed.

[d] *Tom.* 4. p. 292. D.

1 Tim. 5. 25.

2. Some of theſe that have moſt peculiarity of *agreeableneſs* to our *preſent* condition, may not unfitly be ſpecified.

3. *Firſt*, that of a *perfect contentment* and unfeigned *ſubmiſſion* to the good *will* and *choices* of *God*, with what *ſharpneſs* ſoever they come *mixt* to us: In the words of *Micha*, which S. *Hierome* recommends to him particularly, * on whom the *cenſures* of the *Church* are fallen, *Micha* 7. 9. *I will bear the indignation of the Lord, becauſe I have ſinned againſt him* ('tis ſure we have *ſins* enough to own this, or whatever *worſe* thing ſhall *happen to us*) *untill he plead my cauſe and execute judgment for me.*

* *Si de congregatione fratrum & domo Dei ejicimur*—*in* Ezec. *ca.* 17. *Tom.* 4. *p.* 381.

4. To this *plenitude* of *chearfull contentment*, beſide many *others*, one *eminent* motive ſuggeſts it ſelf, by conſidering, that when we were ſo *richly furniſht* with *variety* of *infamous* matter, any leaſt of which might fitly have *own'd*, as having moſt juſtly *provoked*, the fierceſt of *God's revenges*, and, if he had ſo pleaſed, made us *doubly miſerable*, once under the *ſmart* of his *rod*, and a *ſecond* turn under the *reproach* of the *ſcandalous* ſin, which it *ſignally* was directed to *point* out, and *viſit*; *God* hath *given* to us (ἐκαίσιον) out of his *ſpecial* undeſerved favour *vouchſafed* to us to *ſuffer for well doing*, at leaſt not for *evil doing* (and that

that [f] such shall not *lose its reward*, the examples of *Job* and *Lazarus* will secure us) and so to *bear in our bodies* no other (στιγματα) *brands*, or *marks*, but onely those of the *Lord Jesus*. This, I say, if *applied*, and brought home by every man to his *own* individual, and the *foulest* sins he hath at any time been *guilty* of, and might have been surprised in, will found more than a *contented acquiescence* in *God's* present *choices* for us, even *oblige* us severally (as Saint *Peter* thought most just upon consideration) to *sanctifie the Lord God in our hearts*, to *magnifie* the *mercy*, not *repine* at the *severity* of his *methods* towards us.

[f] Κᾶν μὲ δὲ ἡ σὸν τὸ πάθῃ, πάθῃ δὲ ἄμωμα, ἀλλ' ἡγναίωσε ἐκεῖνα καὶ ἀφεῖκε, ἢ σὸν ἐστὶ πᾶσι δεῖξαι μειζόνων ἀγαθῶν ἀναβάσεων πυγχάνει, ἀπεὶ καὶ Ἰὼβ----Chrys. *Ep.* γ'. *Tom.* 7. p. 73. l. 17. &c. Καὶ ὁ Λάζαρος —l. 21.

5. And for the judging of this, whether it be *sincerely* what it ought, it must be observed, First, Whether we have any very *unkind reflexions* on those that are the *instruments* of it. *Abishai* that would have had *David's* displeasure break out against him that *cast stones* at him and *all his servants*, did not look through *David's Optick*; if he had, he would have discerned what *David* did, *that possibly the Lord had said unto him, curse David, and who shall then say, wherefore hath he done so?* It is as sure as any thing can be in the world, that *God* meant no real *curses* or *mischiefs* to *David* at this time, yet because *David* had sins enough, for which this, and much more might justly be *permitted* by *God* to fall upon him, and by his not withholding *Shimei*, 'twas evident *God* had thus *chosen* to *permit* it, the holy man is forward to take it as coming *directly* from *God*, and *quarrels* nothing but the *impatience* of *Abishai*, *What have I to doe with you ye sons of Zerviah, so let him curse, because the Lord*—— Sam. 16. 6. Verse 10.

6. The *pious* man under *God's* discipline hath *impatience* to none, but those that would have him *impatient*, as our *Saviour*, that expresseth not the least *displeasure* to the *instruments* of his *death*, to *Caiaphas*, to *Pilate*, to the *Souldiers*, to *Judas*, to the *Devil* himself, doth yet *rebuke Peter's kindness* that would have *averted* his *suffering* it: He is the onely *Satan* that would rob him of his *chearfull*, and *joyfull submission* to the *Father's will*, for the accomplishing of which *Satan* himself is but a kind of *Disciple*: *Judas* and he doe him a very acceptable *service*; the former is styled *friend*, and called upon onely to *make haste*, in thus *ministring* unto him. John 13. 27.

7. *Secondly*, the *sincerity* of the *contentment* may be judged by the *quiet* and *stilness* and *constancy* in that *posture*, into which *God* hath cast us. An uncontented mind is always *removing* and *tossing* upon the bed, from one *side* to the *other*, as in a continual *posture* of the greatest *uneasiness*: And so is he, that hath any *inward* regrets to the condition, that God hath placed him in; whereas the *pious* man can be *content* to wait [g] *God's* leisure, and with *steadiness* of fixed *eyes* to *look for him*, till he shall please to *discover his face*.

[g] Εἰ βουληθείητε εἶναι ἡγναίωσε, κᾶν ὀλίγοι ἢ δεινῶν ἦτε, πειράσεται σὸν πλειόνων σὸν ὅσῃ καιρὸς καλλωπιζομένων. Chrys. *Ep.* ϛμη'. *Tom.* 7. p. 173. l. 27.

8. Such indeed are wont to be times of *temptation*, wherein as *false Prophets* are wont to *arise*, so they have many advantages, by the *assistence* whereof to *deceive many*, and the greatest and most *prevalent* of those is the *reproach* of our *solitude*. He that is *cast out* will be ready to *hearken* to any that tenders him an *hospitable reception*, and those that have least *reason* to *produce* for his entring into their *society*, will be most forward to make use of such an *advantage*, which may supply the place of *argument*. Matt. 24. 11.

9. And thus an *errour* that hath but the *luck* to be gotten in fashion, may by the *pomp* or φαντασία of many *followers*, probably enough get his *company*, that finds himself left *alone*, and is not very well *pleased* with the state, and satisfied of the *reasons* of his *solitude*.

10. This therefore is the second trial of our *contentment*, if being *cast* out by *men*, we can satisfie our selves with *God's* company (and the man that was *born blind* will yield us a good *omen* in this matter; when the *Jews had cast him out*, presently *Jesus heard it* and *found him*) if being in the *wilderness* we be not one of those *Reeds* there, which our *Saviour* tells us are *shaken with the wind*. John 9. 33.

11. This were the way to *cast* our selves out *indeed*, and so to have that *character* of real *Hereticks* or *Schismaticks*, in Saint *Paul*, so far as to be αὐτοκατάκριτοι, *condemned by our own sentence*, which is much worse than to be more *severely* handled by *other* men; and nothing but the *grace of God* and a *contemplation* of his *wisedom*, and an *acquiescence* in his *choices* (which sees *persecution* fitter for some servants of his, than the *greatest calm* or *grandeur* of the most *prosperous* profession) can secure us (if *temptations* chuse their *seasons*) from being thus *shaken*.

SECT. IV.

Secondly, Peace with all men.

1. OUR second *vital employment*, very fitly apportion'd to our *solitude*, is our ardent *desires* of, and *Prayers* for the *peace* of *Jerusalem*: We know what was required of the *captive Israelites*, when they were carried into a *strange land*, to *seek the peace of that City, whither they were carried away captive*, and *to pray to the Lord for it*. And we now know, I hope, assuredly; whither it is that we are *banished*, even just thither, where we were *before*, into the *bosome* of the *holy Catholick Church* of *Christ*. Jer. 29. 7.

2. And therefore as those, that serve *God* in an *Hermitage*, have not thereby their thoughts *confined* to that narrow *compass* wherein they *corporally* move, but *intercede* hourly for the most *common concernments* of *all* others; so must our *Oratories* be now designed, like *Daniel's Chamber* in *Babylon*, with our *windows wide open toward Jerusalem*, our *devotions* and bended *knees* (his *three times a day* at least) ingaged in that one great interest of *Christians*, the *glory*, i. e. the *peace* and *true piety* of that *new Jerusalem*, which is *come down from Heaven*; that like that which *remains* there, it may be *at unity within it self*. Dan. 6. 10.

h Ἐπήχει μὲν ὁ λόγον ἡ μνήμη τὸν ἀνωφελῆ χαρδίας, καὶ ἐκπίπτον τὸ δάκρυον ἢ φωνὴν ὀνικῶσι, ὅταν ἐνθυμηθῶ ὅτι ἀχάπητε καὶ εἰσὶν ὑμῖν θεὸς Κυρίου καταλελοφθείσης ἡ ζητῆμεν τὸ καταλεφθέν.

3. There cannot be a more h *amazing* dismal *prospect* in the world, than that vast *rupture* and *chasm* betwixt the *East* and *West* (the effect of that *wind*, those *tormina*, of *pride* and *ambition*, and *aëry speculation*, gotten long since into the *bowels* of the *great body*, and causing this *Ecclesiastical* σεισμὸς, this *Earthquake* first, and thence this *Hiatus* or *aperture*, which could never have the skill to *close* again) and the many *Subdivisions*, lesser *rents* and *fractures*, which are multiplied infinitely in this one *Western* part of it, a new *carnificina* or act of *cruelty* to the *mystical* body of *Christ*; first, cut asunder in the *midst*, and then so much life secured to *each* moiety, as to make it capable of the *Rack* and *Torture* in every *limb* of it, and of continuing for ever *howling* and *laughing* at once under those *torments*, till at length it cannot without fits of the most *phrenetick* rage be besought to come *out* of this condition.

Mr. Basil. *Hom.* xxix. *Tom.* 1. pag. 620.

4. 'Tis a strange *Romance*, and to any that partakes but of *ingenuous nature*, an incredible *Fable*, that the one *Heir* of the *Othoman Family*, having possession of so great a part of the world, far greater than any other *Potentate*, should therein reign a *Sullen*, *Solitary Tyrant*, *consecrated* first in the *blood* of all his *Brethren*, and then *thriving* and *prospering* into a vast *bulk* by keeping himself to this one *Canibal diet*, (full hausts of the *blood* of men) receiving this *tribute* from his *own*, as well as others *subjects*, all his *vassals* living to no other *design*, but of *killing* and *dying* at his *direction*, and to secure them of the continuance of this *trade*, the *Christians* not deemed *sufficient*, his fellow *Mahomedans* (if they do but differ from him in the *question* of [who is the right *successour* of their *great Prophet*] and affirm *Hali* to be the man) become as *unsufferable enemies*, as lawfull *prize*, as necessary to be *invaded* and *overrun* with his *hosts* of *Locusts*, as any. And all this while no news of the *one* design, and *business* of *power* and *dominion*, distribution of *justice* to *others* or examples of it in *himself*: As if all the rest of the world, but he that hath the *luck* to *strangle* his *brethren*, were born to no other purposes, but those of the *Gladiatours* in the *Roman Theatre*, onely to *fight* and *die*, with their *heart-blood*, yea and their souls also, to *minister* to his *ambitions*, or *rages*, or *frantick* devotions, paid to his *sanguinary* Prophet, to *pass through the fire to this Moloch*, to run like *mad doggs* through the world, sowing *death*, whersoever they come, till at last they *fall* themselves.

5. And for all this there is certainly no other account to be given, but that the *Dragon*, *the old Serpent*, *the Devil and Satan* being according to *prediction let loose for a time*, this their *Epileptick Prophet* was pitcht on for his *General*, entertain'd, and *inspired* by him, to prescribe this course for the *prosperous* managing of those *Battels*, which are mentioned, *Rev.* 20. 8. And accordingly it hath *succeeded*.

6. But that in the *Polity* of *Christ*, that *real Theocraty*, wherein *God personally* and *visibly* descended to settle (and to *preside* in) it *himself*, the *fundamentals* whereof were laid in a grand *pacification* betwixt *earth* and *heaven*, the *Statute-Laws* first and last (the *Old* and the *New Commandment*) the very same, for our *loving one another*, and the whole body or *Codex* most exactly conformable; first *peace*, then *mercy*, then *patience*, and *long-suffering*, then *bowels* of *compassion*, *loving* and *laying down the life*, a tribute of that *love*, extending to *affections*, to *actions*, toward *brethren*, toward *strangers*, towards *enemies*, both our *own*, and *God's enemies*, toward *heathens*, toward all *mankind*, never projecting other contentions or *victories*, but that one of *abounding* in *goodness*, and *overcoming evil with good*: That, I say, in a *Government* thus establisht upon such *principles* and by such *rules* as these, there should yet be so much of the *contrary* temper, nothing but *wars* and *fightings* among *Christians*, eternal *feuds* among children of *peace*, that the *whole host* of *Angels* of *light* should transform themselves into *legions* of *darkness*; that the *Mahomedan*, that is otherwise *impregnable*, should be onely thus *conquered* by the *Christian*, that this hath more *wars* a managing than he, and those *wars* more *cruel*, reaching to the *Soul*, *anathematizing* of *brethren*, casting out the *Greek Church*, the *whole East*, for *Hereticks*, upon no other *quarrel*, but the *Filióque*; and a great part of the *West* (without pretence of any word in the *Old Creeds*) for not accepting the *Trent Articles*, or differing with them about their one *Monarchick Successour* of *our great Prophet*: That all *Religion* should be placed in the *belief* of those *Doctrines*, which if they were *true*, are no least part of the *Christian Faith*: That all those things, whereon certainly our *eternal* state depends, *Judgment*, and *Mercy*, and *Faith*, should, by consent of parties, be left out of the *Scheme*; little or none of our *zeal* laid out on them, or for them, but all mis-spent on that, *which is not bread*, that brings no vital *nourishment* to any. *Lastly*, That those that *rebuke Tyranny*, and *bitterness* in others, under no *meaner* a charge than that of *Antichristianism*, should out-go all these *patterns* themselves, proclaim *liberty* to the *Captive*, to get the *cross* off from their *own shoulders*; and when they have done so, *inslave*, and bind it fast on the *shoulders* of all *others*, and (after all these contradictions both to *Religion*, and *reason*, and but *ingenuous* nature, to the *goodness* and *joyfulness* of *brethrens living together in unity*) men that are guilty of *all* these, proclaim *God* the *inspirer* or *favourer* of all, transform the *Prince* of *peace* into the *Inciter*, or *friend* of *Confusion*: These are a whole *Chaos* of *prodigies*, a *Landskip* of *wild* appearances, above all that the *African Merchants*, or *Scriptores Mirabilium* have ever furnisht us with, and yet make up but a part of those *Monsters* and *fish-heads*, which adorn our *Maps* of *Europe* at this day.

7. And then what Armies of *Votaries* can be sufficient to keep off that *wrath* of *God*, that threatens no less than *all Christendom*, for that one *unchristian* piece of her temper; what *Flouds* and *Rivers* of *tears*, to slake the *rage* of this one sin, which is more probable, than all the powers of *darkness* beside, to bring it low to the πύλαι ἅδου, which yet we have assurance shall never wholly *prevail* against it?

8. How can we at such a *vacancy* as this, be more *profitably* employed, than in *learning* and *practising* our *postures* in this *sacred Militia*, in *wrestling* and *combating* with *Heaven* for this *one blessing*, this *comprehensive* donative, this *grace* beyond *all other graces* (* *the greatest of these is charity*) this *duty* above *all other duties* († *above all things have fervent charity among your selves*) this utmost pitch of *celestial joy*, this *Divinity* it self (*God is love, and he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God, and God in him*) the blessing of *Catholick unity*, *universal peace*; and with *Jacob* never give over the *combat*, till we have *prevailed* with God for this *blessing*?

* 1 Cor. 13. 13.
† 1 Pet. 4. 8.

A Form of Prayer to this purpose the Reader will find at the end of the Treatise of Fundamentals.

9. And

9. And that it may not be ἐναίσχυντος ἀυχὴ, in *Hierocles*, or *Muliebre ſupplicium*, in *Portius Cato*, an *unactive prayer*, or *Womaniſh ſupplication*, that our *hearts* and *hands*, our utmoſt *endeavours* may herein be *ſemblable* to our *tongues* and *prayers*, 'tis very much our *duty* firſt to *cleanſe* our own *hearts* from every degree of this *pollution*, not to leave alive in us one *animoſity* either to any *Perſon*, or *Society*, or *portion* of *Chriſtians* in the world, to reſolve with the *Fathers* in their dealing with the *Donatiſts*, that thoſe ſhall be *our brethren*, which will not *admit* us to be their *brethren*, and according to this *beginning*, to ſet out *induſtriouſly*, and *indefatigably*, in the *ways* of *peace*, every man to contribute his *Symbolum* toward ſo good a work, and every man, as *God* ſhall enable him, to doe it *freely* and *chearfully* (for in nothing more than in this doth *God love the chearfull giver.*) Saluſt.

10. And would we but take the *Apoſtle's counſel* herein, * φιλοτιμεῖσθαι ἡσυχάζειν, be as *emulous* and *ambitious*, and as *zealouſly ſolicitous* in our *contention* for *quiet* (*i. e.* never *contend* with any but the *implacable* and *unreconcileable*) as the moſt *paſſionate broiler* or *boutefeu* is wont to be for his μᾶλον ἐμὸν his *beloved ſtrife* and *contention*, that brings him in no other *reward* but *blows* and *woe*, a *Tophet* here, and a *Hell* hereafter, I ſhould not doubt but ſome *valuable* contribution might be made to this *ſacred treaſury* at this time by the *poor widow Church* of *England*, with her *few mites*: which if they cannot hope for *thanks* from *men*, have yet a full *aſſurance* of being not *deſpiſed* or *unrewarded* by him, who ſtill *ſits looking what is caſt into the treaſury.* * 1 Theſſ. 4. 11.

SECT. V.

Thirdly, Frequency of Synaxes.

1. IT is not my purpoſe to *enumerate* all the ſeveral parts of *duty*, which this *Seaſon* exacts from us. Yet one muſt not be omitted, which in ſuch times the *Apoſtle* very diligently warns us of, that of the μὴ ἐγκαταλείπειν τὴν ἐπισυναγωγὴν ὑμῶν, *not giving over the aſſembling our ſelves together*, as oft as we can gain *opportunities* for them, holding up the *Synaxes*, how *thin* ſoever they are fain to be. Heb. 10. 25.

2. And this in reaſon now more *zealouſly* and [i] *frequently* than ever, for that I conceive ſome part of the deſign and importance of the *Apoſtle's* addition there, ἀλλὰ παρακαλοῦντες, but *calling upon one another*, minding of the *neceſſity* and *benefit* of this *duty*. And though the enſuing [καὶ τοσούτῳ μᾶλλον, *by ſo much the more*] be there expreſly *founded* on the *approach* of their *expected deliverance*, yet among the *Primitive Chriſtians* the continual expectations of their *dangers* appears to have had the *ſame* effect, putting them upon their *conſtant* [k] *daily Synaxes*, as not knowing how long they ſhould *live* to *enjoy* them.

[i] Σπουδάζετε τὴν πυκνότητα τῶν συνάξεων ποιεῖσθαι τῆς εὐχαριστίας τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ εἰς δόξαν, ὅτε ἂν ὁ πυκνὸς ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ γένηται, καθαιρεῖται πᾶσα αἱ δυνάμεις τοῦ Σατανᾶ, καὶ λύεται ὁ ὄλεθρος αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ ὁμονοίᾳ ὑμῶν καὶ πίστει. Ignat. *Ep. ad* Epheſ. Ἀφόρητα καὶ Ἀσίαν κατέλαβε κακὰ, καὶ ἔτι ἐρεῖ δὲ πόλεις καὶ ἐκκλησίας· ἄπερ ἀφιεὶς τὸ καθὸ ἕκαστον λέγειν, ἐκεῖνο μόνον ἐρῶ, ὅτι εὐχῶν πολλῶν χρεία, καὶ δήσεων ἐντεῦθεν. Chryſoſt. *Ep.* ρμέ. *T.* 7. *p.* 172. *l.* 20. Εὐχῶν μόνον τὰ παρόντα δεῖται πράγματα καὶ ὑμετέρων, καὶ πολλὴν ποιοῦ τὴν Θεὸν παῤῥησίαν κεκτημένων· Μὴ διαλείπητε οὖν ἐκτενεῖς ποιούμενοι. Id. *Ep.* ρξζ'. *p.* 180. *l.* 15. *Sic & Ep.* ρος'. Καυδιάνοντες καὶ κυπτόμενοι πλείονα χρὴ ἔχειν νῦν φροντιστὴν τῶν εὐχῶν —— μὴ διαλείπωμεν ὑπὲρ τούτου παντὸς. *p.* 186. *l.* 3. *There is nothing fitter for ſuffering Church-mens turns, than thoſe Epiſtles of Saint* Chryſoſtome *to* Olympias *and others, to be meditated on, for the fortifying of themſelves, and for their direction and conſolation.* [k] *In periculo—— Grex omnis in unum congregetur—— ut quos excitamus ad prælium, non inermes & nudos relinquamus, ſed protectione ſanguinis & corporis Chriſti muniamus——* Cypr. *Ep.* 54. *Quotidie calicem ſanguinis Chriſti bibere, ut poſſint & ipſi propter Chriſtum ſanguinem fundere.* Id. *Ep.* 56.

3. The *quality* of the ſin, and the *judgment* that is there threatned to thoſe that *voluntarily* neglect ſuch *opportunities*, is very *conſiderable*. It is there, Firſt, ſet oppoſite to *holding faſt the profeſſion of our hope*, v. 23. and ſo is it ſelf a *degree* of *renouncing* the *Chriſtian's Anchor*, a *wavering* (as is implied in the ἀκλινῆ, v. 23.) and a *drawing back*, v. 39. and that noted to be very dangerous and *deſtructive*. And accordingly we ſee in [l] *Pliny*, that they, who quitted the *Hetæriæ* upon the *Emperour's prohibitions*, were by the *Heathen Inquiſitours* thought capable of *mercy*, as well as they that *denied Chriſt*. Secondly, It is there *included* in the number of the ἑκούσια, the *voluntary* or *wilfull ſins*, in them (I muſt ſuppoſe he meant) who having the *opportunities*, whether more or leſs *publick*, wholly *withdrew* from them. Thirdly, It goes for an ὑπαναντίωσις, v. 27. a branch of *ſecret contrariety* to *God* and *piety*, a preferring the *world* before either. Fourthly, 'Tis of the nature of thoſe *ſins* for which *there remains no ſacrifice*, and hath its part in thoſe other *aggravations*, and *fearfull expectations* that there follow in that *text*.

[l] *Affirmabant hanc fuiſſe ſummam culpæ ſuæ, quod eſſent ſoliti ſtato die ante lucem convenire—— quod ipſum facere deſiiſſent poſt edictum meum, quo ſecundum mandata tua hetærias eſſe vetueram——Dilata cognitione ad conſulendum te decurri.* Plin. *l.* 10. *Ep.* 97.

4. The obligation that the *Primitive Chriſtians* conceived themſelves under, in this reſpect, is viſible by the *frequent* mention of thoſe *Hetæriæ*, and *Antelucani Conventus*, and *Cryptæ Arenariæ*, *meetings in upper rooms, in ſuburbs*, in *priſons*——in times of the *Heathen perſecutours*. And ſo alſo when *Hereſie*, or *Schiſm* prevailed, and drave the *Orthodox Obedient* maintainers of *Catholick Truth* and *peace*, out of the *Churches*. For though in theſe caſes they abſtained from the *publick aſſemblies*, and indeed thought it *ſtrict* [m] *duty* to doe ſo; [n] (The Epiſtle of S. *Baſil* and others to the Biſhops in *Italy*, and *France*, and S. *Hilary's* diſſwaſives in the *former*, that of *proſperous Hereſie*, and the *practice* of [o] *Holy* men in the caſe of S. *Chryſoſtome's depoſition*, doth, for the latter, make that clear) yet the [p] *aſſembling* of the *Orthodox*, and the more [q] *private offices* were not to be *neglected*. And [r] S. *Cyprian*, that adviſes the *prudent* and *cautious* managery of ſuch, doth it expreſly on this deſign, that they might be more ſure not to be kept from them.

[m] *Of the Cenſure of thoſe that ſo far complied with the* Arians *through fear, as to communicate with them, ſee* Concil. *Nic.* 2. ex *Athanaſ.* 2. Ruffinian. Concil. *T.* 5. *p.* 538. &c. [n] Φεύγων τοὺς ἐυκτηρίους οἴκους οἱ ὑγιαίνοντες διὰ λαὸν ἐν ἀσεβείᾳ διεσκεδασθέντα, &c. *Tom.* 2. *Ep.* 69. *p.* 658. *See alſo* Baronius, *An. Ch.* 370. *n.* 20. *from ſome additions to S.* Baſil, *Ep.* 11. *Malè vos parietum amor cepit, malè Eccleſiam Dei in tectis ædificiiſque veneramini, malè ſub hiis pacis nomen ingeritis——* Hilar. *contr.* Arian. *vel* Auxent. *in fine, Edit.* Baſil. *p.* 216. [o] *Vid.* Georg. Alexandrin. *vit.* Chryſoſt. Eton. *Edit. Tom.* viii. *p.* 239. *l.* 15. &c. *Et p.* 241. *l.* 13. &c. *Et* Chryſoſt. *Epiſt.* πε'. *Tom.* vii. *p.* 139. *l.* 1. &c. *Et Ep.* ρμγ'. *p.* 170. *l.* 44. *Et Ep.* ρος'. *p.* 185. *l.* 8. [p] *In time of perſecution, ſee* Baron. 303. 39. [q] *Montes mihi, & ſilvæ, & lacus, & carceres, & voragines ſunt tutiores. In his enim prophetæ aut manentes aut detruſi, Dei ſpiritu prophetabant.* Hilar. *Ibid. p.* 217. [r] Ἐν αὐτοῖς τοῖς διωμωτηρίοις οἰκοῦντες, τὴν ἐγχειρίδιον αὐτοῖς οἰκονομίας

μίας ὐκ αἰρίσεως· ἀλλ' ὁ μακάριος Παῦλος καὶ συσωτήριον οἰκῶν——ἐμυσταγώγει ἐν τῷ συσωτηρίῳ, &c. Chryſoſt. Ep. ριε'. To. 7. p. 190. l. 35. Κατὰ ἓν τὰς ἐρημίας φεύγει ἐν ταῖς ὀργυιαῖς πλατείαις καὶ συναγωγῶν καὶ δικαστῶν τὰς χίλεις αἴρων. Baſil. Ep. 69. Ibid. ' Cautè hoc, & non glomeratim, nec per multitudinem ſimul junctam puto eſſe faciendum, nè ex hoc ipſo invidia concitetur, & introeundi aditus denegetur, & dum inſatiabiles volumus eſſe, totum perdamus. Conſulite ergo & providete, ut cum temperamento hoc agi tutius poſſit. Ep. 5.

† Eccl. Hiſt. l. 7. cap. 1.

5. *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory* is full of this kind of matter; take one for all ſet down by † *Euſebius* from the *Epiſtles* of *Dionyſius* concerning the *perſecution* in *Valerian*'s time, and [t] *Æmylianus's Edict*, and the [v] *Chriſtians* conſtant *practice*.

[t] Οὐδαμῶς ἐξέσται ὑμῖν ὅτε ἄλλοις ποιεῖν ἃ συνόδους ποιεῖσθαι, ἃ εἰς τὰ κοιμητήρια καλοῦσιν, οὔτε εἰσιέναι. Ibid. cap. ια'. [v] Ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἡ αἰδεσίμης ἡμῶν μὲν τῆς κυρίας συναγωγῆς ἀπόστημεν, ἀλλὰ πού μὲν ἐν τῇ πόλει σπουδαιότερον συνεκρότει, ὡς σωθῆ· ἐν ᾗ τῇ μερίδι, καὶ πολλὴ σωθεσίμησεν ἡμῖν ἐκκλησία—— Ibid.

6. The *ſum* of it is, That the Aſſemblies were never *intermitted*, but obſerved σπουδαιότερον, *the more diligently* and *induſtriouſly*, and *God* gave his *bleſſing* to it, a *greater liberty* than they had reaſon to *look* for, ὡς πλατύτερον ἐκκλησιάζειν δύνασθαι, and many [x] *Advantageous opportunities* to *glorifie God* under their *reſtraint*, many *aliens* brought home to *heaven* by theſe means.

[x] Θύρας ὑμῖν ὁ θεὸς ἀνέῳξε τῆς λόγου καὶ——πλείονες ὐκ ὀλίγοι——ἐπέστρεψαν διὰ τὸν θεόν. Ibid.

7. The ſame *Good will of him that dwelleth in* the (*burning* but not *conſuming*) *Buſh*, whoſe *power* doth ſo *preſentiate* it ſelf to them that are in *afflictions*, that it is ſaid * ἐπισκηνῶν to *pitch the Tent*, to *dwell*, as † *Chriſt* did by his *incarnation*, upon or *among* ſuch, as are thus *tempted*, *inſpire* and *inflame* with the ſame *pure zeal*, and *crown* with the *like ſucceſſes*, all that are now ſo nearly concern'd to *tranſcribe* their Copy, to receive benefit by this *exhortatory*.

* 1 Cor. 12. 9.
† Ἐσκήνωσεν. John 1. 14.

Now the God of all grace who hath called us into his eternal glory by Chriſt Jeſus, after that ye have ſuffered a while, ‖ *himſelf reſtore you, ſtabliſh, ſtrengthen, ſettle you.*

‖ Αὐτὸς καταρτίσαι.

Zeph. 3. 28.

I will gather them that are ſorrowfull for the ſolemn Aſſembly, who are of thee, to whom the reproach of it was a burthen.

A LET-

A LETTER OF RESOLUTION TO SIX QUÆRES,

Of Preſent Uſe in

The Church of England.

A LETTER OF RESOLUTION TO SIX QUERIES,

OFFERED TO

The Church of England.

A LETTER of RESOLUTION TO SIX QUÆRES, Of Preſent Uſe in the *CHURCH* of *ENGLAND*.

SIR,

SInce you have upon ſome conſideration *made choice to call for my aſſiſtence to the* truth *in theſe particulars, and expreſſed your ſenſe, that the* perſpicuous *and* brief ſtating *of them, is all that is neceſſary to be offered toward the* reſolution *of them, I ſhall moſt willingly pay my* obedience *in the method which you have propoſed to me; and being confident of your clear perſwaſion, that I ſhall ſay nothing to you, but what I* believe *my ſelf, and of which I ſhall, when I am required, be able to give a competent account to a* Chriſtian gainſayer, *I ſhall firſt thank you for the* advantage *which the* order *of your* Quæres *hath given me toward the* deciſion *of them; The* firſt *being ſo neceſſary, and ſo proper to expedite the reſolution of the reſt, that as that hath fallen under the heavieſt* diſpleaſure, *to the overwhelming of the reſt with the ſingle weight of it; ſo the* prejudices *againſt that being once removed, the* conſequence *will be eaſie and natural (and by way of* reſultance) *that the reſt ſhould return to the* ancient liberty, *which they have always enjoyed in the* Church *of* God, *free from all* encounters *and* jealouſies *in the* practice *of them. For certainly, as in thoſe things of which we have not ſufficient advertiſement from* one ſenſe, *we are wont to call in the aids of the* other; *and when we want the more* valid authentick Teſtimony *of our* own *eyes, we ſupply that by the* eyes *and* Teſtimonies *of other men, and being to ſatisfie our ſelves of things* diſtant *from us, are content to make uſe of ſuch* Perſpectives *and* Otacouſticks, *as theſe (the beſt in every kind, of which the matter is capable, though none of them* perfect *or* infallible) *So having all reaſon to reſolve, that ſuch* Doctrines *and* Practices *of the* Apoſtles *times, (and ſo of the* Jewiſh Church) *which are not* plainly *ſet down in* Scripture, *are ſolely to be learnt from the* Primitive, *and moſt* authentick Records *of thoſe times, preſerved for our uſe by the* Church *of* God, *(as the way to* interpret difficulties *in* ancient Authours, *is by acquainting our ſelves with the* Hiſtories *of thoſe times wherein they were written) there can be no reaſonable* demurr *to the* Concluſion, *that ſuch, when* fairly *produced, are readily to be* admitted, *and all* contrary conjectures *of theſe* later *ages (how* plauſible *and* probable *ſoever they make a ſhift to appear to us) profeſſly* diſclaimed *and* renounced *in this* compariſon; *which being once ſaid, muſt be allowed to have its due* weight *and* influence *on the enſuing particulars.*

QUÆRES.

I. *OF the way of Reſolving Controverſies, which are not cleared, ſtated and reſolved in the Scriptures.*

II. *Of marrying the Wife's Siſter.*

III. *Of Polygamy and Divorces.*

IV. *Of the Baptiſm of Infants.*

V. *Of Impoſition of Hands for Ordination.*

VI. *Of the Obſervation of Chriſtmas-day, and other Feſtivities of the Church.*

OF

OF
Resolving Controversies.

The First *QUÆRE.*

Concerning the way of Resolving those Controversies which are not so clearly stated and resolved in the Scriptures.

FOr the answering of this first *Quære*, I shall need but to *demand* this one thing, (which will, if not granted, be easily *demonstrated*, and the *Contradictory* to it appear to be little less than *Blasphemy*) that whatever hath been delivered by *God*, is *equally* of *infallible truth*; and, if a *Precept*, of *infallible obligation* to those, to whom it is given; whatever hath been the *method* to deliver it, whether by the *Dictates* of *Nature*, or by *Voice* from *Heaven*, or by *Writing* with the *finger* of *God* in *Tables*, &c. And consequently that the onely thing required to secure our *faith*, that it be not placed on a *fallible*, in stead of an *infallible object*, is the *assurance* which we have, that the thing proposed came from *God*, and not the particularity of the *way*, or *sort* of the *conveyance*. *Sect.* 1.

For the illustrating of which, it may be expedient to recount the several *ways*, that men have had of *receiving* things from God. These, beside that of the *law* of *Nature*, the *Jews* have reduced to *four* heads, the *Voice from Heaven*, the *Urim and Thummim*, the *holy Spirit*, and *Prophecy*. *Sect.* 2.

To begin with that of the *law* of *Nature*. It is the known style of that, to be νόμος ἄγραφος an *unwritten law*, put in man's *heart* by *God* at the first *creation*, (λόγος φύσει νόμος, *Reason*, which is *by nature a law*, saith *Arrianus Didymus*, ἐνσπειρόδ᾽ τοῖς λογικοῖς ζώοις, *planted in the essence of every reasonable nature*, saith *Hierocles* on the *Golden verses*) and so, as the *Apostle* saith in another case, *graven in the fleshly tables of mens hearts*, not ἐν πλαξὶ λιθίναις in any *tables* of *stone* or *wood*, &c. 2 *Cor.* 3. 3. And of this I suppose there is no *question*, but that as it is in some measure *delivered* down from man to man with his very *soul* by *traduction*, so the *infallibility* of *God's* speaking by this *inarticulate* voice (this ἄνθρωπος ἐν ἑκάστῃ ψυχῇ κάλουκῶν, as [a] *Philo* calls it, *this man that dwells in every soul*, and that *man* [b] ἡγεμὼν ἀνθρώπου, a *prime commander* within us, ἔφορος θεῖος, *a guardian Angel*, that will not permit us to be wholly ignorant of our *duty*, nor to *transgress* it without some *admonition* and *check*, nay, saith *Theophilus* Μόνος θεὸς, the *onely God* of those *Atheists*, which acknowledge no other *Deity*, and the *certainty* of the *obligation* of it upon all *mankind*, even upon those that have no *eyes* to see any other engrossing of it, nor *ears* to hear it proclaimed or promulgated more *articulately*, is as great and *irrefragable*, as any other *written Revelation* or *image* of *God's Will* of any other kind, or of this it self, when it was afterward, in several *branches*, committed to *Books* or *Tables*. For if the *writing* of the several *branches* of this in the *Tables* of the *Mosaick Law*, were that one *Necessary*, which *satisfied* men of the *obligation* to observe it; then 1. they that lived *before* that time of *writing* it, must have wanted the means of *satisfaction*: and 2. the *obligation* must have equally extended to all, that was thus written, and so to every *circumstance* of the *Judaical Sabbath*, as well as to the *acknowledgment* of the *one God*, &c. Nor can this *obligatorineſs* be assigned by us to any former supposeable *writing* of it in *Adam's* or *Noah's* time, it being uncertain to us now, whether there were ever any such so *anciently written*, much more whether what was *written*, was, as the *Tables* of the *Law*, by the *finger* of *God*, or such as could truly pretend to his *appointments*: It being very probable, that what was before *Moses written* in that kind, was written by *men* on their own *suggestions* and *choice*, whether as *conclusions*, and *deductions* from the *Law* of *Nature*, or whether as *transcripts* of *Positive Laws* given to the *Fathers* by *God*, which were thus *thought fit* to be *conserved* by their *posterity*, but neither of these by *God's* immediate *appointment*, or *inspiration*, or *command* for the *writing* of them. To which it is necessarily consequent, that the *obligation* of such *Law* was *precedaneous* to such *writing*, and did not *follow* it, or *depend* upon it. *Sect.* 3. Of the Law of Nature.

[a] *Lib. Pejorem insidiari meliori.* [b] *De Agricult.* *Ad Autol.*

Next then for the *first* of the *Jewish* ways of *Revelation*, *the Voice from Heaven*, styled by them, בת קול *the daughter of a Sound*, whether a *Wind*, or *Thunder*, which used to *usher* it in; 'tis certain that in the former ages of the World, *God* commonly declared his *Will* by this means, or, which is all one, by *appearances* of *Angels signally* and *irrefragably* testified to be such. Thus did he to *Adam*, לרוח היום, ἐν τῷ δείλῳ τῆς ἡμέρας, saith *Aquila*, *in the wind of the day*, most probably in a *rushing wind*, as to *Elias*, 1 *King.* 19. 11. and *Act.* 2. 2. And in some like manner to *Noah*, to *Abraham*, to *Moses*, &c. And what hath been thus spoken by *God*, hath been by the *Writers* of the *Old Testament* thus far onely mentioned unto us, that *God* did thus *reveal* his *Will* to them, and *speak* divers things, of which some *few*, not *all*, are *recorded* by them. *Sect.* 4. Of the Voice from Heaven.

Of which notwithstanding it is 1. unquestionably true, that those that are not *recorded*, were as truly *delivered* by God, as those that are: Those that are *recorded*, having been *delivered* many years before they *Sect.* 5.

were *recorded*, and nothing differing (in reſpect of their *coming* from *God*) now that they are, from what they were, when they were not recorded. In like manner, as of the *Acts* of any *Emperour*, it is evident, that they were as truly done by him, when there was no *diary* kept, nor *Commentaries* or *Story* written of them, or before either of thoſe were *actually engroſſed*, as now they are known to be, after the *writing* or *engroſſing* of them.

Sect. 6. And 2. that thoſe that were not *recorded*, were as *obligatory* to thoſe to whom they were given, as if they had been *written* in *Tables* or *Books*, or *ingraven* on *Pillars*, and ſo *delivered* to them. Thus 'tis evident in the inſtance of the *forbidden fruit*, a *prohibition* given by *voice* from *Heaven*, without the help of *writing* or *ingraving*, and yet *obliging* ſo ſeverely, that all the *death* that hath involved *Adam*, and all his *poſterity* ever ſince, hath been acknowledgedly the *puniſhment* of that *tranſgreſſion* of a *particular*, *perſonal*, *poſitive*, *unwritten Law*.

Sect. 7. The laws to the Sons of *Adam*. And as that *Law* was given to *Adam perſonally*, ſo the *Jews* with one *conſent* tell us there were *ſix* heads of *Laws* given to his ſons, the *firſt* על עבודה זרה, *of ſtrange worſhip*, or *renouncing* all manner of *falſe worſhip*: the *ſecond*, על ברכת השם, *Of the benediction of the Name*, i. e. *adoring*, *praying* to, and *praiſing* the *true God*: the *third*, על הדינים, *Of Judgments*, erecting of *Magiſtrates*, and requiring *adminiſtration* of *Juſtice*: the *fourth*, על גלוי עריות, *Of diſcloſing Nakedneſſes*, ſetting *bounds* to *luſts*, and *prohibiting Marriages* within ſuch *degrees* of *propinquity*: the *fifth*, על שפיכת דמים, *Of ſhedding bloud*, or againſt *homicide*: the *ſixth*, על הגזר, *Of Theft* or *Rapine*, and of *doing to all, as they would be done to* by others. And of theſe *Laws* it appears not to us, that they were ever given to them in *writing*; or if they were, that ſure was onely as a *memorative* to *preſerve*, not as an *inſtrument* to give an *obligingneſs* to them.

Sect. 8. And of *Noah*. And of *Abraham* And when beſide theſe *ſubſtantial precepts*, there was in the repeating the *fifth* of them (that againſt *Murther*) an additional *mound* caſt up, or *hedge* ſet, a *Ceremony* preſcribed to *Noah* and his *ſons*, on purpoſe to deter them from this *ſin*, and keep them at a full *diſtance* from it: *But fleſh with the life thereof*, i. e. *the bloud thereof*, *ſhall ye not eat*, *Gen.* 9. 4. (In like manner as afterwards to *Abraham*, for the fortifying them againſt all the aſſaults of the *luſts* of the *fleſh*, ſo *abominably* indulged to by the *corrupt world*, the *Ceremony* of *Circumciſion* was inſtituted) And this, and the *ſix* former *diſperſed* and ſcattered among the *heathen*, ſo that *Phocylides* gives us a touch of them, Αἷμα δὲ μὴ φαγεῖν, εἰδωλοθύτων δ' ἀπέχεσθαι, *Not to eat bloud, and to abſtain from the Idol-Sacrifices*, yet were none of theſe committed to *writing* in a long while after, and conſequently had no part of their *obligingneſs* from *Scripture*.

Sect. 9. The Ten Commandments. Thus again in the *Story* of *Moſes*, being with *God* in the *mount*, 'tis evident, that the *Ten Commandments*, *Exod.* 20. together with many other *Precepts*, chap. 21, &c. (leſs weighty in reſpect of the matter of them) were together *delivered* by *God*, but at that time none of them *written*; and that afterwards, when the former part was *graven* in *Tables* (*ten chapters* after, c. 31. 18.) and *delivered* to *Moſes* in that form, to be brought down by him, and the latter alſo, in proceſs of time, *written* by *Moſes* in thoſe Books which are called by his Name: yet this *graving*, or that *writing*, was but *ſubſequent* ſtill, and ſo *extrinſick* and *accidental* to the *delivering* of them.

Sect. 10. The New Teſtament. And thus alſo in the times of the *New Teſtament*, beſide *God's* ſpeaking to *Chriſt*, and *teſtifying* of him from *heaven*, and the condeſcenſion and preſence of that ὁ λόγος, the *eternal Word* of *God* among us, we know that by *word* of *mouth* he revealed his *Father's Will* unto men in long continued *diſcourſes* and *ſermons*, in occaſional *ſpeeches*, and *anſwers* and *parables*, making them his continual *task* for three years or *four* together; none of which were, till after his *Reſurrection* ſome years, ſet down in *writing*: and then ſo ſmall a part of what was in all that ſpace *delivered* by him, that Saint *John* cannot expreſs the *proportion* betwixt the number of the things *ſaid* and *done* by him, which were committed to *writing*, and thoſe which were *not*, in any *calmer* ſtyle, than of [*I ſuppoſe the whole world would not contain the books that would be written*, John 21. 25.

Sect. 11. The Urim and Thummin. The *ſecond* way of *revealing* the *Will* of *God*, was among the *Jews* called חשן the *Pectoral* of the *High Prieſt*, wherein, ſay the *learned* of the *Jews*, there were ſo many words written (the *names* of *Abraham*, *Iſaac*, and *Jacob*, and the twelve *Tribes*, with this addition, כל אלה שבטי ישראל *All theſe are the Tribes of Iſrael*) as contained in them all the *letters* of the *Alphabet*, and by the *prominency* and *ſhining* of thoſe *letters*, the *reſponſes* were received, and communicated to the people. And all theſe were certainly the *reſponſes*, or *Oracles* of *God*, and are ſo called *Rom.* 3. 2. though very few of them are at all communicated to *poſterity* by *writing*. And for thoſe that are (as the *reſponſe* to *David* about the men of *Keilah*, &c.) they continued ſome competent time unwritten, before they were ſo *communicated*.

Sect. 12. The holy Spirit. A *third* way there was known among them by the title of רוח הקדוש *the holy Spirit*: which is thus defined by them: that a *man* being *awake* and in his *full ſenſes*, *ſpeaks* and *acts* like *another* man, but the *Spirit* of *God* (*ſpiritus excelſus*) *excites* him, and *ſuggeſts* unto him *words*, that he ſhall *ſay*. According to that of Saint *Peter*, 2 *Ep.* 1. 20, 21. that *Prophecy* is not ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως, of the man's *own incitation*, or *motion*, (or *ſtarting*, and *letting looſe*, as it were) *but men of God ſpake* φερόμενοι ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἁγίου, *acted*, or *carried by the holy Ghoſt*. Where as the ordinary, *ſecret working* of the *Spirit*, is by *illumination* of the *underſtanding*, and *guidance* of the *affections* in the *known* ways of *God*, revealed to all, ſo the *men of God*, *Prophets* and the like, were *extraordinarily moved* and *carried* by this *Spirit*, and *ſpake* as they were thus *incited* by God. Anſwerable to this is, under the *New Teſtament*, the *holy Ghoſt*, not onely *deſcending viſibly* upon the *Apoſtles* (as before on *Chriſt*) and *teaching* them all things belonging to their *Office*, but the ſame *Spirit*, by ſome *miraculous gifts*, *evidencing* it ſelf in others, without that *viſible deſcent*, as in thoſe on whom ἐπέπεσε, *The holy Ghoſt fell*, *Act.* 10. 44. and *they ſpake with tongues*, &c. and of whom 'tis ſaid, that by *impoſition of the Apoſtles hands* they *received the holy Ghoſt*, *Acts* 8. 17. And certainly many things have thus been *ſpoken* by, or from the *holy Ghoſt*, which were never *regiſtred* by the *pen* of any, and many more, which never came to our hands as ſuch.

Sect. 13. Prophecy. Their *laſt* way was that of נבואה *Prophecy*, and that of two ſorts, *Joel* 2. 28. in time of *ſleep* (κατ' ὄναρ, *by dream*) or *waking* (but being caſt into a *trance* or *ecſtaſie*) by way of *viſion*. And many of both theſe ſorts are not mentioned, but referred to, both in the *Old* and *New Teſtament*, eſpecially that ὑπερβολὴ ἀποκαλύψεων, *abundance of Revelations* afforded to Saint *Paul*, 2 *Cor.* 12. 7. of which there is little more recorded to us in *Scripture*, than that there were ſuch.

Of

Of the many matters made known to men by all theſe means, this one thing will be generally obſervable, that the *books* of the *Old* and *New Teſtament* were never meant by *God* to be ſo *full* and *ample Regiſters* of all *facts* or *ſtories*, as that in them all theſe ſhould be *recorded*. A *truth* which (to omit all other ways of evidencing it) may appear by *Scripture* it ſelf, there being many things *intimated* and *referred* to in *Scripture*, as *known* and *acknowledged* among men, which yet are no where elſe ſet down in *Scripture*, but where they are thus *obſcurely touched* and *intimated*. *Sect.* 14.

And thus thoſe *Precepts* forementioned of the *ſons* of *Adam* and *Noah*, which are no where ſo much as *hiſtorically* ſet down in the *Old Teſtament*, (ſave onely that of *not eating* of *bloud*, *Gen.* 6.) are referred to, *Acts* 15.20. but that ſo *obſcurely*, that were it not for the *Traditions* of the *Jews*, (their *writings* which were never in the *Canon* of the *Scripture* among them or us) we, that are now ſo removed from thoſe *Nations* and *times*, ſhould never know to what that *reference* belonged; But by comparing of *this* with *them*, and with that *breviate* of them in *Phocylides*, (which, though it named but *two*, *abſtinence* from *bloud*, and *Idol-ſacrifices*, was an *intimation*, and *reference* to the reſt of them) we have a clear *view* of the whole matter, and of the *reaſon* of that part of the *Apoſtles decree* in that place, if that were not too long to be here inſiſted on. *Sect.* 15. The Canon of the Council at *Jeruſalem*.

So when the *Authour* to the *Hebrews* mentions it as an act of *faith* in *Moſes*'s parents, that they *hid* their *child*, becauſe *they ſaw him fair*, *Heb.* 11.23. or, as *Philo* ἀστειότερον ὄψιν ἢ κατ' ἰδιώτην, *a greater beauty*, or *majeſty of countenance than could belong to an ordinary perſon*, we have reaſon to conclude, that there had been ſome *Revelation*, (a foundation of that *faith*) that a *deliverer* ſhould about that *time* be born to them. And by Saint *Stephen* we are clearly told, *Acts* 7.25. that it was early *revealed* to *Moſes* himſelf, that he was to be that *deliverer*, *He ſuppoſed that his brethren would* (at that time) *have underſtood*, *how that God by his hand would deliver them*; and yet neither of theſe *revelations* is ſet down in the ſtory of this matter in the *Old Teſtament*, but muſt be conceived to have come to Saint *Stephen* (and the *Authour* of that *Epiſtle*) by the ſame, or the like *Tradition*, by which he knew that *Moſes was skilled in all the wiſedom of the Ægyptians*, *Acts* 7.22. and that he was *forty years old*, at that point of the ſtory, when he *went to viſit his brethren*, *ver.* 23. (which is not to be found *Exod.* 2. or any where elſe in the *Old Teſtament*, but is in the *Jewiſh Records*. See *Midraſch Rabba Bereſith*) or by which Saint *Paul* knew the *names* of the chief *Magicians* (not named in *Exodus*) to be *Jannes* and *Jambres*, 2 *Tim.* 3.8. *viz.* out of the *Cabala*, or *Tradition* of the *Jews* (as we now find in the *Chaldee Paraphraſe* of *Jonathan*, *Exod.* 7.11. and 1.15. that they are ſaid to be *Princes*, or *chief* of the *Magicians*; and in the *Talmud* are called *Jochanne* and *Mambre*, and in the life of *Moſes*, *Jane* and *Mamre*, and in *Tanchuma*, *Jonos* and *Jombros*) and not out of any part of *Holy Writ*: Or by which Saint *James* had *learnt*, that it was by *Elias*'s *prayers*, that the *drought* was brought, and *continued* for the ſpace of *three years* and *ſix months*, and then *removed* from the *land*, *Jam.* 5.17, 18. which is not to be found in the *Hiſtory*, any otherwiſe, than *that there ſhould be no rain for theſe years*, *but according to his word*, 1 *Kings* 17.1. So ſaith *Theophylact* on *Heb.* 9.4. that when the *pot of Manna* and *Aaron's rod* are ſaid to be laid up in the *Ark*; and there is no ſuch thing found written, but the contrary 1 *King.* 8.9. there *was nothing in the Ark ſave the two Tables of ſtone*, &c. it is moſt probable, that Saint *Paul* being taught by *Gamaliel*, had this ἐκ παραδόσεως, *by tradition*; for, ſaith he, οἱ νῦν οἱ φαρισαΐζοντες τῶν Ἑβραίων σωτηδεύονται τοῦτο ἔχειν, *the Jews of his time that were followers of the Phariſees*, *acknowledge it to be ſo*, *but that it was not ſo from the beginning*, *but when the Ark in Jeremie's time was to be hid*. Thus far *Theophylact*. *Sect.* 16. *De vit. Moſ.* *Moſes* a deliverer. His skill. The Magicians names.

So though it be certain that *Baptiſm* was *inſtituted* by *Chriſt*, and his *Diſciples* very early appointed to receive *believers* or *Proſelytes* after that manner, and conſequently in *John Baptiſt's* time it is ſaid, that *Chriſt's diſciples baptized more than he*, whoſe *title* it was to be the *Baptiſt*; yet is not the ſtory of that *inſtitution* ſet down, either at the *ſending* out of the *Diſciples*, *Matth.* 10. or elſewhere, till, at his departing from the World, the *Commiſſion* is enlarged to *all Nations*, and the *form* particularly *preſcribed*, *In the Name of the Father*, *and of the Son*, *and of the Holy Ghoſt*, *Matth.* 28.19. which is rather an evidence that it was before *inſtituted*, than the *hiſtory* of the *inſtitution*. And the like might be ſaid of *Confirmation*, the practice of which we find in ſome places, (and the *Ceremony* uſed in it, *Impoſition of hands*, in others) but the *Inſtitution* of it we do not find in the *New Teſtament*. *Sect.* 17. Baptiſm. Confirmation.

And the *reaſon* of theſe, whether *Omiſſions*, or *Obſcurities* of *Intimations*, is clear, and may here fitly be mentioned, before we proceed any farther. Becauſe in thoſe *times* wherein (and among thoſe, for whoſe *preſent* uſe) the *Scriptures* of the *New Teſtament* were written, theſe things were already ſo exactly known in their *Originals*, and in all other *circumſtances* of them, that any larger *deſcription* of them was perfectly *ſuperfluous*, ſome things being *inſtituted* in their times, other by known *Records* delivered, and by daily *diſcourſe* or *practice* made *familiar* to them. Thus in *Chriſt's firſt ſermon* to his *Diſciples*, there was no *neceſſity* that he ſhould *command* them the obſervation of thoſe three great parts of *Religion*, *Alms-giving*, *Prayer*, and *Faſting*, being all of them by *Jewiſh Laws* and *Uſages* ſufficiently known among them. And therefore when *Mat.* 6. he gives rules for the *regulating* the circumſtances of theſe, he doth rather *ſuppoſe* them already practiſed among his Auditours, than give any *Commands* for the practice of them, *When thou doeſt alms*, *v.* 3. *When ye pray*, *v.* 7. and *When ye faſt*, *ver.* 16. And then if this *acknowledgedneſs* of ſuch particulars, was the reaſon of making no *larger*, or *clearer* mention of them, how *unreaſonable* would it be from that *Negative* argument of their not being *expreſly* mentioned in *Scripture*, to conclude that they were not *Inſtituted*, or to make *doubt* or *queſtion* of the *inſtitution* of them? And whereas it may probably be replied, that the *Scriptures* were *written for our inſtruction*, and not onely for them in whoſe *age* they were *written*; the *anſwer* will be moſt ſatisfactory, that although it be with all thankfulneſs to *God* acknowledged to be ſo, in reſpect of thoſe things which are largely *ſet down* in *Scripture*, and even of thoſe, in ſome degree, which are not, but onely *intimated* and referred to there, yet that *mercy* of *God*'s is not *leſſened* to us, but *improved* by the *addition* of this other, that for thoſe *things*, which are not at *large* ſet down there (and ſo may uſefully be explained to thoſe, that at this *diſtance* are not able to reade that *darker character*) the ſame *God* had *graciouſly* provided a competent *ſupply* by thoſe *Records* of *Primitive* and *pure Antiquity*, that are by the *good hand* of *Providence* happily *preſerved* to us. *Sect.* 18. The reaſon why ſome things are not ſet down clear in Scripture.

What

Sect. 19. The Nazaren Goſpel.

What hath been thus inſtanced in *Baptiſm* and *confirmation*, will on occaſion of the ſubſequent *Quæres* be farther exemplified. Mean while it is evident, that not onely the *Nazaren Goſpel*, which is not admitted into the *Canon*, doth yet *record* to us many *ſpeeches* of *Chriſt*, which we find not in our *Goſpels* (as that excellent one of, *Nunquam læti ſitis, niſi cum fratres in charitate videritis*, that his *diſciples ſhould never be merry, but when they ſaw the brethren live lovingly together*, and ſome other the like, of the truth of which there is little reaſon to doubt, though we have no *Canonical* Writer to *teſtifie* them) but even the *Goſpels* themſelves *record* each of them many things (but eſpecially that of Saint *John*) which are not ſet down by the reſt, and (which is more to our preſent purpoſe) Saint *Paul* ſets down in the *Acts* a ſpeech uſed by *Chriſt*, when he was here on earth (*viz.* that *It is more bleſſed to give than to receive*) which in none of the *four ſtories* of *Chriſt* had been *recorded*, and probably had been loſt, certainly had not come to us on ſuch *Authority Apoſtolical*, had not ſaint *Paul incidentally* made uſe of it, and accommodated it to his purpoſe.

Sect. 20. Chriſt's tears on the Croſs.

So *Chriſt's tears* upon the *Croſs* are by the *Authour* of the *Epiſtle* to the *Hebrews* diſtinctly mentioned, *Heb.* 5. 7. and by their conjunction with the *ſtrong cries*, (or his *crying with a loud voice*, *Matt.* 27. 50. *Mark* 15. 37. *Luk.* 23. 26.) determined to the particular time, in which they were *ſhed*, *viz.* when he delivered thoſe words [*Father, into thy hands I commend my Spirit.*] And yet in all the four *Goſpels* there is no mention of them.

Sect. 21. Chriſt's appearance to *James*.

So the *appearance* of *Chriſt* to Saint *James* after his *reſurrection*, being not mentioned by the *Evangeliſts* is yet related by St. *Paul*, 1 *Cor.* 15. 7. And although to the work of his *converſion*, and the *Goſpel* which he was appointed to *preach*, and the *Commiſſion* which he had thereto, he truly affirmeth, that he neither *received it, nor was taught it by man*, *Gal.* 1. 12. yet there is no *reaſon* to doubt, but that ſuch particulars as theſe, might be *communicated* to him by them which had knowledge of them, and not be parts of *Chriſt's* immediate *Revelations* to him.

Sect. 22. The Apoſtles.

So again of the *Apoſtles*, whoſe *preachings*, and *doctrines*, and *inſtitutions* are ſo owned by *Chriſt* himſelf (by the *Commiſſion* he gave them, *John* 20. 21. and by the *Spirit* he *promiſed* them, which ſhould *lead them into all truth*, and by his *interpreting* mens *hearing* and *receiving* of *them*, to be the *hearing* and *receiving* of *Chriſt* himſelf) that what is truly *Apoſtolical*, is *immediately*, and by *neceſſary* conſequence, *divine* and *infallible* alſo, theſe things will, to this preſent purpoſe, be obſervable, 1. That there is no *authentick* or *Canonical Record* of their *journeyings*, and *practices*, and *inſtitutions*, and *words*, (excepting thoſe paſſages which of Saint *Paul* are incidentally mentioned in his *Epiſtles*) but what the *ſtory* of the *Acts* hath furniſhed us with: which alſo is chiefly ſpent on Saint *Paul's* (and that onely on the former part of his) *Apoſtolacy*, reaching no farther than his *firſt* coming to *Rome* (and for that which is ſaid of Saint *Peter*, 'tis far from being the *thouſandth* part of what is reaſonable to ſuppoſe of ſo *zealous* an *Apoſtle*, in the ſpace of ſo many years, as he *ſurvived Chriſt*.) 2. That it cannot be imagined, but that the other *eleven Apoſtles* which took their *ſeveral provinces*, and planted the *faith* by themſelves, or their *proxies*, over *all the world*, *did* or *ſpake* many things, of which there is no account to be expected; but what muſt be received from other *Writings* than thoſe which are taken in by the *Church* to the *Canon* of *Scripture*.

Their preachings.

Sect. 23. Their Epiſtles.

And for the *Epiſtles*, 3. That 'tis evident that *Paul's* (all but that to the *Romans*, *Rom.* 1. 10, 11, 13. and *c.* 15. 22, 23. and that to the *Coloſſians*, *Col.* 2. 1.) ſuppoſe the whole *Church* or *Churches* (for the moſt part, the whole *Province*, conſiſting of many *Epiſcopal* Sees) to which they were *written*, to have been formerly *planted* by him, and after that *plantation*, *falſe teachers* and *hereticks* to have *crept* in, which generally occaſioned his *ſecond* journeys; and, in the mean while to ſupply that defect, his *monitory Epiſtles* to them.

Sect. 24.

4. That before all this could be done, 'tis *neceſſary* many things ſhould be *ſaid* and *done* by that *Apoſtle*, which will amount to a far larger *ſeries* of *ſtory* in each of thoſe *Churches*, than the *Book* of his *Acts* (or rather of his *ſufferings*) in all thoſe *Churches*, ſets down in all of them. And as thoſe *Epiſtles* relate to many other paſſages of *ſtory*, for which we have no other evidence from *Scripture*, but thoſe *obſcure* references, ſo is it *neceſſary* we ſhould borrow from other *Writings* the fuller underſtanding of thoſe *intimations*, or elſe remain in ſome degree ignorant of them.

Sect. 25. Form of ſound words.

One thing it will not be amiſs here to add, inſtead of many, that although we find by many *paſſages* in the *Epiſtles*, that there was a *form of ſound words*, a number of *ſpecial doctrines*, which were by all the *Apoſtles* conſent to be maintained and preached in all their *journeyings* and *plantations*, μία πίστις, one *faith* or *ſummary* of things to be *believed*, *Eph.* 4. 5. πίστις ἅπαξ παραδοθεῖσα, *the faith once*, or *at once*, or *altogether* (or, as the ἅπαξ may ſignifie τὸ πρῶτον, *at firſt*) *delivered to the Saints*, *Jude* 3. ὑποτύπωσις, a *ſhort breviary* of *wholſome words*, or *orthodox doctrine*, 2 *Tim.* 1. 13. παραθήκη καλὴ, a *good depoſitum*, or *truſt*, *delivered* by the *Apoſtles* to others, *ver.* 14. and in like manner a *Rule* for *rites* and *practices* more *extrinſecal*, *inſtitutions* and *ordinances*, the ſame in all *Churches* (though in ſome few things of *lower nature*, according to the different tempers of the places, ſome *variety* be obſervable:) Yet what all theſe *doctrines*, or theſe *cuſtoms* were, is no where ſet down, either in the *ſtory* of the *Acts*, or in any of the *Epiſtles*, ſave onely as they lie diſperſed in ſeveral *corners*, and from the *preachings* of the *Apoſtles* by the *Records* of the *firſt* times (which never pretended to be *inſpired*) are put together and interpreted to us. In which reſpect it is, that the *pure* and *Primitive Church* of *Epheſus* (and, by *analogy* with that, any other *particular Church*, and all ſucceeding *ages* of it, as far as they *adhere* to, and accord with that) is ſtiled the *pillar* and *baſis* of *truth*, 1 *Tim.* 3. 15. *i. e.* (by the *figure* ἐν δι' ἑνιῶν) a *pillar* firmly ſet upon its *baſis* (ſuch as cuſtomarily their houſes were built on, *Jud.* 16. 26.) and the *truth* of the *Goſpel* (depoſited by the *Apoſtles*, and kept in each *Church* by the fidelity of the *Biſhops* there, *Timothy*, &c.) ſaid to be *held* up firmly by this *pillar*, *ſupported* and *ſuſtained* by it.

Sect. 26.

Having thus far touched on ſome few of the many *evidences*, which are ready to *demonſtrate* and *teſtifie* this truth, that *God* hath *done* and *ſpoken* by *himſelf*, by his *Prophets* and *Apoſtles*, many things in all times which are not, nor can be ſuppoſed to be at large ſet down in the *Scriptures* either of the *Old* or *New teſtament*, that which is behind will be eaſily reducible to theſe three *Propoſitions*.

Sect. 27. The firſt propoſition, Of the authority of the Canons of Scripture.

Firſt, that the *Authority* of the *Canon* of *Scripture*, or the firſt *ground* of *believing* it to contain (what with all *reverence* it is by all *Chriſtians* moſt juſtly *believed* to do) the *word* and *will* of *God*, is taken from the *authentick teſtimony* of the *Chriſtian Church* of the firſt ages, and not from any other ways of probation (one

or

or more) *abſtracted* from this, or not *ſuperſtructed* on it. Two parts there are of this *Propoſition*, an *Affirmative* and a *Negative*.

Sect. 28. Proved in both parts, the Affirmative,

2. Firſt, I ſay, the *Canon* of *Scripture* is taken from the *Authority* and *Teſtimony* of the *Church*: And if there were any need of *confirming* this, this one argument *ad homines* were ſufficient, That the *Canon* of *Scripture*, as it now ſtands in all the *Reformed Churches*, and as they differ from the *Romaniſts* in the aſſigning of the *Books Canonical* and *Apocryphal*, was certainly agreed on by the *Governours* of the ſeveral *Churches* at the *Reformation*, not from any other more *particular* reaſon or *motive*, but from the *affirmations* of the *Ancients*, that theſe, which we now call *Canonical* books, were, as ſuch, *delivered* them down by their *Fathers*; and, that the *Apocryphal*, with *ſome* note of *diſtinction*, were in like manner *tranſmitted* by them, as *uſefull* to be read in the *Church*, and ſo placed not among *Divine*, but *Eccleſiaſtical* Writings. The words of St. *Jerom* and of *Ruffinus*, are ordinarily known to this purpoſe; of the one, *Hæc ſunt quæ patres intra Canonem concluſerunt*: and, *Hæc nobis à Patribus tradita, Theſe are the writings which the Fathers have concluded within the Canon, theſe are delivered to us by the Fathers.* And then a *Catalogue* ſet down exactly concordant to what the *Reformed Churches* uniformly receive at this day. And of the other, *Hos quidem Eccleſia legit, ſed inter Canonicas Scripturas non recipit, Theſe the Church reads, but receives not among Canonical*, and *alii non Canonici, ſed Eccleſiaſtici à majoribus appellati ſunt, Others have been called by our Anceſtours Eccleſiaſtical, not Canonical*, adding an *enumeration* of all thoſe, which we call *Apocryphal*. And this is ſo evidently the way of *determining*, uſed by the *Reformed Churches*, that it is not imaginable, to what other *motive* it can be *imputed*, that we *all* have pitcht *exactly* on the *ſame Canon*. And truly if the *Teſtimony* of the *Church* (or *Biſhops* of *Aſia*, I ſuppoſe, upon whoſe entreaty *Euſebius* tells us, he wrote his *Goſpel*) annext to the *Goſpel* of Saint *John* [*We know that his teſtimony is true*] was of ſo much *authority*, as to be thought meet to have a place in the *holy Canon*, *John* 21. 24. we ſhall have little reaſon to *envy* the *whole Primitive Church* of *Chriſt* that *honour*, and *dignity* of being the *Conſervatory* of our *Records* in this matter.

Sect. 29. The Negative.

Secondly, as the *Canon* is confeſſedly received from this *authentick Teſtimony* of the *Chriſtian Church*, ſo it is not, nor can it be imagined to be *taken* from any *other way* of *Probation*.

Sect. 30. 1. Not from the private ſpirit.

Not from the *private ſpirit*, from any *perſwaſion* in, or of mine own *breaſt*, giving me that *aſſurance* of it: For that being confined *perſonally* to *me*, or the like, cannot be ſuppoſed of ſo much *validity*, as the more *univerſal ſpirit*, and the *perſwaſion* and *teſtification* of the *whole Church*. This being ſo much a *weaker*, as it is a more *particular* way of *probation*: And ſuch as it is, it cannot miſs being confuted, as ſoon as ever it is produced. The *ſpirit* of the *illiterate*, though *pious* man, being no more able to give that *teſtimony* of any verſe of *Scripture* in the *original*, when it were read to him, than of any period in any *heathen Greek*, or *Arabick* Authour; nor the *ſpirit* of the moſt *learned* able to diſtinguiſh betwixt the latter part of the *twelfth* verſe of the firſt *Chapter* to *Titus*, and what was dictated by the *ſpirit* of a *man*, a *verſe* in *Epimenides* a *Greek Poet*. And for the *whole Canon*, as ſuch, it is evident that the *leaving out* any integral *part* of that, or *taking in* any other *part*, is the *changing* of the *whole*, and conſequently, that if every man's *ſpirit* be left the onely *judge*, every *ſingle* perſon in thus *judging*, may differ from every other, (for what *ſome* men *have* done, it is ſure that *all men may*) and ſo by this way of proceeding, there may be as many *Canons* of *Scripture*, infinitely multipliable, as there be, or ſhall be *Chriſtians* to *conſtitute* them: which is an *abſurdity* as groſs, as can reaſonably be faln upon. And if all theſe inconveniences did not lie againſt this *pretenſion*, yet it is moſt certain, that the *ſpirit* of a *private* man is to *judge* for none but *himſelf* (for, *Who hath conſtituted him a judge or diſtributer?*) and conſequently that the *ſpirit* of ſuch an one can never *judge* of a *Canon* or *Rule*, which being ſuch, is to *regulate* others, to impoſe *Laws* univerſally on *all Chriſtians*, and not one particular onely.

Sect. 31. 2. Not from reaſon, or rational diſcourſe.

Nor 2. from the judgment of *reaſon*, or *rational diſcourſe*, from the *ſtyle*, &c. becauſe though it be moſt *reaſonable* to *believe* whatever appears to be *affirmed* by *God*, yet *Reaſon* is no *judge* whether *God* have *affirmed* ſuch a thing or no, any otherwiſe than by concluding it from *teſtimonies*, that *affirm* he hath *affirmed* it. For as to the *ſubject matter* of *Scripture*, there are many things there, which are but *hiſtorical narrations*, *genealogies*, &c. and cannot by help of *reaſon* be diſcriminated from the ſame, deſcribed by any *humane* pen: many things again which are above *reaſon*, the *Doctrine* of the *Trinity*, the *Reſurrection*, &c. the *faith* of which muſt come by *hearing*, and not by *reaſoning*: and many things again, of which there is no other *reaſon* to be given, but the *will* of *God*, which could not have been known to be his *Will*, had they not been *revealed* to be ſo. And on the *contrary*, many things are highly *reaſonable*, which yet are not the *word* of *God*. The *Pythagoreans golden verſes* are, almoſt all of them, *eminently* ſo, and *Epictetus*, and *Arrian*, and *Hierocles*, and *Seneca*, are moſt full of *ſublime* and *divine reaſon*: and thoſe *writings* of *Orthodox Chriſtians*, which have *tranſcribed* ſeveral truths from that great *Original*, are yet no part of that *Canon*.

Sect. 32. 3. Not from the inſpiredneſs of the Apoſtles.

Nay, nor 3. from the undoubted *inſpiredneſs* of the *Apoſtles* of *Chriſt*, and the *promiſe*, that the *Spirit*, when it came upon them ſhould *lead them into all truth*. For that, though it be, *in theſi*, a moſt acknowledged *truth*, yet being applied to this matter, is the *begging* of the *queſtion*, and *ſuppoſes* theſe to be the *writings* of thoſe *inſpired* perſons, which it *ſhould prove* to be ſo.

Sect. 33.

All which being thus inferred, and ſuppoſed, is yet as far from ſubjecting this diſcourſe to that (*ſacrilegious*) blame of *raiſing* the *authority* of the *Church* above the *Scriptures*, as the deſignation of *John Baptiſt* to his office of κήρυξ, to *proclaim*, or give *teſtimony* to *Chriſt*, can be thought to have *elevated*, and dignified him above the *Meſſias*, whoſe *ſhoe latchet* he profeſſeth himſelf *unworthy to unlooſe*: Or as the *lowly*, but *uſefull miniſtery* of a *diſciple*, can de deemed a *pretenſion* to (or uſurpation of) *ſuperiority* over the *Maſter*. A *diſtance* which cannot be rightly meaſured, but by that of one extreme or *contrary* from another.

Sect. 34. The ſecond Propoſition.

Secondly, that the *accepting* of ſo great a thing, as is the *Canon* of *Scripture*, *primarily* and *fundamentally* from this *teſtimony* of the *ancient Church*, and onely *ſecundarily* (and *ſubordinately* to that) from the inward *Characters* of *Divinity* obſervable in it, is a very great *preſumption*, and *acknowledgement* of the force of the argument drawn from the *univerſal teſtimony* of the *firſt* and pureſt ages of the *Church*. And conſequently that as any thing which ſhould appear to us to have been delivered from the *Apoſtles* of *Chriſt*, by the *ſame* or *equal evidences*, by which we acknowledge and receive the *Canon* of *Scripture*, could not with any

reaſon

reaſon be *disbelieved*, or without *impiety* be *rejected* by us: ſo whatſoever is teſtified to come from the ſame fountain, by thoſe evidences which approach *neareſt* to thoſe on which we receive the *Canon* of *Scripture*, that (ſuppoſing the *Scripture* to define nothing in it) is in all reaſon to be believed before the *contrary*, which is either *teſtified* by a leſs competent *authority*, or undertaken to be proved but by *probable arguments*.

Sect. 35. The third Propoſition or the Concluſion. From which *Premiſſes* the leaſt which, in the third place, can be *concluded*, is this, That whatſoever hath the *concordant atteſtation* of the *Chriſtian Church* of the *firſt ages* (the *Scripture* remaining *obſcure*, or *ſilent* in the matter) that it was the *doctrine* or *practice Apoſtolical*, there remains not to any that now lives (thus *remote* from thoſe *fountains* of *ſtory*, and onely *repoſitories* of ſuch *truths*) any imaginable ground of *ſober* or prudent *doubting*, or *queſtioning* the *truth* of it. It being 1. evident to any man's ſight, That this is a *queſtion* merely of *fact*, whether ſuch a *doctrine* were *taught*, or *practice* taken up by the *Apoſtles*, or no: and 2. the *rule* being undeniable, that, in ſuch matters, no *probable reaſon*, one or more, no *collection*, or *conſpiration* of ſuch (be it never ſo lucky) is in any degree competent, or conſiderable againſt that one *argument*, taken from *teſtimony* of thoſe, who cannot be imagined *ignorant*, nor preſumed to have *conſpired* to the *deceiving* of us: It being certain, that nothing is ever done, but 'tis poſſible any one of an hundred things elſe might have been then done in ſtead of it, (the *action* ſtill depending on the then *free choice* of the agent, and not at all *dictated* to him by my preſent way of *reaſoning*) and the addition or application of *probable reaſons* to a *poſſible* event, being merely the work of a good *invention* firſt, and then of *prudence*, and *dexterity* of *contrivance*, that what is *feigned*, may not *betray*, and *confute* it ſelf. And then ſeeing it is affirmed by *God* himſelf, that *his ways* are *unlike ours*, his methods of *wiſe diſpoſal* moſt contrary to thoſe which our *paſſions*, or *intereſts*, or *prejudices* would (if taken into *conſultation*) have ſuggeſted to him, the *concluſion* muſt be, That our way of *judging God's poſitive acts*, *doctrines* or *inſtitutions*, by what ſeems in it ſelf *probable* to us, muſt needs be of all others the moſt *fallacious* and *improbable*; and conſequently that the ſureſt means of *interpreting* ſuch *obſcurities* of *Scriptures*, of *deciding* ſuch *Controverſies* as theſe, which are not *interpretable*, and *decideable* by plain *verdict* of the *Scripture* it ſelf, is the *teſtimony* of thoſe *Writers* of the *firſt times*, which have ſet down more *clearly*, what is but *obſcurely* (in *paſſing*, and without occaſion of adding more) intimated or touched in the *Scripture*, or which *record* the *doctrine* or *practice* of the *Apoſtles*, which is not there *recorded*.

Judges of matters of fact.

Teſtimony of the firſt times.

Sect. 36. To which purpoſe it is obſervable, that there being *two* ſorts of *Doctours* among the *Jews*, the one of the *Talmudiſts*, who profeſs to ſuperadd the *traditions* of *men*, to the *commands* of *God* in *Scripture*, *Mat.* 15.9. the other the *Karæans*, or *Scripturarians*, which explicate the *Law* according to the *literal* ſenſe, לא תוצה לי *without any addition to it*; yet, according to their own confeſſion, *three* things they make uſe of in *interpreting* or *deciding* any *Controverſie*, כתיב והקשה וסבל הירושה, the *Scripture* it ſelf, *Argumentation* or *Conſequence* from *Scripture*, and the *tranſmiſſion* or *delivering* down of *interpretations*. So wide a difference is there between *traditions* of *men*, and *Tradition*, or *tranſmiſſion* of *Interpretations* from the *Authours* of the *Scripture* themſelves, or thoſe that *lived next* them, and beſt underſtood their meaning, that they which kept cloſeſt to *Scripture*, and were moſt diſtant from the former, thought it *fit* and *neceſſary* to make uſe of the *latter* of them.

Sect. 37. *Caution.* What hath been thus far ſaid, muſt be taken with this *caution*, that it be not extended any farther than (to what it is in the *premiſſes* diſtinctly applied) to the *teſtimonies* of the *Primitive Ancients*, and again to an *accordance* of thoſe *teſtimonies* (without any conſiderable *oppoſition*) that this or that was *delivered* from the *Apoſtles*.

Sect. 38. Bare affirmations or opinions of Ancients. The *Millennaries*. For otherwiſe, as in matter of *doctrine*, the bare *affirmations* and *opinions* of *ancient Writers*, are but the *affirmations* and *opinions* of *men*, and others as *ancient* (if there be no ſure ground of judging) may be, and oft are of contrary *opinions*, as in the *doctrine* of the *Millennium* might be inſtanced at large, where *Juſtin Martyr*, the *prime* aſſertor of it, confeſſes other *Chriſtians of pure and pious intentions to be otherwiſe minded*, (Cont. *Tryph.* p. 306.) ſo it is very ordinary for ſuch opinions of ſome few to be taken up *ſucceſſively* by others, as that of the *Millennium* was from *Papias* by *Irenæus*, *&c.* which is but an argument that thoſe others *approved* what they thus took up, and no farther *confirmation* of the truth of it.

Sect. 39. Singular teſtimonies of matters of fact. And ſo likewiſe for *teſtimonies* in *matters of fact*, if, being but *humane*, they be alſo later, or but *ſingular teſtimonies*, and thoſe either actually contradicted by others of equal *authority* with them, or elſe the force and concludency of them evacuated by comparing ſome greater *authorities*, it will be a very infirm *argument* that is drawn from ſuch *teſtimonies*, and that which will receive but little *validity* from the *credulity* of ſome one or two others, which have delivered them down from ſuch *teſtimonies*. As when *Irenæus* from *Papias*, and *Papias* from the *pretended teſtimony* of the *Elders* before him, that ſaw the *Apoſtles*, affirms *Chriſt* to have been near *fifty years old*, when he was put to *death*, the *writings* of the *Evangeliſts*, though they affirm not the *contrary in terminis*, nay are made uſe of for the *founding* the *miſtake*, *Joh.* 8.57. do yet afford *evidences* to diſprove, and thoſe far more conſiderable, than the *teſtimony* of one *Papias* to confirm the contrary to have been the *tradition* of the *Apoſtles*.

Papias, of Chriſt's age.

Sect. 40. Two deductions of uſe, for particular perſons. What hath been ſaid, might now at large be *exemplified* in all the *particulars*, which either the *Socinians*, or other *Hereticks* and *Schiſmaticks* have of late pretended, contrary to the *doctrine* or *practice* of the *firſt ages* of the *Univerſal Church*, upon this one preſumption of preferring their *own reaſon*, or *private ſpirit* (which is but another name to ſignifie the ſame thing) before the *concordant teſtimonies* of thoſe times (which are moſt competent for *matters of fact*) and the more *univerſal reaſon*, and *publick ſpirit* of the *whole Church* of the *pureſt ages*: which is a thing in it ſelf moſt contrary to their *fundamental* pretenſion, *i. e.* exceſſively *unreaſonable*.

Sect. 41. For the Church it ſelf. And from hence alſo might be deduced thoſe *Rules* of *Chriſtian Piety* and *Paternal Duty*, which the *whole body* of the *Chriſtian Church* of theſe *latter* ages, but eſpecially each *particular* branch of it might *prudently* tranſcribe, and accommodate to preſent uſes; That peculiarly of *Gravity* and *Temper*, and *Warineſs*, not to multiply *Articles* of *Faith*, or *Canons* for *Cenſures* or *Dogmatical Determinations*, above what the *ancient Church* of the *firſt ages*, which was neareſt the *ſpring-head*, and moſt likely to know the *Apoſtles* mind, did alſo think *meet* to *determine*: There being no earthly *Providence* ſo likely to *ſecure* the *obedience* of *Children*,

as

as that of the *Parents not provoking* them, and the difference being not great (and the *danger* equal, whether that be done by too great *severity* of *punishments*, or *levity* of *commands*, the one abating the *Love*, the other the *Reverence* due to the *Parent*, and either of those *wants* much weakening the band of *Obedience*, on which all *Religion* so eminently depends, but both of them together (considered with the *imperfectness* of that work, which the *Precepts* and *Profession* of *Christianity* have as yet produced on the hearts of men, through the world) being almost ascertained to *tempt* that petulancy, and *encourage* that *contumacy*, which unarmed *laws* will not be sufficient to *check*.

Sect. 42. The Conclusion.

But these are so *large* fields, and so far extended beyond the bounds of my *present design* or *task*, that I shall rather content my self at this time with the *contemplation* of the *Usefulness*, and *Propriety* of these *Premisses* to the *superstructures*, which the following *Quæres* have squared out, and fitted for them, and therefore immediately proceed unto them.

The Second *QUÆRE.*

Of marrying the Wife's Sister.

Sect. 1.

IN the next place therefore, if it be questioned, by what *law* of *God* it can be defined *unlawfull* for a *Christian* to *marry* his *deceased wife's sister*, I shall offer you my resolution by these degrees:

Sect. 2. Prohibition of marrying the brother's wife.

1. That by the *law* of *God* given to the *Jews*, as it is now recorded, *Lev.* 18. this *Prohibition* is distinctly found, *ver.* 16. *Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy brother's wife, it is thy brother's nakedness.* Where by the *Positive law* of *God*, given there to that people, it is apparent, That as there is a *restraint* prescribed, and from that, some *boundaries* by *law* cast up against *unbridled lust*, not permitting to *marry* those that are *near of kin*, and that extended to the *kindred* of his *wife*, as well as the *man*'s own *kindred*, upon that ground of *Scripture*, that the *man* and his *wife* are *one flesh*, *one body*, and, in reputation of *law*, *one person*, *Lev.* 18. 8, 14. So this is directly applied to the *prohibiting* the *marriage* of the *brother's wife*, ver. 16. And for this there need not any farther *proof* be brought, than that *Text*, nor inquiry be made of the *reason* of *God*'s doing so, than this *will* of his, that being *reason* sufficient to those to whom his *Prohibition* is given, till it be by him freely *superseded* or *suspended* again.

Sect. 3. The right of kindred.

But because it is reasonably to be expected, that every man that reads this *Prohibition* so expres, will also remember the *right* of *kindred* so known among the *Jews*, and derived from the will of the *sovereign Law-giver*, that in case the *eldest brother* die *childless*, his *next brother* hath liberty, and some kind of *obligation* lying on him, *Deut.* 25. 5. to take the relict to wife, and *raise up seed to his elder brother*: It will, before we proceed one step farther, be necessary to the explaining and levelling of our passage, to give a brief account of this *antinomy*, and that not by interpreting the notion of the word *Brother* in *Deuteronomy*, of [the *neareſt of kin*, without the *prohibited degrees*] (as hath been by some frivolously pretended) but by consideration of the absolute *dominion* of *God*, and consequently of his free power, as of *making*, so of *abrogating totally*, or (as far as he pleases) *suspending* the *obligation* of all *Positive Laws*, of what sort soever they are.

Sect. 4. Dispensableness of Positive Laws.

For though some difference be ordinarily made between *Positive Law*, given by *God* to one particular Nation, and those that are given to *all mankind*, and again betwixt *Judicial* and *Ceremonial*; yet 'tis both evident, That those that are given to *all*, may, by some subsequent act, be *abrogated* or *evacuated* to some onely, either *in universum*, or in some *singular* case, and that as fitly, as if they had peculiarly been given to those, and to none else; and that those that concern *civil* life, may, if *God* please, be as reasonably *abrogated*, as those that are *ceremonies* of our *devotions*. And again, that though the *typicalness* of some of those *ceremonies*, may be a more prevalent reason with *God* to *abolish* those *ceremonies*, when the *substance* is come, which the *ceremonies* were set to *foreshadow*, than we can perhaps imagine for the *abrogating* of other *ceremonies*, which are not *typical*; or of *judicial* Laws, which are not pretended to be so: Yet still that is but the *reason* which moves *God* to *abrogate* the one, and not the other, and is not of any force to take away the *obligingness* of the one, more than of the other, till they are thus *abrogated* by the *Law-giver*. And consequently the whole weight of this matter is wholly to be laid upon the *will* of *God*, to *continue*, or *void* the *obligation*, either to *all*, or to whom he *please*. And so there is nothing strange in this, that for the preserving the *name* and *family* of the *dead childless brother*, (in a Nation, whose *genealogies* were with such a *Religious* care to be *observed*, and *transferred* to *posterity*) that *God*, which gave the *Prohibition*, *Lev.* 18. should soon after give the *contrary* directions in *one* case among the same *Jews*, without taking off the *Prohibition* in all other cases.

Ceremonial or Judicial.

Sect. 5. Marriage of brothers and sisters.

Thus upon that great reason of propagating *mankind* at the beginning of the *world*, the marriage of *Brethren* and *Sisters* was allowed by *God*, and so that *law*, which prohibited *incestuous* conjunctions, if it were given (as it is not certain it was) to *Adam* himself, or to his *sons*, before they had any *children*, was to give place to that *present necessity*, (as *Positive Laws* are wont to do) and so as soon as made, dispensed with, being not to take force, say the *Hebrews*, till *mankind* was sufficiently *multiplied*.

Sect. 6. Law of Nature. The Law of eternal { Reason, Creation.

And to this purpose it is an *ordinary distinction* among the *Schoolmen*, from *Thomas Aquinas*, that the *Law* of *Nature* is of two sorts, *Lex æternæ rationis*, *The Law of eternal Reason*, and *Lex æternæ Creationis*, *The Law of eternal Creation*: The former of which is said to be *indispensable*, the latter *dispensable*. This tinkling *distinction*, like many other that come out of the same mint, is not, in my opinion, reconcileable with the *rules* of *Art*. For *Reason* being the *nature* of *man*, and the *law* of *Nature* signifying (no doubt) the *law* of *Humane*, not *Animal*, or *Sensitive Nature*, the *law* of *Nature*, and the *law* of *eternal Reason*, must needs be phrases of the same importance and latitude, and so one cannot duly be a *species* of the other.

And for the *law* of *eternal Creation*, if that be contradiſtinguiſhed to the *law* of *Reaſon*, it muſt needs denote a *Poſitive law* given by *God* to *Adam*, and all his poſterity; and if ſo, it cannot be a *ſpecies* of the *law* of *Nature*, but of *Lex Poſitiva*, *Poſitive Law* in *general*, as that contains both that which is given to *all*, and that which is deſigned onely to *ſome part* of *mankind*.

Sect. 7. But this *impropriety* of *expreſſion* being paſſed by, which onely renders the *diſtinction inartificial*, not *uſeleſs*, there is certainly ſo much of *truth* in that which is defined by the *Schools*, as will ſuffice to clear this matter, *viz.* that though the *law* of *Nature* and *Reaſon* be acknowledged to be deſigned by *God* to *oblige all* men, of *all* times, in *all* caſes, and ſo in his *decree* to be *indiſpenſable*; yet of any other ſort of *laws*, even thoſe that are given to *mankind* at the firſt *Creation*, this will not be affirmable.

Sect. 8. The indiſpenſableneſs of the Law of Nature. That the *law* of *Nature* is *eternally obliging* and *indiſpenſable*, ſeemeth to ariſe 1. from the *conſtitution* of man's *Soul*, becauſe what is the *dictate* of *Reaſon*, is of the *nature* of every *man*, as *man*, i. e. as *he* was at firſt *created* after *God's image* (in *conformity* to which, *goodneſs* doth conſiſt) and the contrary of that muſt needs be contrary to that *image* of *God*, and to that *goodneſs* which is in him *eternally*; and, unleſs the *Soul* of man be changed, muſt neceſſarily be reſiſted by *natural conſcience*, that *inarticulate voice* of *God*, and manifeſtation of that to man, which is *eternally* in *God*. And 2. from the *propriety* of the *matter* of theſe *laws* of *Reaſon* or *Nature*, which is *eſſentially good*, and conſequently the *tranſgreſſion* of the *laws*, which enact it, is *evil*, *antecedently* to their being enacted: theſe being therefore *enacted* becauſe they are *good*, whereas all other are good, and the *tranſgreſſion* of them *evil*, on no other ſcore, but becauſe they are *commanded*.

Sect. 9. Shedding of innocent bloud. Thus the *ſhedding* of *innocent bloud* was *evil*, and ſo looked upon, and adjudged by *God* in *Cain*, and by his own *conſcience* condemned as *criminous* and *puniſhable*, before any *Law* was by *God* or *Adam* promulgate to the contrary. And although *God* (before whom 1. no man is ſo *innocent*, but that by the *ſentence* pronounced againſt *Adam's ſin*, he is juſtly liable to the common fate of *mortality*; and who 2. is the *donour* of *life*, and may therefore *take* it away, when, and by what means he pleaſeth, by the *Father*'s knife, as well as by a *fever*) may therefore fitly command *Abraham* to *ſacrifice* his *onely ſon Iſaac*, and then the doing it in *obedience* to that command of *God*, is not the *act* of *Abraham*, but of *God*; yet for any *man*, without this *ſpecial commiſſion* from *God*, to doe the like, is, and was *eternally evil*, and therefore was afterwards *prohibited*. Thus *Piety*, *Charity*, *Meekneſs*, *Peaceableneſs* are, and *eternally* have been *good*, even before any man was ever exhorted to follow them, and have therefore been in time ſeverally *commanded* by the *Father*, and *Chriſt*, becauſe they were *always good*. Nor will, nor can there ever be a time, wherein any, or all of theſe ſhall be as *diſpleaſing* to *God*, as the *contraries* of them have hitherto always been. It may moſt truly be ſaid, that *God* cannot *enact* a *Law*, whereby thoſe *vices* ſhall be *authorized*, *Malice*, *Hatred*, *Cruelty*, &c. and the contrary *vertues prohibited*.

Abraham's ſacrifice of his ſon.

Piety and Charity eternally good.

Sect. 10. *Cicero's* opinion herein. And accordingly this hath been acknowledged even by *heathens* themſelves, and diſtinctly affirmed by *Cicero*, *de Legib. l.* 1. where having premiſed, that *nothing is to be counted good, but what is laudable of it ſelf*, i. e. *may be commended of its own accord (nihil in bonis numerandum, niſi quod per ſeipſum ſit laudabile, id eſt, ſponte ſuâ poſſit laudari)* he adds, that that which is ſo, is *before and without any precept, good and laudable (quod autem laudabile ſponte ſuâ, illud ante & ſine præcepto bonum & laudabile.)* And the truth of this is ſuppoſed by all *Chriſtians*, when they aſſign the *difference* of the *Ceremonial* from the *Moral Law*, or the *reaſon* why the one is *perpetually* obſerved, but not the other.

Sect. 11. Poſitive Laws diſpenſable, why? But then theſe *reaſons* notwithſtanding, which are peculiar to the *Law* of *Nature*, It will be affirmable of all other, *i. e.* of every *Poſitive Law* (whether given to *all men*, or onely to *one Nation* of men, or whether given with an *actual reſervation* of ſome caſes, wherein it ſhould not oblige, (as the *Sabbatick Reſt*, in caſes of *neceſſity* and *mercy*, and for the *ſervices* of the *Temple*, *Matth.* 12. 5.) or *indefinitely* without any *explicite* or *implicite reſervation)* that it is freely *diſpenſable* and *alterable* by *God*, 1. Becauſe *God* is ſuppoſed to give this to *man* after his *creation* (who was therefore *man*, before he received it) and ſo this is but *accidental* and *adventitious* to him, and utterly *extrinſecal* to his *nature*, not *implanted* in him, or made a piece of his *conſtitution*, nor conſequently ſuch as, without altering his *fabrick*, may not be altered, as in the *Law* of *Nature* was ſuppoſed. 2. Becauſe this being not *eternally good*, but receiving the *goodneſs* from *God's command*, and conſequently that *command* being given *in time*, *God* may alſo give it for what *term* he pleaſeth, either to laſt *always*, or to ceaſe when he ſees fit, and conſequently whenſoever he *diſpenſes* with it to any particular man or men, that is a *time* wherein it *ceaſeth* to *oblige* him or them; and whenſoever, by any other way of revealing his *Will*, he *ſuſpends* or *aboliſhes* that *Law* to *all*, it again *ceaſeth* to *oblige* any, and having the beginning from his *poſitive* Will, it *determines* upon any *contrary* act of that.

Sect. 12. Difference between unnatural ſins and Inceſts. All which is directly applicable to the caſe in hand: For when all thoſe *acts* which are contrary to the *natural uſe* of *men* and *women*, *Rom.* 1. 26, 27. are to all the world *(antecedently* to any *Poſitive command) univerſally* and *indiſpenſably* unlawfull, and accordingly are called *diſhonourable affections*, ver. 24. and elſewhere, *not to be named*, and *abominable* and *deteſtable*; yet theſe *inceſtuous conjunctions* being forbidden by *poſitive* Law to *mankind*, are by *God*, that prohibited them, *diſpenſable*, and appear ſometimes actually to have been *diſpenſed* with, ſome to the *children* of *Adam*, this of marrying *the brother's wife*, to the *Jews*. Which *laws* notwithſtanding being not *in univerſum repealed*, or as far as concerned *mankind* in *general*, but farther confirmed either by the *Law* of *Moſes* or of *Chriſt*, have ſince that continued *obligatory* to all, to whom they were not *actually diſpenſed* with; and conſequently are to *us Chriſtians* now in the ſame *force*, that among all the *Nations* of the world they always were, *i. e.* as *truly*, (though not in the ſame *kind) obligatory* to us *Chriſtians*, as the *Law* of *Nature* is in all other things; becauſe, though they were always *capable* of being *diſpenſed* with by the *Law-giver*, as the *Law* of *Nature*, in the reſpects forementioned, is not, yet theſe have not to us been *actually diſpenſed* with, but by ſtricter precepts of *Chriſt confirmed* upon us.

Sect. 13. The Law of not marrying the brother's wife, farther conſidered. Having therefore cleared the *Prohibition* of *marrying* the *brother's wife* from that one *prejudice*, It will now *ex abundanti* be obſervable, That however this were *afterward diſpenſed* with to the *Jews*, yet 1. when it was given them, *Lev.* 18. 16. it was given as *abſolutely* as any other of the *Prohibitions* in that *Chapter*; parti-

particularly, as that of *taking* the *father's wife*, which is acknowledged most *inceſtuous*. 2. It was *enforced* with this reaſon [*It is thy brother's nakedneſs*] *i. e.* by being thy *brother's wife*, ſhe and thy *brother* are ſo perfectly *one fleſh*, that thou mayſt no more *marry* her, than a *ſiſter* may *marry* a *brother*. The *Laws* of *Conſanguinity*, which forbad a *woman* to be *married* to her *Father*, or *Uncle*, or *Brother*, were on this reaſon (of the ſtrict *union* cauſed by *marriage*) proportionably enlarged to *affinities* alſo, to the *forbidding* the *marriage* of the *Father's*, and *Uncle's*, and *Brother's wife*. And 3. the *reaſon* of all this is clear alſo: For the *principal* ground, which appears, of all theſe *interdicts*, is the *neareſt* of *kin*, (and accordingly thoſe are the words of the *general interdict*, ver. 6. under which all the *ſpecials* are comprehended, *None of you ſhall approach to any that is near of kin to him*) and not any other *conſideration*: Not that of *Reverence*; For, 1. that is due onely to *Parents*, and thoſe that ſome way partake of that *relation* in the *aſcending* lines: and yet the *father's* marrying the *daughter* or *niece*, thoſe of the *deſcending*, to whom he *owes* no *reverence*, is the ſame foul *Inceſt* with the former, and ſtill where on one ſide *paternal reverence* is *due*, on the other ſide it is *not due*: And, 2. the *reverence* due from the *Child* to the *Parent*, being in a more eminent manner due from the *Subject* to the *Prince*, yet becauſe there is not the *relation* of *Propinquity*, as well as obligation to *Reverence*, the marriage of a *Subject* to a *Prince* is not under any *interdict*. And, 3. the ſtate of the *wife* being a ſtate of *ſubjection*, and ſo of performing of *reverence*, this would be a *propriety* for (of more weight and conſequence, than any *objection* againſt) the *daughter's* being *married* to the *father*, if the *reverence* were the onely conſiderable. The *reverence*, I conceive, which is ſpoken of in this matter, is the *fear* of *approaching* thoſe that are *near of kin*, whom, on that *ſcore*, and not becauſe of the *reverence*, *God* hath forbidden us to approach. And accordingly the marriage of the *ſuperiour* to the *inferiour*, the *ſon's daughter*, &c. *ver.* 10. is forbidden on this reaſon, *for their's is thine own nakedneſs*, the *children*, to the end of the World, coming from the *parent's loins*, and ſo being *part* of the *parent*, and ſo that a proof of the great *nearneſs*, (becauſe every one is *neareſt* to himſelf.) And ſo ſtill the *Propinquity* is the bar, and not onely or principally the *reverence*. From all which it follows, that ſeeing the *wife* of the *father* and of the *uncle* are acknowledgedly interdicted by the *Law*, the *wife* of the *brother* (who, if he be not as *near* as the *father*, is certainly *nearer* than the *uncle*, the *father's brother*) is in reaſon deemed to be *forbidden* alſo, and accordingly is by the expreſs words of that *Law*, *Thou ſhalt not uncover the nakedneſs of thy brother's wife*.

Conjugal unity the ground of Affinities.

Propinquity the onely ground of the interdicts.

Not Reverence.

Sect. 14.

This therefore being thus *confirmed* and *cleared* to have been a *Law* given to the *Jews*, and that ſtanding in *force*, till it was to them, as a *Poſitive Law*, *diſpenſed* with (and then the contrary either *permitted* or *commanded* for a determinate end, the *preſerving* the *name* and *family* of the *elder brother*) It now follows by *laws* of unavoidable *conſequence*, 1. That the marrying the *wife's ſiſter*, was to thoſe *Jews* forbidden alſo, and that 2. not *ſuperſeded* afterwards by that countermand in *Deuteronomy*. I ſhall briefly evidence theſe two parts of this *conſequence*.

Marrying of the wife's ſiſter forbidden by the Jewiſh Law.

Sect. 15.

The firſt of theſe appears by the *parity* of *reaſon*. And the *Jews* have reſolved in this matter, even thoſe of them (the *Karæans* or *Scripturarians*) that bind themſelves moſt to the *Scripture* rule, 1. That there is place for *argumentation* and *deduction* from the words of the *law*: and 2. That whatſoever can be *deduced* thence either *à fortiori*, or *à pari*, either becauſe the *remoter* degree is prohibited, or that which is *equally remote*, is to be deemed *piouſly* and *rightly* concluded. Thus when *ver.* 7. the *Father* and *Mother* are both *named*; and *ver.* 12. the *father's ſiſter*, and *ver.* 13. the *mother's ſiſter*, and *ver.* 14. the *father's brother*, yet the *mother's brother* is not named, nor the *ſiſter's daughter*, which would be equivalent with that. And yet this being the marriage of the *uncle* on the *mother's* ſide, with the *niece*, which is of the ſame diſtance, with the *uncle* of the *father's* ſide, with the *niece*, and the *aunt* on the *mother's* ſide, with the *nephew*, from the *naming* and *prohibition* of theſe, *ver.* 13. and 14. by the *parity of reaſon*, that which is not named is by all reſolved to be *prohibited*.

Prohibitions *à pari*.

Sect. 16.

And juſt thus it is in this matter: This of the *wife's ſiſter* which is not named, being directly the ſame degree of *Propinquity*, that the *brother's wife*, which is *named* and *prohibited*. And that will appear by either of the two ways of *meaſuring* the *Propinquity*, the *wife's ſiſter* being as near to the *husband*, as the *husband's brother* is to the *wife*, and the *ſiſter's husband* as near to the other *ſiſter*, as the *brother's wife* can be to the other *brother*. And accordingly the *Scripturarian Jews*, as well as the reſt, do here reſolve, That a man is forbidden to *marry* לשני שארים *two*, which are *kin* to one another, and ſpecifie in a *woman* and her *ſiſter*.

The wife's ſiſter is as near as the brother's wife.

Sect. 17.

And if by the *Engliſh* reading of our *Bibles*, *Lev.* 18. 18. [*Neither ſhalt thou take a wife to her ſiſter to vex her, to uncover her nakedneſs, beſide the other in her life time*,] it be thought that the *marrying* the *wife's ſiſter*, *in her life time*, be the onely thing *forbidden*, and conſequently that to *marry* her after the *wife's death*, is not *forbidden*, that will be preſently anſwered from the *margin* of our *Tranſlation*, where the *Hebrew* [נאשה אל־אחתה, γυναῖκα ἐπ' ἀδελφῇ αὐτῆς] is fitly and truly rendred, not [*a wife to her ſiſter*] but [*one wife to another*] and ſo is a direct prohibition of *Polygamy*, at leaſt, when the *firſt wife* is *deprived* and *vexed* by the *taking* in of the *ſecond*, (as ſhall appear in the *Diſcourſe* of *Polygamy*, Sect. 7.) but not a *permiſſion* to *marry* any that was otherwiſe *prohibited*. And that that is the meaning of the place, may be *firſt* more generally concluded from the *variation* of the *ſtyle* in *this*, from the former *verſes*. The former *interdicts* had been given upon the *reaſon* of *Propinquity*, and accordingly that *reaſon* diſtinctly mentioned, firſt in *general*, verſe 6. and then purſued in all needfull *particulars* of it, to the end of *ver.* 17. But the *interdict* here is upon a *new reaſon*, that of *vexing*, which is an *evidence*, that the firſt ſort of *interdicts* (continued for *twelve* perſons) is now quite *finiſhed*, and that *another* head is begun againſt *more wives* than one: and accordingly upon that enſue alſo divers other *new* and particular *Commands* to the *end* of the *Chapter*. *Secondly*, this will be concluded alſo from the *nature* and *particular propriety* of this *reaſon* (here annext) to that of *Polygamy*, *viz.* that of *vexing*, לצרר, *to weary*, or *provoke*, or *exaſperate* her, for which the *Septuagint* reade ἀντίζηλον, *one that may raiſe*, *or inflame her rage or jealouſie*. For as *that* is not to be feared, but in the *life* time of the former *wife*, ſo as long as ſhe is *living*, it will be cauſed by any proſperous *rival* or *competitour*, by *admiſſion* of any *ſtranger* into an *higher* degree of *favour*, and not oneiy, or peculiarly of the *wife's ſiſter*. *Jealouſie* we know is not wont to be *confined* within *bounds* or *limits*, but is *equally* and *impartially*

Objection from *Lev.* 18. 18.

Anſwered.

partially common to any *perſon*, which is injuriouſly preferred in her *life time*, and thereby provokes her *grief*, or her rage, is matter of *vexation* to her. For prevention of which it was, that the *Divorces* were recommended in *Malachi*, as a more tolerable *unkindneſs*, as will alſo appear in the Diſcourſe of * *Divorce*, by the view of that place.

* *Sect.* 13. and 15.

Sect. 18. The *Karæans* interpretation of the place.

And thus again the *Karæi* or *Scripturarians* (oppoſed to the *Talmudiſts* or *Traditionals*) interpret this place, that 'twas here *forbidden* to have *two wives* at the ſame time: and they render a moſt *ſatisfactory* account for the ſeeming difficulty of the *expreſſion*: becauſe, ſay they, the word *Siſter* in *Hebrew*, referring to ſomewhat that is precedent, ſignifies *any other thing* of the *ſame kind*. So *Ezek.* 16. 48. [*Sodom thy ſiſter*] is *Sodom*, guilty of the *ſame ſins* that *Iſrael* was, as appears, *ver.* 49. *Behold this was the iniquity of thy ſiſter Sodom*, &c. and ſo *ver.* 45. *Thou art the ſiſter of thy ſiſters*, i. e. juſt *ſuch* another as they, *Sodom* and *Samaria*, were. And it is an ordinary *Hebrew figure* thus to expreſs *parity*, or *likeneſſes*. So *Exod.* 32. 27. *Slay every man his brother*, is to be interpreted, Every man *another*; and accordingly when the *ſons* of *Levi* obey'd that *command*, ver. 28. the concluſion was, that *there fell of the people that day* (not of the *Levites* peculiarly) *about three thouſand men*. So *Iſa.* 19. 2. *I will ſet the Ægyptians againſt the Ægyptians, and they ſhall fight every one againſt his brother*, i. e. one againſt *another*. And this is ſo ordinary an *Hebraiſm*, that 'tis uſual when the *Hebrew* reads *brother*, for the *Engliſh* to render it [*another*] *Gen.* 37. 19. *They ſaid one to his brother*, we reade fitly, *one to another*, though they were *brethren* that are there ſpoken of; and ſo *Gen.* 42. 21. And where the ſpeech is not of *brethren*, yet the phraſe is ſo, *Exod.* 10. 23. *They ſaw not one his brother*; and *Exod.* 16. 15. *They ſaid one to his brother*; and *Iſa.* 3. 5. *The people ſhall be oppreſſed every one by his brother*. And *Exod.* 16. 3. it is uſed of *things* (of *curtains*) not onely of *perſons*. And in all theſe places we reade (as the *phraſe* ſignifies, not as the *words* literally ſound) *one to another*. In the ſame manner, as when the *Hebrew* reads a *Companion*, the meaning often is no more than ſimply *another*, as *Judges* 16. 20. *Sampſon's wife* was given to his *companion*, that is, to another, *c.* 17. 2. 6. and ſo *Eſther* 1. 19. *give her royal eſtate to her companion*, i. e. to *another*, for ſure the *Queen* had no *companion*. And conſequently here [*a wife to her ſiſter*] will be directly according to the *ſacred Idiome*, or the *Hebrews* manner of ſpeech, *One wife unto another*.

Brother and ſiſter taken by the Hebrews for Another.

The interpretation of other Jews.

Sect. 19. * On *Lev.* 18. 18. In favour of Polygamy.

'Tis true, what * *H. Grotius* and *J. Druſius* ſay, that the *Peſictha* reprehends the *Karæans* for this *interpretation*. And the *Jews* more generally affirm, That the thing *forbidden* in that place, is the *having two ſiſters together*, and not *two wives together*; and from thence conclude it *lawfull* to have *two ſiſters ſucceſſively*. But it is viſible what brings them into that opinion, *viz.* the *beloved* and *preſumed lawfulneſs* of *Polygamy*, which they are unwilling to have *reſtrained*; yet muſt acknowledge to be ſo by this *Text*, if thoſe words be thus interpreted with the *Karæans*. Mean-while it will be hard to find among thoſe *Jews* (who affirm from that place the *lawfulneſs* of *marrying two ſiſters ſucceſſively*) any ſhew of *reaſon* for either of theſe two things, 1. Why the marrying the *deceaſed wife's ſiſter* ſhould be there *permitted*, where marrying the *deceaſed brother's wife* is diſtinctly *forbidden*. Or 2. Why *Polygamy*, which by *diſpenſation* to the *Jews*, is acknowledged to be *permitted* them in order to *multiplying* that people, ſhould not be believed to be *prohibited* the *Jews* in general, or the *prohibition* of it be ſet down among thoſe *Laws*, which had been given to the *ſons of Adam and Noah*, (here put together in this *Chapter*) as well as the *marrying the brother's wife*, which is acknowledged to be *permitted*, nay in one caſe *preſcribed* the *Jew*, is yet diſtinctly here *forbidden*.

Sect. 20. The vanity of their Reaſons,

For the former of theſe, 'tis true that *Abarbanel* enquiring why it ſhould be *prohibited* the *nephew* to *marry the uncle's wife*, and not *prohibited* the *uncle* to *marry* the *nephew's wife*, refers himſelf to *Maimonides Moreh Nevochim*, 3. 49. where he ſaith, That *God*, intending the *diminution* of *uncleanneſs*, prohibited it under thoſe heavy *penalties* in thoſe perſons, which had the moſt *continual converſation* together, and ſo moſt occaſion of it, as the *nephew* hath more occaſion to converſe in the *uncle*'s houſe, than the *uncle* in the *nephew*'s. And again he adds it, as the *opinion* of one of their *Divines*, that the *Reaſon* of moſt of the *prohibitions* in this kind, is to be fetcht from the care of *peace*, and *avoiding* of *jealouſie* and *contention*, which is *ſharpeſt*, ſaith he, among perſons that are otherwiſe *neareſt*: Which reaſon ceaſeth, when the *ſiſter* of her that is married is deceaſed. But certainly there is little in either of theſe *reaſons* to ſatisfie any *reaſonable* man.

Sect. 21. Diſcovered.

For 1. can it be believed that it is indeed *lawfull* for the *uncle* to marry the *nephew's wife*, when the *nephew*'s marrying the *uncle's wife* is expreſly *prohibited*? or are the *Jews* to be heeded in ſo ſenſeleſs an affirmation? It hath already been ſhewn, *Sect.* 13. That all *marriages* of *near* of *kin* (whether *Conſanguinity* or *Affinity*) are diſtinctly forbidden, *ver.* 6. and is there any imaginable colour of doubting, but the *nephew's wife* is as *near* to the *uncle*, as the *uncle's wife* to the *nephew*: And again, that *parity of reaſon* is of force in the *interpreting* theſe *prohibitions*? And what is *parity* of *reaſon* in this matter of *Propinquity*, but that thoſe *marriages* which equally partake of *Propinquity*, ſhould be deemed *equally* unlawfull?

Sect. 22.

And for the *Reaſon* there cited from *Maimonides*, it is impoſſible it ſhould be ſoberly conceived to have any thing of *reaſonableneſs* in it: for 1. By that reaſon *Inceſt* ſhould be *forbidden* onely to keep men from *fornication*, and ſo *fornication* be the *greater*, and *Inceſt* the *leſſer ſin*. As that certainly, which is therefore forbidden, that it may *ſecure* another *Precept*, is to be looked on as a *lighter* fault, than the *breach* of that *Precept*, as the means is *inferiour*, becauſe *ſubordinate* to the *end*: and as the *prohibition* of the *eating* of *bloud*, being deſigned to deter from *ſhedding* of *man's bloud*: and the *command* of *Circumciſion*, to keep from *uncleanneſs*; the *eating* of *blood* and *neglect* of *Circumciſion*, are ſure *lighter offences* than *Murther* and *unnatural Luſts*. 2. By this reaſon, thoſe ſevere *penalties* ſhould onely have been made againſt *Fornication* or *Adultery*, committed with thoſe with whom we moſt familiarly *converſe*, but not againſt *marrying* of them. For ſuppoſing that it were ſtill lawfull for *brothers* and *ſiſters* to *marry*, the making it *capital* for them to *commit uncleanneſs* one with another out of *marriage*, would as much deter them from ſuch *uncleanneſs*, as if it were alſo *capital* for them to *marry*. He that were ſure to be *hanged* for *ſwearing*, would be as certainly deterred from *ſwearing*, as if the ſame puniſhment were denounced againſt *ſwearing* and *curſing* alſo; which makes it probable, that the *ground* or *end* of thoſe *prohibitions*, was the *leſſening* of, or *reſtraining* from *uncleanneſs*, but more probably, that *peace* and *amity* might by this means be *extended*

tended more largely, than the *natural* bands of *relation* had *extended* it, as both *Plutarch* in his 101 *Roman queſtion*, and Saint *Auguſtin. de Civ. Dei, l.* 15. *c.* 16. have affirmed. Or if there were no other reaſon againſt *inceſtuous conjunctions*, the *Poſitive Will* of *God* alone were *reaſon* ſufficient. But then 3. there is no reaſon to affirm or ſuppoſe, that thoſe that are expreſly forbidden to *marry* others, are more frequently *converſant* in their *houſes*, than thoſe that are as *near*, but are not *forbidden*. For example; the *father's brother* is named, and the *mother's ſiſter*, but the *mother's brother* is not named; and yet the *niece* may be as converſant in the *mother's brother's houſe*, as in the *father's brother's*, or as the *nephew* in the *mother's ſiſter's*, and there is no imaginable *reaſon* of *diſparity* to be pretended. And however, this cannot be applied to the *point* in hand; for the *wife's ſiſter* is as frequently in the *houſe*, and *converſant* with her *ſiſter*, as the *husband's brother* with his *brother*; and ſo there is no reaſon deducible from hence, why the *one* ſhould be interdicted, the other not.

Sect. 23. The ſecond reaſon from the ſharpneſs of ſiſters quarrels.

Then for that other *Reaſon*, fetcht by their *Divines* from the *care* of avoiding of *jealouſie* and *contention*, that certainly muſt extend to the *interdicting* of all *Polygamy*, or, if conſidered in earneſt, *Concubinacy*, where the *wife* doth not conſent; as well as of taking one *ſiſter* to *another*. For ſuppoſing the *wife* to whom he hath *covenanted* to cleave as long as ſhe *lives*, to *require* of him the *diſcharge* of this *Oath*, what *peace* can there be betwixt her, and any other (an *inferiour*, her *ſervant* perhaps) that is *injuriouſly* taken in and *preferred* before her? This is *in univerſum* ſo contrary to *peace*, ſo ſure to be *vexatious*, that, as was ſaid, *Divorces* were permitted by *God*, as more *tolerable* injuries, more *reconcileable* with *peace*, than they.

Sect. 24. A miſtake.

The whole weight of this pretended *Reaſon*, lies upon this, That the *quarrels* of thoſe that are *neareſt* are moſt *ſharp*: But if there were no *injury* to provoke any *quarrel* at all, (as ſuppoſing *Polygamy abſolutely* lawfull, though there would be *ſin* againſt the *law* of *propinquities*, yet againſt the *wife* there would be no *injury* in taking in one *ſiſter* to *another*) then ſure the *nearneſs* were a more reaſonable argument to *ſecure* their *friendſhip*, than to *engage* their cauſleſs *enmity*. For although the greatneſs of the former *friendſhip*, by *enhancing* the ſubſequent *injury*, doth fitly add to the *exaſperation*, and make it more *unreconcileable*; yet ſure without any ſuch *provocation*, it cannot reaſonably *beget* it, and therefore the *old ſaying* of *Fratrum quoque gratia rara eſt*, the *kindneſs of brethren is a rare thing* (which I ſee by ſome *learned* men made uſe of to this purpoſe) is ſure miſapplied by them, for that was never in any the moſt *iron age* ſo to be interpreted or extended, that the *friendſhips* of *brethren* are *rarer* than of any others, (unleſs by the *accident* of *living* moſt together, they may have more occaſions of *quarrels*, than others that live at greater *diſtance*. And then to *counterbalance* that, the length of the *familiarity*, and *acquaintance*, and *advantage* of *converſation* to beget *kindneſs*, and *conſerve* it, may be as competent *reaſons* to make their *kindneſs exceed* others, and being *deeper* rooted, to *flouriſh* the more) but that, as an expreſſion of the *little love* that is among men, *fratrum quoque — even brethren alſo* have ſeldom a *conſtant agreement* and *kindneſs* one to another. Thus certainly it is meant by the *Apoſtle* as a ſad character on the *latter days* (thoſe before *God's vengeance* on the *crucifiers*) that men ſhould be *without natural affection*, as *Chriſt* had foretold of the ſame times, that they ſhould be *betrayed* by *parents* and *brethren*, &c. *Luke* 21. 16. *Mar.* 13. 12. which ſignifies this to be the greateſt, and the moſt *extraordinary* evidence of the falling, or *growing cold* of *Charity*, *Matt.* 24. 12. and that which includes, and preſuppoſes the *lower* degrees of *uncharitableneſs*, between thoſe that are not ſo *near*; but is far from concluding, That thoſe that are thus *neareſt*, are thus apteſt to *betray*, and *hate one another*. It is clearly a preſumption of the *contrary*.

2 Tim. 3. 3.

Sect. 25.

So far is it from having any appearance of reaſon (what is pretended by theſe *Jews*) that the *taking two ſiſters together* is the onely thing there *forbidden*. And indeed, if thoſe two things were granted, which are by them *ſuppoſed*, 1. That *more wives* might by that *law* be had *at once*; and 2. That *one ſiſter* might be taken after the *deceaſe* of the *other*, the *concluſion* would undeniably be inferred, that the *two ſiſters* might be *taken together*, were it not for that one *danger* of their being more *vexatious*, and more *unreconcileable* to one another, than any others would be; which being ſhewed to be no *reaſon*, their whole *pretenſion* is vaniſhed, their double plea, 1. For *Polygamy*, and 2. For *marrying two ſiſters ſucceſſively*, is brought to nothing.

Sect. 26.

Then for the ſecond, why it may not be *believed*, or acknowledged by a *Jew*, That *Polygamy* ſhould be here *forbidden*, though by *diſpenſation* otherwiſe *permitted* the *Jews*, as well as *marrying* the *brother's wife* be *permitted* the *Jew*, which is here acknowledgedly *prohibited*, I find not any reaſon pretended, nor is it imaginable that any thing of any weight ſhould be producible by any *Jew*. 'Tis viſible to *common ſenſe*, that what would hold for one, would hold for the other, being both *poſitive laws*, and ſo *equally diſpenſable*; both given to the *Sons of Adam* and *Noah*, and from thence *tranſcribed*, under that head of *diſcloſing* of *nakedneſſes*, and ſo equally *obligatory*, till they were *diſpenſed* with, and to all others, who had no ſuch *diſpenſation*; and ſo, without any *explicit interdict* of *Chriſt's*, both *prohibited* to us *Chriſtians*. And therefore 1. it was but a *ſhortneſs* of *diſcourſe* in thoſe *Jews*, that thought their *Charter* for their *beloved Polygamy* ſo deeply concerned in this *interpretation* of thoſe words: and 2. the greater their *intereſt* was conceived to be, the leſs will their *authority* be able to perſwade *others*. And however, the *Karaans*, thoſe that *profeſs*, and by their name are *acknowledged* to keep cloſe to the *letter* of the *ſacred Precept*, are leſs likely to miſtake, by *enlarging* the *literal* ſenſe of it, than any others, who from the *ſubſequent permiſſion* and *cuſtomary practices* of *Polygamy*, and their known *zeal* in that cauſe, whereby their *luſts* were ſo highly gratified, have been induced to that other *interpretation*. And of *Maimonides* 'tis evident, (which of all thoſe *Hebrew Writers* hath the reputation of the moſt *ſober* and moſt *ſkilfull* in their *learning*) that in his opinion by this *Chapter* of *Leviticus*, are forbidden the *conjunctions of thoſe, that are neareſt to one another, by marriage*, as well as by *bloud*, in which number the *wife's ſiſter* muſt needs be acknowledged to be included, none being imaginable to be *nearer*. And ſo the words of the *Text* enforce, *ver.* 6. *None ſhall approach to any that is near of kin to him.*

The *Karaans*, And *Maimonides*.

Sect. 27. *Jacob's* marrying of two ſiſters.

But to all this the practice of *Jacob* in *marrying two ſiſters* before the *law*, is objected, both as an *example* of the *lawfulneſs* of that practice among the *Nations*, before the *law* was given to the *Jews*, and as a *probable* reaſon, why this *law* againſt *taking one ſiſter to another* in her *life* time, was here made, *viz.* to prevent the like *quarrels*, which had fallen out between *Leah* and *Rachel*, and ſo as a *reaſon* ſtill, that thoſe words ſhould be rendred [*a wife to her ſiſter*] and not [*one wife to another.*]

To

Sect. 28. Anſwered.

To this I anſwer, 1. That theſe *quarrels* (as was ſaid) are as incident to *ſtrangers*, that meet in the ſame great *intereſt* (in caſe of ſuch *injury* and *invaſion* of *propriety*) as to *ſiſters* they can be. If *Jacob* had *married* any other *wife* inſtead of *Leah*, it is probable that *Rachel's love*, and *barren womb*, would have been more *patient* of that *competition*. If all ſuch *diſſenſions* as thoſe betwixt *Jacob's wives* were deſigned to be prevented by this *law*, it is certain the *law* was very *imperfect*, and *unable* to attain its *end*, or elſe *all Polygamy*, againſt the *conſent* of the former *wife*, was here *prohibited*. And therefore 2. unleſs it otherwiſe appear, that that interdict, *Lev.* 18. 18. be to be interpreted of *two ſiſters*, that of *Jacob's marrying two ſiſters*, will have nothing to doe with it, being not at all referred to any part of the *Context*, but onely fanſied to be ſo from the caſual *concurrence* and agreement of the *ſtory* of the one, with that which is conceited to be forbidden in the other. Which indeed may probably have been a means to *impoſe* upon ſome, and have given them *prejudices* this way: but being a *remote* ground of *conjecture*, which is not ſo much as a *probable* argument (of which alſo there may be more than one for any thing that is moſt *untrue*) will have no force to interpret that *Text* that way, much leſs to prove that the *ſixth* verſe, which forbids *approaching to any that are near of kin*, did not forbid *approaching* to the *wife's ſiſter*, which is ſo very *near*; or that the 16. verſe, that forbids *approaching* to the *brother's wife*, did not *à pari*, forbid this which is directly *equal* and parallel to it.

Sect. 29. *Jacob's* example impertinent.

And therefore all the force that can be pretended from this *objection*, muſt be that, which ariſes from *Jacob's example*, who, it is acknowledged, did this, and was a *pious* man, and lived before the *law*, and ſo may ſeem to be a *proof* that this was *formerly practiſed*. And therefore ſome farther *anſwer* muſt be given to that: And it will ſoon be done, 1. By obſerving that as far as it doth prove *any thing*, it doth prove *more* than they that make uſe of it to infer the *lawfulneſs* of *marrying* the *ſiſter* of the *deceaſed wife*, do deſire to *prove* from it. And therefore I ſhall firſt demand, whether they can from *Jacob's example* think it *lawfull* for a *Chriſtian* now to have *two ſiſters together?* and if they think they may not, then whence the *unlawfulneſs* of that proceeds? If from the *Jewiſh law* in that verſe, *Lev.* 18. 18. then, it ſeems, that, which was given to none but the *Jews*, doth oblige us *Chriſtians*: which is both falſe, and acknowledged by the *objectours* to be ſo: If from the *law* given to the *ſons* of *Adam* or *Noah*, then it ſeems this was forbidden by that *law*, and then *Jacob's practice* muſt be *directly* contrary to that *law*, and ſo be an acknowledged *tranſgreſſion* in him, and not *imitable* in us: If onely by the *Chriſtian law*, then that *Chriſtian law* will no where appear *expreſs* to that purpoſe; and for any *deduction* which will be producible from thence, to *conclude* this, the like will as readily be produced to *interdict* the *marriage* of the *ſiſter* of the *deceaſed wife*. And ſo ſtill this argument from *Jacob's example* will not be *uſefull* to the *objectour*. But then 2. for *Jacob's practice*, as it concerned his *individual*, conſidered as a *pious* man, though it be moſt certain, that *all* the *actions* of a *pious* man are not *pious*; and, that *Jacob's actions* particularly, do not all appear to be *pious*, witneſs the *deceiving* his *father*, and *ſupplanting* his *brother* of his *birth-right* firſt, and then his *bleſſing*, yet it is farther obſervable to what *original* this *action* of his muſt be imputed.

Sect. 30. The original of *Jacob's* action.

He *loved Rachel*, and, by compact for *ſeven years ſervice* with *Laban* her *father*, was promiſed to *have her to wife*, *Gen.* 29. 18, 19, 20. and having performed the condition ſo far as to call her, and that truly, *his wife*, v. 21. he required to have her *given* him, that he may *go in unto her*. And the *marriage-feaſt* being kept, *ver.* 22. (all which implies and ſuppoſes them abſolutely *married*) *Laban* at night took *Leah*, and *brought her to him, and he went in unto her*, miſtaking her for *Rachel*, and not knowing his *errour* till the *morning*, ver. 25. which thus far being wholly imputable to *Laban*, and not to *Jacob* (who was not conſcious of it) cannot be imagined ſufficient to *annul* his *marriage* with *Rachel*, which was before completed (as far as *compact* of *parents*, *conſent* of *parties*, and all the *ſolemnities* of *marriage*, accuſtomed in the place, could complete it) and ſo leaves this hard *neceſſity* inevitably on *Jacob*, either to leave his own *eſpouſed beloved Rachel*, and take his neither *eſpouſed*, nor *beloved Leah*, or elſe to leave them both, the one whom he had *married*, the other to whom he had *gone in* (for it is not imaginable, that *Laban* that would not before let him prefer *Rachel* before *Leah*, would now, having a much ſtronger *obligation* to the contrary, *permit* him to doe it) or elſe to take them *both*, which accordingly he did. To which alſo that ſome *divine diſpenſation* was added, though it is not defined in the *Scripture*, yet, conſidering the *promiſe* of *God* to *keep* him, and *be with him* in all, whether *places* to which, or *affairs* about which *he goes*, *Gen.* 28. 15. and again the many *revelations* of *God* by *dream* afforded him; and yet farther, the *bleſſing* that enſued on *Leah's off-ſpring* (*ſix Patriarchs*, and *Judah* the *line* of *Chriſt*, one of them) and the cuſtome of *bleſſing* in her name, *Ruth.* 4. 11. it is (not improbably) ſuppoſeable. But I lay not the *weight* on that. The force of the *objection* was before ſufficiently evacuated.

Sect. 31. The prohibition of marrying the wife's ſiſter never ſuperſeded.

The firſt part of the *conſequence* being thus cleared, *viz.* that the *taking* the *wife's ſiſter* was to the *Jews forbidden*; The ſecond branch (*viz.* that this *prohibition* was not afterward *ſuperſeded* and *diſpenſed* with, by the *countermand* in *Deuteronomy*, of *marrying* the *brother's wife*) will immediately appear both by the force of the *old rule*, That the *law* of *exceptions confirms the obligation of all thoſe that are not excepted*, and eſpecially by the *ceſſation* of the reaſon for the taking away this *latter*, which held and prevailed for the taking away the *former obligation*. For whereas the *preſerving* of the *elder brother's family*, depended on the younger's *marrying* the *relict*, and raiſing up *ſeed* to him, which might *ſucceed* to his *name* and *patrimony*, 'tis manifeſt that the *ſiſter's ſucceeding* the *ſiſter*, and bearing *children* to the *husband*, would bring no ſuch advantage along with it: For any other *wife*, of any other *family*, would as probably bear him *children*, and doing ſo, as certainly bear up his *name* and *family*, as his *wife's ſiſter* could do: whereas the *ſon* of *another family*, *marrying* the *relict* of the *eldeſt brother* of this, would certainly beget all the *children* to his own *name* and *family*, and not to him, whoſe *wife* he *married*.

Sect. 32. How this law, being given to the Jews, is obligatory to Chriſtians.

All that is now behind for the bringing this home to us *Chriſtians*, will be beſt *adapted* by way of *reply* to one expected *objection*. For it being granted, that this was thus by *parity* of *reaſon* acknowledged to be interdicted the *Jews*; It will yet be *replied*, and objected, That neither of theſe two *interdicts* pertain to us *Chriſtians*, any more than other *judicial laws*, which were by *God* alſo given to the *Jews*, are ſuppoſed to be *obligatory* to us. To this I anſwer by acknowledging the *force* of the *objection*, as far as is yet pretended, For it is certain, that no *law obliges* thoſe, to whom it was not given, and conſequently that no

law

law, given to the *Jews* (that people of *one* particular *Nation*, and not the *Repreſentative* of the *whole world*, or from whoſe *loins* all others were to be *peopled)* lays any engagement (though to them 'twere given even by *God* himſelf) on any other Nation, into whoſe *municipal laws* it hath not by the *Governours* been received, either by their free, *prudential Choice*, or by way of *imitation* from *them*, and following that *pattern*, which they ſee given by *God* to his *own people*. And when it is ſo received by the *ſubſequent laws* of any other *Nation*, it is their *receiving* it, and not the firſt *giving* it to the *Jews*, that becomes *obligation* to thoſe others.

Sect. 33. This law given formerly to the ſons of *Adam*.

Onely here it muſt now be added in the laſt place, That this *law* which was given to the *Jews*, *Lev.* 18. had been formerly given by *God* to the *ſons* of *Adam*, (either after that the way of ſatisfying the firſt *neceſſity*, the *propagating* and *peopling* the *world*, was once provided for, or before, with a *reſervation* of *liberty* in that one caſe) and from thence by *Tradition* to the *ſons* of *Noah*, as thoſe that repreſented *all* the *Nations* of the *world*, that ſhould come from them, and ſo conſequently was *obligatory* to *all*. Whereupon the *Jews* affirm of that *interdict*, *Lev.* 18. 6. which forbids theſe *marriages*, that it binds not onely the *Iſraelite*, but הגר the *ſtranger* or *proſelyte*, who, we know, was *obliged* by thoſe *Precepts* onely, which were given to the *ſons* of *Noah*. For though God's giving theſe *laws* to the *ſons* of *Adam* or *Noah* is not affirmed in *Scripture*, yet (according to the *foundation* laid in the former * *Diſcourſe*, as a preparative to what I am now to build upon it) it is to be believed by all thoſe that acknowledge *Scripture*, upon another *ſcore*.

* *Sect.* 7.

Sect. 34. The proof of that.

For 1. one of the *Precepts* of the *ſons* of *Adam* and *Noah* enumerated by the *Jews* (and therefore looked on by the *Apoſtles* at the *Synod* of *Jeruſalem*, as that which concerned the *Gentiles* as well as the *Jews)* is intituled, as was ſaid על גלוי ערויות *Of*, or, *Againſt diſcloſing Nakedneſſes*, and that by the *Jews* generally expreſſed by *De inceſtu & illicito concubitu*, *Of inceſt and unlawfull conjunction*; and every one of the *forbidden propinquity*, *mother*, *ſiſter*, &c. ſtyled ערוה *nakedneſs* or *turpitude*. Which therefore in all reaſon is to be extended as far as the *interdict*, *Lev.* 18. which is there intituled in like manner, *The diſcloſing* or *uncovering of Nakedneſs*, ver. 6. &c. This will farther appear by comparing theſe *ſeven Precepts*, as they have been ſet down from the *Jews Traditions*, with the ſtyle wherein they are mentioned, *Act.* 15. whereas the two firſt *concerning ſtrange Worſhip*, and *the benediction of the one God*, the *God* of *Iſrael*, are ſummarily compriſed under the ſtyle of *Abſtaining from things offered to Idols*; and that *of ſhedding bloud*, under [*Abſtaining from bloud*] and that *of a member of a live creature*, or *eating fleſh with the bloud* in it, under that of *things ſtrangled*, and thoſe two, *of judgments*, or *adminiſtration of juſtice*, and *of theft* (for which ſome *Jewiſh* Writers reade [*doing as they would be done to*] under thoſe words, (which ſome *printed* Books, and *many ancient written Copies*, particularly *Beza's venerable Greek* and *Latine* one, which he ſent to the *Univerſity* of *Cambridge*, have added, and the *Æthiopick* and other *Interpreters* retain) καὶ ὅσα μὴ θέλητε ἑαυτοῖς γίνεσθαι, ἑτέρῳ μὴ ποιεῖν, *and what you would not have done to your ſelves, doe not that to any other*; ſo the fourth *Precept*, על גלוי ערויות *Of*, or, *Againſt diſcloſing Nakedneſſes*, is rendred, ἀπέχειν ἀπὸ πορνείας, *abſtaining from Fornication*.

The ſeven Precepts of the ſons of *Noah*, *Act.* 15.

Sect. 35. Fornication uſed in a latitude for all luſts prohibited.

Which being premiſed, it is 2. manifeſt, that the word πορνεία, ordinarily rendred *fornication*, is uſed in the *New Teſtament* in a greater *latitude* than is ordinarily thought to belong to it, ſo as to contain in it, not onely *Adultery*, as appears, *Matt.* 5. 32. and 19. 9. but alſo all *unnatural ſins* contrary to the *diſtinction* of *ſexes* and *kinds*, (Κινναδὸς πόρνος, ſaith *Thomas Magiſter)* and alſo all breaches of the *poſitive interdict* of *Propinquity*, In a word, *all unlawfull deſires* of the *fleſh*, of what kind ſoever, all acts of prohibited *carnality*. Of this nature there were many ſorts ſtill remaining among the new *Converts* of *Corinth*, 1 *Cor.* 5. 1. and therefore his charge againſt them lies in that *indefinite* form, πορνεία, *fornication*, or perhaps in an *univerſal comprehenſive* form, ὅλως πορνεία, *Fornication univerſally* or *in groſs*, containing all the ſeveral *ſpecies* of it: And one *ſpecies* there named by him, is that of *inceſtuous Copulation* with the *father's wife*.

* Ὅλως πορνεία.

Sect. 36. Inceſt unlawfull among the Gentiles.

Now to bring home theſe premiſſes to the point in hand. It is there directly ſaid, 1 *Cor.* 5. 1. that the *having* (or *conjugal living* with) the deceaſed *father's wife*, is *ſuch* a *fornication*, *as is not named among the Gentiles*. To which I might add that ſpeech of *Virgil*,

——*Thalamos auſum inceſtare Novercæ*,

calling it a *bold inceſtuous* fact. This was by *Charondas* a *heathen* made *infamous*, which is more than to be pronounced *unlawfull*. And when *Seleucus* the *King* would have *married* his *wife Stratonice* to *Antiochus* his *ſon*, he was afraid, ſaith *Plutarch*, leſt ſhe ſhould be *offended with the unlawfulneſs of the fact*. Of other *inceſtuous conjunctions*, ſuch as this was, the *heathens* are frequent in their expreſſions of *deteſtation*. *Lyſias* an *heathen Oratour*, σωφρὼν ὁ πάντων ἀθλιώτατος τὴν μητέρα, καὶ συγγαμεῖ, *to marry the mother and the daughter, was an act of the moſt wretched of all men*. And *Cicero pro Cluentio*, cries out of another of like ſort, *O ſcelus incredibile, & præter hanc unam in omni vita inauditum*, that it was *an incredible villany*; and of which *in his whole life* he had *never heard* of a *precedent*. And * *Ariſtophanes* ſpeaking of a *brother* lying with his *ſiſter* of the ſame *mother*, ſpeaks it with a full *deteſtation*.

* Νεφελ.

——ὡς ἐμίνει
Ἀδελφὸς, ὦ 'λεξίαχε τὴν ὁμομητρείαν ἀδελφήν.

O accurſed man, &c. And it is *Ariſtotle*'s obſervation in his *Politicks*, that he that ſhould *ignorantly* commit ſuch a fact, would, when he knew it, *abhor* that *pleaſure*.

Sect. 37. Though practiſed by them.

And thus it is the *conjecture* of the *learned Photius*, That the *Circumciſion* of *Abraham*, and his *poſterity* was inſtituted as an *embleme* of *reſtraint* from *inceſtuous copulations*, The *Chaldæans*, ſaith he, *Epiſt.* σϑ'. *mixed with their mothers daughters and ſiſters*, ἀνοσίῳ νόμῳ, *by an impious deteſtable cuſtome*, gotten in among them; and therefore, that *neither he*, *nor* his *poſterity*, τοῖς παρ' ἑαυτῷ ἐς ἔθεσι κεκλιμακόσιν, *ſhould be polluted with theſe cuſtomes of their fathers*, he was commanded to be *circumciſed*, εἰς ἀθέτησιν τῆς τοιαύτης ἀρρητοποιΐας, for *the aboliſhing of ſuch nefarious turpitude*, the *circumciſing of his own fleſh*, being ſaith he, διαίρεσις τῆς παρεστηκυίας συγγενείας καὶ ἀποτροπὴ, *the dividing, and averting him from thoſe of Conſanguinity, or Affinity with him*, ὅσα γε εἰς γαμικὴν ὁμιλίαν, *in reſpect of conjugal converſation*. Whereas, ſaith he, the *Chaldæans incontinence*, ἀδεῶς καὶ ἀνεπαισχύντως, *without fear or ſhame, continued a long while after Abraham's time to commit ſuch villanies*. And if this were ſo, and upon that ſcore, among others, *Abraham* were *commanded* to *leave* the place of his *nativity*, then will this be an evidence of the *prohibition* of theſe *marriages* to all the *Nations* before that time, by the *precepts* given

given to the *ſons* of *Adam* and *Noah*. And then there will be little reaſon to *doubt*, but this *interdict* extended to *affinities*, as well as *conſanguinities*, and all that are *prohibited* the *Jews*, *Lev.* 18. particularly that mentioned by S. *Paul*, with ſuch *abhorrence*, as that which *was not named among the Gentiles*, or which, though it had been *committed*, was yet looked on as an ἀρρητουργία, a *commiſſion of that which it was a ſhame to name*. To which purpoſe it is obſervable, what is ſo oft and ſo diſtinctly affirmed, *Lev.* 18. 24, 25, 27, 30. and *c.* 20, 23. that *in all theſe*, i. e. all the *inceſtuous marriages* (as well as *unnatural luſts*) there prohibited, *the Nations were defiled which God caſt out before the Jews*, which ſo heavy a puniſhment inflicted on thoſe *heathen Nations* for this *iniquity*, muſt conclude this *poſitive prohibition* of *inceſtuous marriages* to have been long before given to them, as well as thoſe *natural inſtincts* againſt the *unnatural ſins*, for all which jointly they were *abhorred* by *God*, and *caſt out*.

Sect. 38. The learned * *Hugo Grotius* indeed (whoſe authority, I foreſee, will be here objected) is inclinable to *reſtrain* the *note* of *univerſality* to the *principal heads* of that *Chapter*, *unnatural conjunctions* with *mankind*, with *beaſts*, with *parents*, with *ſiſters*, with *other mens wives*, and that the other are added onely εἰς περισσολογίαν, by way of *fortification* and *prevention* of the former. But (beſide, that the *Karæans* have prevented this *interpretation*, by affirming the whole kind of *inceſtuous marriages* (of which, ſay they, thoſe that follow are but ſome *examples*) to be comprehended in the firſt words of the *interdict*, ver. 6. *None of you ſhall approach to any that is near of kin to him*) 'tis obvious to conceive how ill a *precedent* this is, and how *dangerous* a way of *interpreting*, to *reſtrain*, where the *law* doth ſo diſtinctly *not reſtrain*, to *except* ſome *particulars*, when the words are repeated over and over, in the moſt *unlimited comprehenſive* form of *univerſality*: *Defile not your ſelves in any of theſe, for in all theſe the nations*, &c. ver. 24. and, *Ye ſhall not commit any of theſe*, ver. 29. *for all theſe abominations*, &c. ver. 27. and, *Whoſoever ſhall commit any of theſe abominations*, ver. 29. and, *not any of theſe abominable cuſtoms*, ver. 30. And ſo again, *c.* 20. 23. *the nations committed all theſe*. 'Tis not poſſible words ſhould be more providently formed to exclude all *exception* or *reſtraint*, and to define *every* of the forenamed practices to be *abominations* firſt, and thoſe very *abominations* (*all* of them) for which the *Canaanites* were *caſt out*, and conſequently that they were *prohibited* by ſome *former law*, by which thoſe *Canaanites* were *obliged*, or elſe could not thus be *ſpued* out for *committing* them. As for the *example* of *Jacob*, which is conceived to favour that interpretation by *marrying two ſiſters*, that † *Sect.* 27, &c. hath been anſwered † already, and an account given of his doing it, which is reconcileable with that *prohibition*; and though he were a *pious* man, 'tis clear, *Laban*, who was the *cauſe* of his *defiling Leah*, when he had *married Rachel*, was not to be deemed ſuch. And for the example of *Amram's marrying* his *aunt*, and ſome of the *Grecians*, *Iphidamas* and *Diomedes*, doing the like, they, if granted, being ſo few, will be far from argumentative, when 'tis conſidered how many *ſingle* men of all times, and even *whole Nations* have been guilty of *breaches* of a higher nature, than thoſe againſt *poſitive laws*.

* *De Jure Belli, l.* II. *c.* 5. *Sect.* 14.

Every of theſe prohibited to, and puniſhed in the nations.

Sect. 39. But this being applied to the *heathen* teſtimonies, we ſhall have no need to make uſe of it for that of *Amram*, which alone we meet with in the *Scripture*. For if that place which is, by our *Engliſh* rendring, conceived to affirm it, *Exod.* 6. 20. [*Amram took Jochebed his father's ſiſter to wife*] be more carefully weighed, it will be found reaſonable to conclude with the *Septuagint*, that *Amram* married not his *aunt*, but *coſin german*. For 1. it is evident that the *Hebrew* דדתו, which we render *his father's ſiſter*, is by the *Septuagint* rendred [θυγατέρα τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ, *the daughter of his father's brother*] and from thence it will be reaſonable to conclude, either that the *Hebrew Text* which they rendred, differed from that which we now uſe, or, which is more probable, that they, who knew the importance of their *native* language better than we, knew this which they gave to be the *meaning* of it. Agreeable to the *Septuagint*, the *vulgar Latine* reads *patruelem ſuam*, *his uncle's daughter*, and the *Chaldee* ſet out by *Arias Montanus*, differs onely in this, that for the *uncle's or father's brother's daughter*, that reads the *aunt's*, or *father's ſiſter's daughter*. By all which it appears, that דדה in this place ſignifies not a *father's ſiſter*, but an *uncle's*, or an *aunt's daughter*. And ſo upon farther examination it will be found agreeable to the uſe of דד the *maſculine* in other places, which ſignifies not an *uncle* onely, but an *uncle's ſon* alſo. So *Jer.* 32. 12. *Hananeel*, who was *Jeremy's uncle's ſon*, ver. 8, 9. is called by *Jeremy* דדי, *my* דד, that muſt needs be, not *my uncle*, but *uncle's ſon*, as both our *Engliſh* render it, and the *Septuagint*, ὑὸς ἀδελφοῦ πατρός μου, *the ſon of the brother of my father*. Thus in the *Septuagints* rendring of 1 *Sam.* 14. 50. דד *Saul*, is ὑὸς οἰκείου Σαοὺλ, perhaps it ſhould be ὑὸν τοῦ θείου Σαοὺλ (as alſo *c.* 10. 14.) *the ſon of Saul's uncle*, for the *vulgar Latine* reade from thence, *patruelis Saul*, *Saul's uncle's ſon*; Or if the right reading be οἰκείου, *kinſman*, that will make no conſiderable difference, becauſe the *uncle* is ſuch. And ſo by this way of interpreting the Hebrew דד, the whole matter is clear, that *Jochebed* was not *aunt*, but *coſin german* to *Amram*.

Sect. 40. As for the *Texts* which ſeem to reſiſt this, they are but *two*, and they will be eaſily ſalved. *Firſt*, *Exod.* 2. 1. *There went a man of the houſe of Levi*, (i. e. *Amram*) *and took to wife a daughter of Levi*, (i. e. *Jochebed*) where if *Jochebed* were a *daughter of Levi*, then ſhe was *Kohath's ſiſter*, and ſo *aunt* to *Amram*, *Kohath's ſon*. But the *anſwer* is eaſie, that *a daughter of Levi* here, may well ſignifie no more than one of the *ſtock* or *progeny* of *Levi*; it being an *idiome* of *Scripture*, very ordinary, that all *lineal deſcendents* be called *ſons*, and *daughters*, not onely in the *immediate*, or *next* degree, but in that which is more remote; as when *Chriſt is called the ſon of David*, *the ſon of Abraham*, *Matt.* 1. 1. (and agreeably in the *collateral* line, *brother's ſons*, and not onely the *ſons of the ſame father*, are called *brothers*, as when we reade of *Chriſt's brethren*, and *James* the *Biſhop* of *Jeruſalem*, is called the *brother of the Lord*, being his *next kinſman*) and accordingly the *vulgar Latine* here reads, *Accepta uxore ſtirpis ſuæ*, he *took a wife of his own ſtock* or *kindred*, and the *Septuagint*, ἔλαβεν ἐκ τῶν θυγατέρων Λευὶ, *he took a wife of the daughters of Levi*, which, by the uſe of the *like* phraſe, *Luk.* 1. 5. (where *Elizabeth* is ſaid to be ἐκ τῶν θυγατέρων Ἀαρὼν, *of the daughters of Aaron*) appears to be of a larger extent, than the *immediate* daughters of *Levi*.

Sect. 41. The *ſecond* Text is that of *Numb.* 26. 59. *The name of Amram's wife was Jochebed a daughter of Levi*, *whom her mother bare to Levi in Ægypt*, *And ſhe bare unto Amram Aaron and Moſes and Miriam their ſiſter*. But in this place 1. it is to be obſerved that the *Hebrew* reads not the words [*her mother*] which, in a different *letter*, the *Engliſh Tranſlatours* have put in, to make up the ſenſe. 2. This *mother* might be the *wife* of *Gerſhom*, or *Merari*, bearing this child to *Levi* the *grandfather*, and chief of the line, (as before in *Exod.* 2. 1.) it be-

it being ordinary for *grandchildren* to be acknowledged children of the *grandfather*, as well as of the *father*; as when *Laban* tells *Jacob*, *Gen.* 31. 43. *theſe daughters are my daughters, and theſe children are my children.* And ſo *Gen.* 46. the *ſons of Levi*, *Gerſhom*, &c. are ſaid to be *born to Jacob*, ver. 15. Nay 3. if the *mother* were named here, and that *mother* acknowledged to be *Levi's wife*, yet ſtill that would conclude nothing; becauſe as *Gen.* 46. 15. the *ſons of Levi* are ſaid to be *born to Jacob* their *grandfather*, and that by *Leah* their *grandmother*, ſo ſtill *Jochebed* may be *Levi's grandchild*, and not his *daughter*, though *Levi's wife* were granted to *bear* her to him. And ſo *Gen.* 46. 18. the *ſixteen ſouls* which *Zilpah bare unto Jacob*, are not all the *immediate* off-ſpring of *Zilpah* or *Jacob*, but their *children* and *grandchildren*, as appears, *ver.* 16, 17. So *ver.* 22. *Rachel's children* are all recited, *ver.* 21. i. e. *grandchildren*, as well as *children*, and ſo again, *ver.* 25. *Bilhah's ſons which ſhe bare unto Jacob* are her *ſons* and *grandchildren*, ver. 24. And if it be demanded, why *Jochebed* is not ſaid to *bear* her children, *Aaron*, &c. *to Levi* the *great grandfather* (as well as ſhe is ſaid to be *born to Levi* her *grandfather*) but to *Amram* their *immediate* father, the reaſon is obvious, becauſe *Levi* was alive at *Jochebed's* birth, but not at the birth of *Aaron*, *Moſes* and *Miriam*, who therefore are named to their *father* then *living*. But then 4. after all this, the *Septuagints* rendring is to be heeded, who finding no words to denote [*her mother*] but onely אשר ילדה אתו *which begat her*] they, it ſeems, reading not אתו, but אתם, with a very little change of the letter ה into ם, render it ἣ ἔτεκε τούτους τῷ Λευὶ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ, *who begat theſe to Levi in Ægypt*, where 'tis evident that ſhe who is ſaid to *bear* theſe to *Levi* is *Jochebed* her ſelf (not *Levi's wife*) a *daughter of Levi* in the forementioned ſenſe, bearing her *children* firſt to *Levi* the *head* of the *Tribe*, then to *Amram* their *immediate father*. Beſides all this, if it be conſidered, it will be found evident by *Chronology*, that unleſs it were by a *miracle* (which we have no reaſon to flie to, when the *Text* is capable of a fair *interpretation* (*Jochebed* cannot be ſuppoſed to be *Levi's daughter*, nor conſequently *Amram's aunt*. For the ſpace of the *continuance* in *Ægypt* after *Jacob's* deſcent, being 215 years, ſaith *Joſephus*, and *Levi* being 43 years old at the leaſt, at the time of the *deſcent*, (as may be concluded from *Joſeph's* age, *Gen.* 41. 46. and the whole time of his life being 137 years, *Exod.* 6. 16. and ſo his *death* falling out 94 years after the *deſcent*;) And then conſidering that *Aaron* was 83 years old, and *Moſes* 80, *Exod.* 7. 7. at the coming out of *Ægypt*, to which it is conſequent that *Aaron* was born 132 years after the deſcent, *i. e.* 38 years after *Levi's* death, and ſo that if *Jochebed* were born of *Levi* in his laſt year of life, ſhe muſt be 38 years old at *Aaron's*, 41 at *Moſes's* birth: And that again being impoſſible in reſpect of *Levi*, to beget at that *extreme* old age, when long before, *Abraham* at 100 years old was counted *dead* to *generation*, *Rom.* 4. 19. and ſo likewiſe unimaginable, if it be remembred that *Levi* had begotten all his ſons before his coming into *Egypt*, i. e. before he was 43 years old, *Gen.* 46. 11. It cannot be ſuppoſed that *Jochebed* was *Levi's* daughter, without making her at the leaſt 75 years old, in all reaſon many more, before ſhe bare *Aaron*, which will not be imaginable neither, when long before that, *Sarah's* womb at 90 years old was *dead* to conception, *Gen.* 17. 17. *Rom.* 4. 19. All which being thus deduced, there is no pretence of reaſon to believe that *Jochebed* was *Amram's aunt*, as is ſuppoſed in the *objection*.

L. 2. c. 6.

Sect. 42. As for the few other *examples* among *heathen* people, there is nothing ſtrange in them: That it was not much more ordinary among all people, it would be very *ſtrange* if there had not been ſome acknowledged *reſtraint* laid upon it, and the very producing of ſo *few*, and theſe noted as *ſingular examples*, is a fairer probability on the other ſide, that ſuch *marriages* were accounted *unlawfull*, where the *law* of *Moſes* had not prohibited them, and ſo that to ſome *former laws*, that *obliged all*, this temper was imputable. And accordingly it is known, that *Reuben*, *Jacob's eldeſt ſon*, (long before the *law* given to the *Jews*) is *diſinherited* for the crime of *going up to his father's bed*, *defiling* his *father's Concubine*, *Gen.* 25. 22. and *c.* 49. 4. and 1 *Chron.* 5. 1.

Sect. 43. Which being granted, there will be no reaſon to doubt, but that all and every of thoſe *marriages* forementioned, particularly that of the *brother's wife* (which is the next degree to the *father's wife*) and this of the *wife's ſiſter* as *near* (and in the ſame *line*) as that, was forbidden alſo. To which purpoſe there is an eminent teſtimony of a *learned Arabick* Writer, *Al Shareſtanius*, ſet down by Mr. *Pocock* in his *Notes* on the *Hiſtory* of the *Ancient Arabs*. *Turpiſſimum eorum quæ faciebant (Arabes tempore ignorantiæ) erat hoc, quòd vir duas ſorores, & patris ſui uxorem, velut ſucceſſor, aſſumeret, The fouleſt thing that the old Arabs did in time of ignorance, was this, that a man married two ſiſters, and took, as heir, or ſucceſſour, the wife of his* deceaſed *father*. Of the latter of which, ſaith *Al Moſtatraf Ebnol Arhir*, that *when a woman was left a widow, or divorced from the husband, the eldeſt ſon ſhould take her by inheritance, and caſt his garment over her as a ſign of it*. This being formerly in uſe, was by the *Alcoran* forbidden, *O vos qui creditis, non permiſſum eſt vobis fœminas hæreditatis jure accipere, They that receive Mahomed's laws muſt not take the fathers wives by way of inheritance*. From which *teſtimonies* though it be concluded that ſome *Nations* did admit that, which Saint *Paul* ſaith was *not ſo much as named among* the *Nations* (as it is affirmed by *Strabo* of thoſe *Arabians*, that they uſed to take their own *daughters*, and ſo *Clemens* and *Bardeſanes* ſay of the *Perſians* alſo) yet Saint *Paul* might by the word *Gentiles* mean the *civiler*, or more *regular* of the unconverted *Gentiles*, or ſpeaking to the converted *Corinthians*, might mean the *unconverted* of that *Province*; and being true of thoſe, it is ſufficient to juſtifie Saint *Paul's* ſpeech, who to the reproach of *Chriſtians*, mentions this practice among *them*, and adds that the *heathens* were not without an *abhorrence* of it.

The *Arabians* practice herein.

Sect. 44. Meanwhile it is clear from thence, both that the *practice*, though admitted among the *old ignorant Arabs*, was looked upon by *Mahomed* himſelf as a foul *nefarious* thing, and alſo that taking to *wife* of *two ſiſters* was looked on as a *crime* of the ſame *quality* with *marrying* the *father's wife*, and that is all I intended to conclude from it.

Sect. 45. Which therefore being thus concluded, and ſuppoſed to be by *God* interdicted to the *ſons* of *Adam* and *Noah*, (and ſo to *all* the *Nations* of the *world*) and that not onely as a *ceremony* to hedge in another duty (as that of the member of a *live creature*, or *fleſh* with the *bloud* in it, or *ex animali*, *of that which was ſtrangled*, evidently was, to beget a *dread* of *ſhedding man's bloud*, *Gen.* 9. 4, 6.) but as a prohibition terminated in it ſelf, and this again not abrogated by *Chriſt*, but ſtricter laws of *purity* now enacted by him, than ever had been before, and *morale* in the *full latitude* abſolutely *forbidden*, as that which ſhould

The Chriſtians obligation.

exclude him that were guilty of it out of the *Kingdom of heaven*; and the ſame again by Saint *Paul* more diſtinctly applied to this matter, under the ὅλως πορνεία, *fornication in groſs* (containing all the ſpecies of it, and ſo all theſe *diſcloſings* of *nakedneſs*, *Lev.* 18. of which number this is by analogy reſolved to be one) All this, I ſay, together, will make a very competent authority to deter any *Chriſtian* from the uſe of it, and that διὰ συνείδησιν, *for conſcience* of that duty and *obedience*, which every *creature* muſt pay to *God*, every *Chriſtian* to *Chriſt*, though the *Scripture* rather *intimates* (and relates to) this *interdict*, as a thing *ſuppoſed*, than defines *how*, or *when*, or to *whom* (beſide the *Jews*) it was ever given.

Sect. 46. The Authority of the Church.

Beyond all this it is farther manifeſt, That the *Church* of *Chriſt* (which will bear ſway with all *humble* and ſober *Chriſtians*, and to whoſe *Canons* none did ever *obſtinately* deny ſubmiſſion, without the brand and reward of *Schiſm*, that great *ſin* of *carnality* in the *Apoſtle*'s account, moſt contrary to the *unity* of *members*, and to the *meekneſs* preſcribed by *Chriſt*,) hath through all ages from the *Apoſtolical* firſt and *pureſt* times, been moſt ſtrict in preſcribing *abſtinence* from ſuch *liberties*, particularly this, which we have now in hand: which appears partly by the *Infamy* which hath attended ſuch *marriages*, which ſuppoſes them to have been reputed *unlawfull* by ſome *former law*, partly by the plain words of *Canons* which have forbidden them.

The Apoſtolick Canon.

The *Apoſtolick Canons* forbid the taking of any man into the *Clergy*, making him *Biſhop* or *Deacon*, which ſhall have *married two ſiſters* (one after the *death* of the other) or the *brother's daughter*, ὁ δὺο ἀδελφὰς ἀγαγόμενος, ἢ ἀδελφιδῆ, ἢ ἀνεψιὰν ἔχων γαμετήν. And *Zonaras* ſtyles it there, ἀσεμνογαμίαν, an *inceſtuous marriage*. Where, if it be thought that this is no mark of the *unlawfulneſs* of the thing, but onely an *interdict* to the *Clergy*, that *they* ſhall not marry thus, leaving it free to others: This will be the ſame ſtrange way of arguing, as if from the qualifications of the *Biſhop*, ſet down by Saint *Paul*, that he ſhould be *no drunkard*, *no covetous perſon*, &c. *i. e.* that ſuch as are ſo, ſhould not be admitted to *holy Orders*, we ſhould conclude that theſe *qualities* might be *lawfull* and *free* for other men, who were not *Eccleſiaſticks*, or becauſe the *Biſhop* muſt be one that hath *not married* after ſuch [a] *Divorces* as are forbidden by *Chriſt*; and the *widow* is to be the *wife* but of *one husband* in like manner, it were therefore *lawfull* for all other *Chriſtians* to uſe ſuch *Divorces* and *marry* again, which we know was prohibited by *Chriſt*, or that other *Chriſtian women* might have *more husbands*, or leave one and *marry* another, which we know was never *lawfull* among any *civil*, though *heathen* people. The plain of it is, that the *onely* thing concluſible from the *interdicts* of the *Church Canons*, is the *frequency* of ſuch *practices* among *unbelievers*, which made it neceſſary to *revive* and *refreſh* the *prohibition* to *Chriſtians*: To whom, under *Chriſt*, ſuch *marriages* were reputed ſo *foul*, and the ſtate of ſuch ſins being *permanent*, did ſo much enhance them above the nature of *Single* acts of *greater* ſins, that, although for every commiſſion of any *known Sin*, a man were not made uncapable of any *dignity* in the *Church*, (or rendred *irregular*, if after the receiving *Orders*, he were found guilty) yet of *theſe* ſins he that were once guilty, ſhould for ever remain under a *brand*, and be counted uncapable of *holy Orders*, which he, that were otherwiſe worthy, would not, ſurely, have been, had it not been accounted *unlawfull*, before that *Canon* inflicted that puniſhment on the offender. And then it being acknowledged that *Chriſt* hath not deſcended to the *ſpecifying* of ſuch *particulars*; and that the *Apoſtle* that ſpeaketh of one ſuch ſin, ſaith it was *not named among the Gentiles*, the reſult will be, That this *brand* of the *Apoſtolical Canon*, is founded in the *Univerſal Prohibition* obliging *all men*, and ſo the *Chriſtians* of *all Nations*, as well as the *Jews*, and that not *abrogated* but *confirmed*, and by *ſtricter* precepts of *Continence*, and denunciations againſt the *incontinent*, continued on the *Chriſtian* by *Chriſt*.

[a] See Reſolution to the Third Quære, *Sect.* 34.

Sect. 47. The Eliberian.

What was thus *puniſhed* and *marked* by the *Apoſtolical Canon* was after in the *Council* of *Eliberis* univerſally *interdicted* to all under a ſevere *penance*, *Can.* 61. or rather a *penance* of ſuch a *quality* aſſigned it, which preſuppoſed the *prohibition*, and acknowledged *unlawfulneſs* of it: *Si quis poſt obitum uxoris ſuæ ſororem ejus duxerit*, &c. *If any man after the death of his wife, ſhall marry his wife's ſiſter, and ſhe be a believer, he ſhall be excommunicate for the ſpace of five years.* And the like is ſo frequent throughout the *Canons*, and ſo acknowledged to be ſo, that there is no need of *multiplying* any more teſtimonies. They who have *diſputed* this *interdict*, and againſt whoſe doubts this *Diſcourſe* was deſigned, being the men who expreſs their *diſpleaſure* againſt the tyranny of the *Church Canons*, which have, ſay they, obtruded theſe *reſtraints* upon men, who have otherwiſe a *richer* inheritance of liberty belonging to them.

Sect. 48. The Laws of the Realm.

To theſe I ſhall add but this one thing, that if the *authority* of the *univerſal Church* of *Chriſt* be ſo vile to them, yet the *authority* of the *Civil Magiſtrate*, and *Municipal Laws* being not ſo *profeſſly* under their *prejudice*, it is ſufficiently known that thus much of the *Canon Law* is received into, and *confirmed* by the *Law* of this *Land*, and the [b] *marrying* the *wife's ſiſter* expreſly prohibited. And this is not raſhly to be deſpiſed by any, though the *Commiſſioners* which were wont to have the *cognizance* and *puniſhing* of ſuch facts, be not ſo likely to call men to account for them, It being ſtill reaſonable that *conſcience* ſhould *reſtrain*, when *fear* of *wrath* is not ready to doe it; and that thoſe *Laws*, which are not preſently able to *avenge* themſelves, ſhould be eſteemed to have *God* (whoſe Title it is *to defend the poor, and puniſh the wrong-doer*) for their more *ſolemn*, and more *formidable avenger*.

[b] See Stat. 25 H. 8. c. 22. and 28 H. 8. c. 38. and Lord *Coke*'s *Magna Charta*, p. 683.

The

The Third QUÆRE.

CHAP. I.

Concerning Polygamy and Divorces.

OF this *ſubject* I have [a] formerly ſpoken as far as ſeemed neceſſary for the informing of *vulgar* underſtandings: But to ſatisfie the *Objections* of ſome, which have appeared in publick, and out of a *foreſight* of poſſible, if not *approaching*, Evils; and becauſe there is more hope of *obſtructing* their entrance, than of *removing* them after *admiſſion*: It may be both *charitable* and *ſeaſonable* to take a larger view of this matter, and to vindicate it from the *prejudices* under which it hath faln, and to which the *pride* and *luſts* of men have ſubjected it in theſe licentious days.

[a] *Pract. Cat. l. 2. Sect. 7.*

Sect. 1. The Law of the Creation in this.

And firſt it will not be amiſs to imitate *Chriſt's method*, *Matt.* 19. who in anſwer to this ſame *Quære* propoſed by the *Phariſees*, recalleth and remitteth them from the *diſpenſation* which had been made, and the *corrupt practices* which had crept in among the *Jews*, to the *firſt inſtitution* of *God* in the *creation*, v. 4, 5. That *inſtitution* is expreſſed in theſe words in *Geneſis*, *A man ſhall leave his father and mother, and cleave to his wife, and they two ſhall be one fleſh*, *Gen.* 2. 24.

Sect. 2. Concluſions from *Chriſt's* interpretation of that.

And from *Chriſt's* interpretation of it, which is moſt certainly *authentick*, 1. That the [*they*] is [*they twain*] and 2. That thoſe that are thus *united* by this *inſtitution* of *God*, are not *ſeparable* by any act of *man*, *Matt.* 19. 6. And 3. that there was in *God's inſtitution* but one onely caſe reſerved, wherein, according to his *Will*, there ſhould be place for *Divorces*, [*viz.* that *caſe* of *fornication* in the *wife*, ſo contrary to the *ends* and *vow* of *marriage*] the reſult is immediate and evident, that by the *law* of his *creation*, a *man* was to *marry* but *one wife*, and being *married*, he was obliged (unleſs in that one *caſe* allowed of by *God*) ſo to *cleave* to her, as never to *ſeparate* or *depart* from her.

Sect. 3. Two parts of that Law.

Of this *inſtitution* thus ſet down, there are viſibly *two* branches, one for the *interdicting* of *Polygamy*, or having at once *more wives* than *one*, the other for *prohibiting* of *Divorces* in all but that *one* caſe.

Sect. 4. Firſt an interdict of Polygamy.

The words οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν, [*they two ſhall be one fleſh*] which *Plato* appears to have learned as he did other things, out of *Moſes*, when in his *dialogue* περὶ ἔρωτος, he ſaith, that *anciently male and female were put together into one body*) are an evident *interdict* of *Polygamy*, being an affirmation that the *husband* and *wife*, being *originally* but *one*, though divided into *two* bodies, are now *by God's inſtitution*, inſtead of the firſt *natural* oneneſs, *morally* become *one* perſon, *i. e.* in *reputation* of divine *law*, and by *virtue* of their *vow*, have but *one* will in thoſe things, wherein that *union* is to conſiſt, *i. e.* in *conjugal* matters, and conſequently that the one hath not *power* or *liberty* to diſpoſe of himſelf, without the conſent of the other, the thing which Saint *Paul* affirms as that which is known in *marriage*, 1 *Cor.* 7. 4.

Sect. 5. Polygamy adulterous.

And ſo it appears by *Chriſt's* reaſoning, when from that *union* he concludes the *perpetual unlawfulneſs* of *putting away*, ver. 6. which could not be *unlawfull* from the *beginning*, if that *no power* over himſelf were not the meaning of that *union*, which was then *inſtituted*. So again when *Chriſt* not onely forbids *Divorces* (ſave in that *one* caſe) but alſo ſaith, that if they *marry* again, they are *adulterous*, this is an evidence that *Polygamy* is *adulterous* alſo.

Sect. 6. The adulterouſneſs of Divorces conſiſts in the ſecond marriage.

For though the *putting away* a *wife* (*ſave onely in caſe of fornication*) be an *offence* againſt the *conjugal vow*, and contrary to that *union* forementioned, the *man having not power over his own body*, without the *conſent* of the *other part* of him, his *wife*; yet without his *marrying* again, he doth not himſelf actually *commit adultery* (onely gives her *temptation* to commit *adultery*, *Matt.* 5. 32.) By which 'tis evident, that the *marrying* that *ſecond wife*, while the *former* lives, is that in which that man's *adultery formally* conſiſts, and conſequently that the having *two wives* together muſt neceſſarily be *adultery* alſo (according to that firſt *inſtitution* and *law* of *God*) when the former is not *divorced*.

Sect. 7. * *Sect.* 16. The interdict of Polygamy, *Lev.* 18. 18.

To which purpoſe it may be remembred what was incidentally ſhewn in the * former Diſcourſe, that though *Polygamy* was diſpenſed with, and ſo permitted the *Jews* in order to the *multiplying* that *people*, (in which reſpect many other things are obſervable in the *Jewiſh* writings, as peculiar to them: as when the *Talmudiſts* reſolve, That every *Jew was bound to marry*, that he *was a murtherer that did not*, *Gemara Babyl. Tit. Jabimoth*, c. 6. And ſo *Joſephus*, that the *characteriſtick* propriety of the *Jews*, wherein they differed from other people, was παιδοποιΐα, *getting of Children*) yet under the ſtyle of *taking one wife to another*, it was *formally* prohibited them, *Lev.* 18. 18. in the cloſe of the interdicted *marriages* (all which by the *Poſitive Law* of *God*, had been, *from the beginning*, *forbidden*, and are all comprehended under the title *of diſcloſing of nakedneſs*, the *fourth* of thoſe *precepts* to the *ſons* of *Adam*) *Thou ſhalt not take one wife to another to vex her*, (to *provoke* her *jealouſie*, to deprive her of any part of that which was *due* to her) *in her life time*. And it will anon appear, that the moſt *unlawfull divorce* (that which was founded no otherwiſe than in ſome *diſlike* of the *firſt wife*, or of ſtronger *inclinations* to ſome other) is by *God* himſelf *preferred* before this *taking in another to vex her*, *Mal.* 2.

A recital of the Law of the Creation.

Sect. 8. The opinion of ſome Jews of Polygamy.

And accordingly it is the determination of ſome *Jews*, I ſay not how truly, that the *Moſaical permiſſion* of *Divorces*, is the onely account, upon which *Polygamy* can become reconcileable even with *Moſes's Law*. So *Rabbi Ami* in *Gemar. Babyl. Tit. Jabimoth*, c. 6. *Every one that marries a wife to a wife, muſt put away the firſt, and endow her.*

Sect. 9. Concubinacy with consent of the wife.

without it.

Both unlawfull till dispensed with.

And though in the case of *Hagar*, and the *handmaids* of *Jacob's wives*, the *consent* of the *wives*, and their *giving* them to their *husbands*, that they might bear *children* in their stead, (*Gen.* 16. 2. and 30. 9.) do make a visible difference from all other *Concubinacies* or *second marriages*, wherein the former *wife* doth not *consent*, yet had this most moderate sort of *Polygamy*, or rather *Concubinacy*, (which is but a species of *Polygamy*, differing from it onely in some *formalities*, and in respect of the *manner* of *endowing* the *woman*, and the *law* of the *children* not succeeding to the *inheritance* with the *children* of the *wife*, to which the *Apostle* refers, *Gal.* 4. 30.) been absolutely *unlawfull*, as contrary to the *institution* of *marriage* in the *first creation*, had not *God*, for the *increasing* of *Abraham's seed*, been pleased to *dispence* with it.

Sect. 10. This *dispensation* we find not in the *Law*, when it was *given*, but see it *supposed* in the case of the *maid-servant*, *Exod.* 21. 10. *If he take him another wife, &c.* and *Deut.* 21. 15. *If a man have two wives, one beloved and the other hated*, (both certainly at the *same* time) and *assigning* a *portion* in the *inheritance* to the *son* of the *superinduced*, supposeth him to be a *legitimate* issue. And the example of *David*, a man after *God's* own *heart*, so great a *Prophet*, and type of *Christ*, and yet so great a *Polygamist*, and that mentioned as the *gift* of *God*, and a *blessing* upon him, 2 *Sam.* 12. 8. are farther evidences of it. Yet this, I suppose, given to that people, not *infinitely*, but with some *temper*, if the *Polygamist* treated the *first*, as he ought, and rendred her the *duty of Marriage*. So in that of *Exod*, 21. 10. in case of the *servant* taken to *wife*, which failed of some *privileges*, which the *free-woman* had, yet *If he take him another wife, her food and her raiment, and her duty of marriage shall he not diminish.* The last of which the *Septuagint* renders ὁμιλίαν, and St. *Paul* seems to *Paraphrase* by ὀφειλομένην τιμὴν. And if this were not done, if the *first wife* were *hated* in comparison of the *second*, *i. e. partially* and *injuriously* dealt with, then was the sin mentioned, *Mal.* 2.14. and there charged on the *Jews* by the *Prophet*, the *dealing treacherously with the wife of his youth*, when *God* had been a *witness* between them, and she was the *wife* of his *Covenant*. And if any did then so multiply *wives*, not for *propagation*, but for *lust*, or to satisfie a *wandring* appetite, (a symptome of which it was, if the *superinduced* were more *kindly* treated, to the *grieving* of the *first*) without *question* that was then *treachery*, and *falseness*, and *adultery* in that *Jew*, and is so called from *God*, *Mal.* 2.16. and pronounced by him utterly *unlawfull*.

Sect. 11. Prohibitions of Polygamy among Jews and Gentiles.

Accordingly, As among the *Jews* themselves, which took their *liberty* in the greatest *latitude*, it was not allowed the *high priest* to have more than *one* (*He must not have two together*, saith *Maimonides Halach Isuribia*, *c.* 17. and *Gemara Babyl.* collects it from *Lev.* 21.13. for *it is there written*, say they, אשה אחת ולא שתים *one wife, and not two*) so from the *reliques* of that *law* of the *first creation*, this was among the *heathens* so far resented as *unlawfull*, that though the *Persians* and *Indians*, by *barbarous customs* having worn out the *remains* of the *law*, are confessed to have practised it, yet the *civiller* of the *nations* did religiously abstain from it. The *Germans* saith *Tacitus*, in his time *contented themselves with one wife apiece.* Among the *Athenians*, *Cecrops* revived the practice, ἑνὶ ἑζεύξεν, *and joyned* or *yoked*, *one woman to one man*, saith *Athenæus*. And of the *Romans* 'tis known, they never used that *liberty* of taking more. And even among the *Ægyptians*, their *Priests* (which were most knowing, and most observant of duty) solemnly *abstained* from it, saith *A. Gellius*, *l.* 15. *c.*22.

Sect. 12. All forbidden under Christ.

And ever since *Christ's* coming to *reform* the world (and that in no one thing more than in restraining *unbridled lusts* in the *fountain*, *Mat.* 5. 8, 28, 29, 30, 32.) 'tis evident by his words opposed to the *Mosaical indulgence*, and by the strictness that is by him superadded to the *Jewish* doctrines concerning *Divorces*, that it is *in universum* prohibited to all *Christians*, and being pronounced *adultery*, either simply, *Mar.* 10. 11. and *Luk.* 16. 18. or in case of any but one kind of *Divorce*, *Mat.* 19.19. (when yet the *former wife*, by being sent out of the house, is more *moderately ill* treated, and so comparatively a *gainer* by it, being freed from the *vexation* of the ἀντίζηλον or *rival*) it must needs be acknowledged so, when *that* is not the case.

In this I foresee not any farther considerable difficulty, and therefore I proceed to the second branch, that concerning *Divorces*.

CHAP. II.

Of Divorces.

Sect. 1. The first institution.

IN this matter of *Divorces* also, if *Christ* may be believed, the *interdict* was positive and clear in the first *Institution* (at the *creation* of *man* and *woman*) that the *man* should so *cleave to his wife*, as to be *inseparable* from her, and that without any reserve or exception, save in that onely case of *falseness* to the *marriage-bed*, or *fornication*.

Sect. 2. The case of Fornication in the wife, reserved in the first Institution.

This, though it were not named by *Moses* in that place, where the strict *union* is expressed, *Gen.* 2. 24. was yet, it seems, folded up in that first *law* (for to that onely *Christ* in his *reformation* of this part of the *Jewish Oeconomy* refers the matter) in like manner, I suppose, as *liberty* to *works* of *mercy* and *necessity*, and the *service* of the *Temple*, was reserved in the *law* of the *Jewish Sabbath*, so that there needed no *intervention* of new *law* or *dispensation* to make it *lawfull* to *divorce* and *separate* in that one case, any more than to *heal*, or *draw* the *ox* out of the *ditch* on the *Sabbath day*, but in the very *Institution* it self it was always *lawfull*.

Thus certainly it stood by the *law* of the *creation*: and for any other *liberty*, ἀπ' ἀρχῆς οὐ γέγονεν οὕτω, *from the beginning it was not* instituted *so*. So saith St. *Jerome*, *l.* 1. *adverſ. Jovinian.* *Ab exordio conditionis humanæ nec carnibus vescebamur, nec dabamus repudium, From the beginning of man's creation we did neither eat flesh nor use Divorces.*

But

But then, as of *Positive Laws*, it was formerly cleared, that they may, when *God* pleases, be dispensed with, to those with whom he *pleases*, so it must be acknowledged, That among the *Jews*, such *dispensation* was given, to *divorce* in other cases, beside that singular reserved one of *Fornication*. And though from the *words* of *Christ* it must be concluded, that the *reason* of that dispensation, was not the same with other of *Polygamy*, nor so *justifiable* and clear from blame, (the *hardness* of their *hearts*, to which it is affixt, fastening an *ill character* upon it, as that which in a manner *extorted* from *God* the mitigation of the *severity* of the *Law*, in respect of the *punishment*, rather than *perswaded* the *taking off* the *obligation* of it) yet this is but an account of the *different reasons* of *God's actions*, no way concluding against his *liberty* of *permitting* that to some, by *dispensing* with a *Positive Law*, which otherwise had always stood more universally prohibited.

Sect. 4. The Jews dispensation herein. The occasion of it.

This *dispensation* to the *Jews* is set down first *Deut.* 24. 1. and referred to *Mal.* 2. 16. In *Deuteronomy* the words are, *When a man hath taken a wife and married her, and it come to pass that she find no favour in his eyes, because he hath found* ערוה דבר, which we render *some uncleanness*, or *matter of nakedness in her; then let him write her a bill of divorcement, and give it in her hand, and send her out of his house, and when she is departed, she may go and be another man's wife*, ver. 2. *And if the latter husband hate her, and write her a bill of divorcement, or if he die, the former husband may not take her again to be his wife*, ver. 3. 4.

Sect. 5. Deut. 24. 1.

In this place, wherein the *Jewish Charter* of *beloved liberty* is contained, great *contention* there hath always been among their *Doctours*, how largely it might be extended, some *interpreting* it (by the former clause [*her not finding favour in his eyes*] and mention of *hating*, ver. 3.) to such a width, that whosoever *disliked* his *wife*, might thus speedily quit himself of her, and that κατὰ πᾶσαν αἰτίαν, *whatsoever the cause* of *dislike* were. Others have been content that this immense *latitude* should be *limited* by the latter *clause* to *matters* of *turpitude* or *nakedness*, whatsoever that signifie, it being by all resolved, that it signifies not the *sin* of *adultery* onely.

Sect. 6. The Jews interpretation of it.

To state and decide this *Controversie* betwixt the two pretensions of their *Doctours*, will not be worth our pains and stay, neither of those *liberties* being originally their *due*, much less the *Christians* portion. Yet of the *Text* it self two things may briefly be observed, 1. That the immediate ground of the man's *divorcing* the *wife*, is specified to be her *finding no favour in his eyes*, *ver.* 1. his *hating her*, *ver.* 2. *i. e. disliking* her either *absolutely*, or *comparatively* with some other, whom he preferred before her, and that the ערוה דבר *matter of uncleanness* or *nakedness*, is but the *motive* or *occasion* of that *dislike* or *disfavour*. 2. That when he thus thought fit to *gratifie* his *lust* or *fancy* with *variety*, the *obligations* lay on him, 1. To *write a bill of divorce, and give it her in her hand*, as an act of *manumission*, and *sealing* her *liberty* to her: and 2. to *send her out of his house*, which, I suppose, signifies the *furnishing* her for her *journey*, *endowing* her, making *provision* for her, for so προπέμπειν, *to send out*, signifies in the *New Testament*, to *provide* a *viaticum*, 1 *Cor.* 16. 6, 11. *Act.* 15. 3. *Tit.* 3. 13. where 'tis explained by ἵνα μηδὲν αὐτοῖς λείπῃ, *that they have no want of any thing*: and accordingly in *Rabbi Ami* before cited, the *endowing* the *wife*, is annexed to the *putting her away*.

Sect. 7. The ground of the Jewish divorces. The occasion of that ground. The Restrictions in the dispensation. Προπέμπειν.

Both which are in *favour* of the *wife*, privileges that accrue to her, to make the *injury* supportable. And the effect of them is, That she may go and be *another man's wife*, *ver.* 2. be *married* to some other that will *like* her, and treat her *better*; and by way of *mulct* to the *husband*, that if he shall after be willing to *rescind* his unkind *divorce*, and *receive* her back again after the *decease* (or *divorce* again) of the *second husband*, he is not *permitted* to do it. To which it is added in *Shulcan Aruch*, *c.* 10. *Sect.* 1. that if she that is thus *divorced* be afterwards *defiled*, the *husband* is then bound to take her again, which, if it be true, will render it no very *valuable liberty*, or advantage to the *husband*, that he might thus *put her away*.

Sect. 8. The advantages to the wife in divorce.

This makes it less necessary, to inquire what the ערוה דבר there signifies, which is rendred as the *cause* of his *dislike*: for if, the *dislike* being supposed, the *Law* of *Divorce* were designed more for the *wives*, than the *husbands* advantage, to *free* her from the *pain* and *vexation* of his *unkindness*, and the greater danger of another's being taken in, and *preferred* before her; It matters little what the *husband's cause* of *dislike* was, it being very far, whatever it were, from being *justified*, or made *blameless* by this *Law*.

Sect. 9. The unjustifiableness of the husband.

From the place therefore in *Deuteronomy*, I proceed to that other in *Malachi*, which is fully agreeable to what hath been concluded from hence, though it be somewhat *darkned* in the *prophetical* style, especially by our vulgar *misrendring* of it, which having not formerly been adverted by me, may have betrayed the *Reader* of the *Practical Catechism* (*p.* 62.) to some mistake, for which, being obliged to make him satisfaction, this *literal interpretation*, and brief *Paraphrase* of a few verses, will help to do it.

Sect. 10. The place for divorces. *Mal.* 2. A paraphrase of it.

This people are frequently guilty of *breach* of their *vows* of *wedlock*, taking in to their lawfull *Jewish* wives, *heathen* women that are unlawfull, and *preferring* these latter, to the great *injury* and *vexation* of the former, not considering the *obligation* of *kindness*, as to those which have long been *married* to them, nor of *justice*, as to those to whom, by their *vow* of *marriage*, they are strictly bound never to take in any others, to the wronging and *vexing* of them; nor of *piety*, as to those, who by being of the same *Religion* with them, are much fitter for their *friendship* and *company*, and to whom withall they are joyned by a most *sacred* tie, to which *God* was called as a *witness*. By all which it appears what a *false*, what an *impious* dealing this is.

Ver. 14. *The Lord hath been witness between thee and the wife of thy youth,* [a] *against whom thou hast dealt treacherously; yet she is thy companion, and the wife of thy Covenant.*

Sect. 11. [a] Or whom thou hast *forsaken* בגדת, or *despised*.

In this matter it would doe well, that you, that boast your selves to be the *Children* of *Abraham*, and expect great *privileges* from thence, would think fit to imitate that *first Father* of yours, *the Rock whence ye are hewn*, *Isa.* 51. 1. 2.

Ver. 15. *Did that one* (or *the first*) *doe so? of whose spirit we are the residue: And what did that one?* (or, *First?*) *he was seeking a seed of God* (or, *a godly:*) *therefore restrain your spirit and do not despise the wife of your youth.*

Sect. 12.

(called therefore *One* אחיר, as *One*, (for *want* of *degrees* of *comparison* in *Hebrew*) is equivalent with *First*, as μία Σαββάτων, *Matth.* 28. 1. *the one*, *i. e. the first of the week*; and as the *first* denotes the *Father*,

or

or *firſt* of that *Nation*) whoſe *actions* are to be copied out by you, that ye may be the *children* of his *piety*, as well as of his *body*. Now of *Abraham* it is eminently known, That although his *wife Sarah* were barren, and ſo able to bring him no *child*, yet he would by no means take in to her any *Idolatrous heathen wife*; he intended and deſigned this one thing, the having *children that ſhould worſhip God*, and ſo would not be tempted by her *barrenneſs* to take in an *heathen wife*, which might betray them to the contrary: whereas you, without that *temptation*, take in *heathen wives* to the *Jewiſh*, which you have long enjoyed, yea and prefer thoſe *mothers* which will bring up your *children* to *heatheniſm*. Let this example of his *reſtrain* your *wrath* or *diſpleaſure* (called רוח *ſpirit*, *Job.* 15. 13. where *turning the ſpirit againſt God*, is, being *angry* with him; and *Zech.* 6. 8. where *quieting God's Spirit*, is *appeaſing his wrath*) and do not you uſe your *wives* thus unkindly, which have lived ſo long, and ſo friendly with you.

Sect. 13. כי שנא שלח *If thou hateſt, put away*, which *Jarchi* interprets אם שנא אחד מכם אשתו ישלחנה *If any of you hate a wife, let him put her away.* So *Gemara Babyl. ad tit. Gittin, c.* 9. *Rabbi Jehuda* ſaid, אם שנחה שלח *If thou hateſt her, put her away.*

Ver. 16. *For the Lord God of Iſrael ſaith,* [b] *If thou hateſt her, put her away, for one covereth violence with his garment, ſaith the Lord of Hoſts; therefore reſtrain your ſpirit, that you deal not treacherouſly.*

For by the *law* of *God*, *Deut.* 24. 1. thou art obliged, in caſe of ſuch *diſlike* and *hating* of thy *wife*, rather than thus to *vex* and *grieve* her, by taking in and *preferring* another, to the *deſpiſing* and rejecting her, to *diſmiſs* her by *bill* of *divorce*, that ſo ſhe may *marry* ſome other that will be more *kind* to her, at leaſt be removed from that *vexation*. And thy keeping her thus in thy houſe to ſee her ſelf *wronged* and *hated*, is but a ſad *diſguiſe* or ſalve for the *injuſtice* toward her, that which will yield her no more *relief*, than the *hiding* one, whilſt I do him *injury*, *caſting a garment over him* (by which *marriage* is wont to be deſcribed) whilſt I uſe him moſt contumelioufly. Wherefore, I ſay again, *reſtrain your wrath* and *diſpleaſure* againſt your *wives*, and be not thus perjurouſly falſe to them any longer.

Sect. 14. Divorces, κατὰ πᾶσαν αἰτίαν.

Thus in both theſe places thus explained, but eſpecially in the latter, where there is no mention of *turpitude*, or any other accuſation laid againſt her, the *divorcing* of the *hated wife* merely on the *husband's diſlikes*, and *averſations*, without any real, or even pretended Crime, appears to have been *permitted* among the *Jews*; which ſort of *diſlikes* of his being multiplied according to his *will*, it follows, that it was, as the *Phariſees* ſay, *Matth.* 12. 3. κατὰ πᾶσαν αἰτίαν, *upon every cauſe*, κατ' ἀιτίας δυπτοῦν αἰτίας, *for any kind of accuſations*, ſaith *Joſephus*, *Ant. l.* 4. *c.* 8. κατ' ἣν ἂν τύχῃ πρόφασιν, *upon any occaſion*, ſaith *Philo de ſpecial. leg. ad præc.* 7. and as *Joſephus* in his own life ſaith of himſelf, μὴ ἀρεσκόμενον τοῖς ἤθεσι, *upon diſlike to her manners*, certainly upon many others beſide that one of *fornication*.

Sect. 15. The Remiſſion of them but comparative. And in pity to the wife.

Onely the *occaſion* of this *permiſſion* muſt be taken notice of, which is both by *Moſes* and *Malachi* ſo aſſigned, as to render it rather a *comparative*, than an *abſolute permiſſion*, *rather* to *put away* the *hated wife*, than by taking in another, to be *falſe* and *vexatious* to her; and ſo, when it was *permitted*, as an act of *mercy* and *pity* to the *wife*, (and accordingly the *bill* of *Divorce* is in *Syriack* ſtiled כתבא דרוללא *The bill of Propriety*, *Matth.* 5. 31. whereby ſhe is ſet at *liberty* from that *unhappy yoke*, and λάθοι γὰρ ἄτοκος ἐξουσίαν σωσαμένη ἑτέρῳ, ſaith *Joſephus*, *By this means ſhe hath power to marry another*, *Ant. l.* 4. *c.* 8.) rather than of *indulgence* to the *husband*.

Sect. 16. And for hardneſs of their hearts.

And that notion of that *permiſſion Chriſt* may ſeem to have had, when he ſaith, that *for the hardneſs of their hearts Moſes ſuffered them to put away their wives*, *Matth* 19. 8. For although thoſe words may poſſibly ſignifie no more than a *general* mark of the *obſtinacy* of this *prevailing* humour, that (among them, when that *permiſſion* was given) was not to be ſuppreſſed by *laws*, as a *Chronical* diſeaſe reſiſts *Phyſick*, and as *Tacitus* ſaith of *adulta vitia*, *grown vices*, that *it is better to paſs them over in ſilence, than by unſeaſonable prohibitions to let men know, quibus flagitiis impares ſumus, that ſome vices are too hard for us*; Yet the force of the words may very well be extended to this alſo, that they were ſuch a *ſtiff-necked* people, and particularly ſo *implacable* to their *loathed wives*, that unleſs they had *liberty* to remove them and make new *choices*, they would doe that which would be much more *ingratefull* to thoſe *wives*; and that therefore not onely thoſe *practices* were *tenderly* handled, and *puniſhments* ſuſpended, but a *permiſſion* explicitely *allowed* them for the avoiding of ſomewhat *worſe*.

Sect. 17. And contrary to the firſt inſtitution.

But this, all this while, if we will believe our *Saviour*, diametrally *contrary* to that which had been from the *beginning*, *Matth.* 19. 8. *i. e.* (as, I conceive, the *context* inforceth) to the *firſt Inſtitution* of *God* or the *law* of the *Creation*.

Sect. 18. [c] *De Jure Belli, l.* II. *c.* 5. *ſect.* 9.

For although the learned [c] *Hugo Grotius* be inclinable to interpret it onely of the *quid Optimum*, *Deóque Gratiſſimum*, *&c. that which was beſt, and moſt acceptable to God*, yet ſure our *Saviour's* words are clear, ver. 5. from *Gen.* 2. 24. that *A man ſhall*, *i. e.* (is *obliged* to *leave father and mother*, *and to cleave to his wife*, *and they two ſhall be one fleſh*, and that this was a *conjunction* of *God's* making, *ver.* 6. All which being in form of *Precept* [*A man ſhall*] and [*they two ſhall*] and that founded in the taking the firſt *woman* out of the *man's ſide* (which was a ſignal *embleme* of the deſigned *unity*) and the words in *Gen.* 2. 24. [*Therefore ſhall a man cleave to his wife*] being not part of *Adam's* ſpeech precedent, but either a *concluſion*, and *deduction* made by the *writer* of the *Book*, and ſo referring to ſome *known law* to that purpoſe; or, as by *Chriſt's citation* of it, *Matth.* 19. 5. it is evident, the *Command* of *God* himſelf, a *law* then enacted by him, *He that made them*, verſe 4. *ſaid*, *For this cauſe ſhall a man leave father*, *&c.* And indeed the *law* of *diſcloſing* of *Nakedneſſes*, or of *Fornication*, *Acts* 15. (*i. e.* the *prohibition* of all Conjunctions, but that of the *one husband* and *one wife*) being one of the *Precepts* vulgarly known among them by that title of the *precepts* of the *ſons* of *Adam*, to which *Moſes* there, and *Chriſt* here might moſt properly refer, I cannot diſcern any reaſon or place of doubting, but that this great *conjugal Law*, was the *Law* (though not of *nature*, yet) of the *firſt Creation*, wherein *all mankind* was concerned, and ſo that by it all thoſe *Divorces* were *prohibited*.

All Divorces but one unlawfull by the firſt inſtitution.

Sect. 19. The Jews confeſſion.

To which I may add, That it is one of the ſentences of *Ben Syra* a *Jew*, גרמא דנפיל בחולחד גרדיה *Gnaw the bone which hath faln to thy lot*; which the *Comment* ſet out by *Paulus Fagius* applies peculiarly to this matter, and concludes that he *doeth ill*, if he *put her away*, *though ſhe be ill*, *i. e.* that every *fault* of the

wife

wife doth not ſubject her to this *ſeverity* or *exciſion*: Which, though it be no evidence of the *practice* of the *Jews*, which 'tis known was contrary; yet it is an argument, that the *ſober* and *wiſe men*, even among them, to whom this *diſpenſation* was given, had no honourable opinion of it.

Sect. 20. Christ's dealing in this matter.

The caſe ſtanding thus among the *Jews*, and ſome *diſpenſation* of the *Primogenial law* being allowed them, or rather, by the *temper* of the *people*, and the *obſtinacy* of the *diſeaſe*, and for the relief of the oppreſſed *hated wife*, *extorted* from the *Law-giver*, *Chriſt* comes from heaven to the *review* and *reformation* of this, among other *laws*, and in direct *oppoſition* to what had been ſaid among the *Jews* in this matter, *Matt.* 5. 31. *i. e.* to the *liberty* allowed them, he pronounceth for the *future* to them and all other *Chriſtians*, that *whoſoever* makes uſe of that *indulgence*, *puts away his wife*, *ſave for* (that one crime of) *fornication*, *he cauſeth her to commit adultery*, *i e.* gives her the ſtrongeſt *temptation* imaginable, betrays her to the utmoſt *hazard* of *doing* it, and, as Saint *Luke* adds in his reciting of that paſſage, *Luke* 16.18. *If he marrieth another* (as in all probability he *deſigns* to do, when he thus puts away the firſt upon ſuch *diſlikes*) *he committeth adultery*; *and whoſo marrieth her that is divorced*, *committeth adultery*. A threefold complicated *adultery* the effect of ſuch an *unlawfull Divorce*, and ſecond *marriage* attending it.

A threefold adultery in it.

Sect. 21. The onely queſtion, whether after Divorce for fornication it be lawfull to marry again.

And ſo again *Matth.* 19. 9. and *Mark* 10. 6. the ſame words are, on another occaſion, again repeated. Two places of ſuch *clearneſs* and *perſpicuity* (one *cauſe* of *divorce* allowed the *Chriſtians*, that great *breach* of the *conjugal Vow*, and *whoſoever divorces and marries again*, ſave in that *one* caſe punctually named, *committeth adultery*) that as no *Paraphraſe* can make them more *intelligible*: ſo there is but one *queſtion* that can reaſonably be ſtarted in them, *viz.* Whether he that *puts away his wife* on this one *authentick cauſe*, be ſo perfectly *freed* from the *conjugal Vow* and *bands*, that he may *lawfully*, by the ſame *laws* both of *God* to the *ſons* of *Adam*, and of *Chriſt* to his *followers*, *marry* ſome other *woman*, and ſome *other man marry that divorced adulterous Wife*.

Sect. 22. The occaſion of this queſtion.

The occaſion of this doubt is the *variety* of the words, wherein the ſpeech of *Chriſt's* is expreſſed in the *Goſpels*. For as *Mat.* 19. 9. the words are, that *Whoſoever ſhall put away his wife*, *ſave for fornication*, *and ſhall marry another*, *committeth adultery*; *and he that ſhall marry her that is put away*, *committeth adultery*: which are favourable to the affirmative, That it is *lawfull* for him in that one excepted caſe, to *marry again*: ſo *Mark* 10. 11. and *Luke* 16. 18. the *exception* is left out, and the words are the ſame in both, *abſolutely* delivered, *Whoſoever putteth away his wife*, *and marrieth another*, *committeth adultery*.

Sect. 23.

That theſe places, that in *Matthew*, on one ſide, and in the other two *Evangeliſts*, at leaſt in Saint *Mark*, on the other ſide, are a report of the ſame paſſage of *ſtory*, and of the ſame *part* of *Chriſt's* ſpeech, appealing from the *Moſaical* permiſſion, to the *firſt inſtitution* of *marriage*, there is no ground of making any *Queſtion*. And therefore it follows, that one muſt be *interpreted* by the other, either Saint *Matthew* by the other two, or the other two by Saint *Matthew*.

Sect. 24. *Mark* and *Luke* expounded by *Matthew*.

That *Matthew* ſhould be interpreted by the other, the more *explicite* and *large* by the *ſhorter* and leſs *explicite*, ſeems not reaſonable. And beſides, it were not eaſily imaginable, what ſhould become of thoſe words in *Matthew*, both there and *Matth.* 5. [*except for fornication*] if the *full* ſenſe were expreſſed by *Mark* and *Luke*, without them: for though it be eaſie to conceive ſuch words to be *meant*, when they are not *expreſſed*, yet it is not eaſie to conceive them not to be *meant*, when they are *expreſſed*.

Sect. 25.

Whereas on the other ſide, that *Mark* ſhould be *interpreted* by Saint *Matthew*, this reaſonable account may be given from the *Context*, 1. Becauſe it being apparent by Saint *Matthew*, both *c.* 5. and *c.* 19. that *Chriſt* did allow *divorces* in caſe of the *wife's* committing *fornication*, St. *Mark*, in this whole paſſage not mentioning any ſuch thing, muſt yet neceſſarily be *preſumed* and interpreted to *imply* it: and then thoſe words [*ſave for fornication*] muſt be *underſtood*, or ſuppoſed as *ſpoken* and *meant*, though not *expreſſed*, *verſ.* 11. and if ſo, it will then be all one with Saint *Matthew's* reciting of it.

Sect. 26.

And the purpoſed brevity of Saint *Mark* (whoſe *Goſpel* was written after *Matthew's*) will be a *ſecond* reaſon to incline us to believe this; and accordingly 'tis manifeſt, that when the *Phariſee's* form of *queſtion* was, Whether it were *lawfull* to *put away the wife* κατὰ πᾶσαν αἰτίαν *for every cauſe?* Saint *Mark* (and Saint *Luke* alſo) leaves out that *clauſe*, and propoſes the *queſtion* thus, *Is it lawfull for a man to put away his wife?* Where, as it is certain that the *Phariſee* ſpeaking according to the then preſent doctrine of the *Jews*, and asking whether the *Jewiſh divorces* were not *lawfull*, muſt conſequently ask whether *divorces for every cauſe*, or many other beſides *fornication*, were not *lawfull*, though *Mark*, for brevity ſake, rather *intimate* that (by ſaying that it was the *Phariſees* that asked, and *asked tempting*, *ver.* 2.) than *expreſs* it: ſo in *Chriſt's* anſwer given more *privately* to the ſame matter, *ver.* 10. the ſame muſt be implyed again, *viz.* that *whoſoever ſhall put away his Wife for every cauſe*, *i. e.* for any other cauſe beſide *fornication*, *and marry another*, *committeth adultery*, and ſo in like manner he that *marrieth* her, *i. e.* her that is *put away* for any *other* ſuch *cauſe*, (which is not, according to the *firſt Inſtitution*, a juſt reaſon of *diſſolving* the *bond*) *committeth adultery* alſo.

Sect. 27.

That this is the meaning of *Chriſt's* words, may 3. be farther proved by the nature of *Divorce*, which among the *Jews* was the *reſcinding* of the *Conjugal Bands*, and by one ſuppoſition common to *Jews*, and *Romans*, *viz.* that they which were *duly divorced*, might *marry again*: ſo of the *Jewiſh divorced Wife*, *Deut.* 24.2. 'tis expreſly ſaid, ſhe *may marry another*; and of the *man*, it is known that this was his onely *end* of *putting away his Wife* in that place, that he *might marry another*, whom he liked better: and accordingly this is the *form* of *Divorce* in *Miſna*, *tit. Gittin*, *Behold thou art* מותרת לכל אדם *free*, or, *at liberty for any man*, *and this is the Bill of Divorce between me and thee*, *ſo that it is free for thee to marry* לכל גבר *to any man thou wilt*. And ſo every where in their writings on this *ſubject*. And among the *Romans* there is no queſtion of it. And this being thus known of the *Jews*, and preſumed by *Chriſt*, yet all that he chargeth with *Adultery* in the *Jewiſh Ceremony*, is their *putting* away for *cauſes* not allowed in the *inſtitution* of *marriage*. And in oppoſition to that onely, he propoſeth his *reformation*, defining what is the *due* αἰτία or *cauſe* of *Divorce*, upon which a man may (as upon any other he may not) *freely divorce*, ſtill ſeeming to preſume, that he that *divorceth*, may alſo without *Adultery marry again*.

Sect. 28.

If this be the meaning of the words in the *Evangeliſts*, as theſe circumſtances make it probable to be, then the *queſtion* is anſwered, that in ſuch a *divorce*, allowed both in the firſt *inſtitution*, and by *Chriſt* himſelf, there

there lies no interdict, or *hindrance* againſt that man's *marrying again*, though in all other *caſes* there doth.

Sect. 29. Arguments on the other ſide.

And yet on the otherſide it may be *argued*, that although, in the *Moſaical Law*, *Divorce* was the *reſcinding* the *Conjugal bands*, to which it was conſequent, as long as the *Jewiſh policy* laſted, that they that were *duly divorced* (as in the one *caſe* of *fornication* it is acknowledged) might freely *marry* again: yet in the acceptation of our *Chriſtian Courts*, *Divorce* appears not to be any more, than the *ſolemn*, *judicial ſeparation* from *conjugal ſociety*, as that is rather the freeing the Husband and Wife from the *obligation* to mutual conjugal duties, than the utter *reſcinding* and *diſſolving* the bands. For if it were ſo, then that Husband and Wife could never come together again without a *new wedlock*, which yet hath not been heard of in the Church: As for *Adultery* it ſelf, the *meritorious*, and ſo efficieut cauſe of *divorces*, that yet it is (though a *breach* of the *conjugal vow*) no *actual diſſolution* or *voiding* of the *conjugal bands*, among us *Chriſtians*, may ſeem probable by theſe two Evidences, 1. Becauſe *Adultery* committed by the *husband*, diſſolves not *marriage*, which yet it equally ſhould, if that *fault* committed, and not the *ſentence* of *Divorce*, reſcinded the *conjugal band*. For though the *ſuperiority* of the *husband* over the *wife*, makes ſome difference, in reſpect of which it is acknowledged, That *ſhe* cannot *put away her husband*; yet would that be of no force in this matter, ſuppoſing that *Adultery* were a *diſſolution* of the *bands*, for then ſhe ceaſing to be *bound*, as a *Wife*, would alſo ceaſe to be *inferiour* or *ſubject* to him. And in this a difference is obſervable between the *Jews* and us; for in caſe of *Fornication*, the *Jew* expected no ſentence of the *Conſiſtory*, but the man might put her away, give her from *himſelf* a *Bill of Divorce*, which hath never been allowed among *Chriſtians*. 2. Becauſe if this were ſo, if *Adultery* in the *Wife diſſolved* the *bands*, then the *Husband*, that after the *Wife's adultery* continued to live with her *conjugally*, muſt be concluded to commit *fornication* with her, the validity of thoſe *bands* being it (and nothing elſe) which makes *conjugal ſociety lawfull*, and *honourable*, and *acceptable* in the ſight of *God*.

Sect. 30. The opinion of the Church.

And agreeable to this arguing, it may be conſidered, what hath been defined in the *Church* of former ages, Εἴ τις λαϊκὸς γυναῖκα ἐκβάλλοι, ἑτέραν λαβεῖν, ἢ αὐτὸν ἄλλης ἀπολελυμένης, &c. *Can. Apoſt.* 48. *If any Laick put away his Wife, and marry another, or marry a woman which hath been put away by another, let him be excommunicate.* So in the *Council of Arles*, *An. Ch.* 314. *De his qui conjuges ſuas in adulterio deprehendunt, & iidem ſunt adoleſcentes fideles, & prohibentur nubere, placuit ut in quantum poſſit, conſilium iis detur nè viventibus uxoribus ſuis, licèt adulteris, alias accipiant*, Can. 10. *They that deprehend their Wives in adultery, and are believers, and young men, and are forbid to marry, 'tis decreed that counſel be given them, that as far as may be they marry not others, whilſt their Wives, though they be adultereſſes, live:* Where both *counſel* is given them not to *marry*, and a reference made to ſome former *Canons*, where ſuch *marriage* was forbidden. So in the *Milevitan Council*, where Saint *Auguſtine* was preſent, *An. Ch.* 402. *It is decreed, ut ſecundum Evangelicam & Apoſtolicam doctrinam neque dimiſſus ab uxore, neque dimiſſa à marito, alteri conjungantur, ſed ita maneant, aut ſibimet reconcilientur, That according to the Evangelical and Apoſtolical Doctrine, neither the man that is diſmiſt from his Wife*, nor *the woman that is diſmiſt from her Husband marry any body elſe, but either remain unmarried, or be reconciled to one another.* So in the *Codex Can. Eccl, African. can.* 102. Περὶ τῶν τοὺς ἄνδρας ἢ τὰς γυναῖκας ἀπολυόντων, ἵνα ἄπρας μείνωσιν. *That they that are divorced from Husbands or Wives, ſhould remain unmarried.* What hath thus been defined by theſe *Canons*, is evidently received into the *Eccleſiaſtical Conſtitutions* of this *Church*, which therefore decrees, that when *Divorces are pronounced, monitio & prohibitio fiat, ut à partibus ab invicem ſegregatis caſtè vivatur, nec ad alias nuptias alterutrâ vivente convoletur: Admonition and prohibition be given, That they that are thus parted live chaſtly, that neither marry whilſt the other lives*, *Conſtit. Eccl. An. Dom.* 1597.

Sect. 31 The Reſolution.

In this difficulty thus argued on both ſides, the Reſolution, I ſuppoſe, will be made by theſe *propoſitions*, 1. That by the force of *Chriſt's* words in all the *Evangeliſts*, he that marries again after any kind of *Divorce*, but that one for *fornication*, doth *commit* an *unchriſtian ſin*; and that at leaſt of a *double Adultery*, one in taking a *new Wife*, whilſt the former *liveth* (which is formally *adulterous*) the other in *deſerting* (and denying the *duty of marriage* to) the *rejected wife* of his *youth*, which may be cauſally *adultery* in her, and in the mean while is an *injuſtice* join'd with *wandring luſt*. *Secondly*, That by the force of the *arguments* firſt produced for the interpreting *Mark* and *Luke*, by *Matt.* 19. 5. it may be probably concluded, That in that one caſe of *divorce* for *fornication*, the marriage of the innocent party ſhall not be *adulterous*. *Thirdly*, That although this be granted, yet the words of *Mark* and *Luke*, and eſpecially the words of St. *Paul*, 1 *Cor.* 7. 39. do give ſuch *prejudices* againſt *marriages* after *divorce* indefinitely, that the *ancient Canons* of the *Church* of *God*, and the *conſtitutions* of our *Engliſh* Reformation, have thought fit not to *permit* ſuch *liberty* in any kind.

Sect. 32.

And this may appear, if we now *review*, and conſider the *temper* obſerved in the recited *Canons*: Firſt, it is with an [*in quantum poſſint, conſilium iis detur, as far as they can, let them be counſelled*] And *monitio & prohibitio fiat, admonition and prohibition* joyned together.] And our *Conſtitution* adds, *Denique quò illud firmiùs obſervetur, ſententia ſeparationis non antea pronunciabitur, quàm qui eam poſtulaverint, cautionem fidejuſſoriam ſufficientem interpoſuerint ſe contra monitionem & prohibitionem nihil commiſſuros, That this may be more firmly obſerved, the Decree of Separation ſhall not be pronounced, till they that demand it, ſhall put in ſufficient bond that they will doe nothing againſt the admonition and prohibition.* And if this be not obſerved by the *Judge*, he is to be *puniſhed*, and the *ſentence* of *Divorce* for ſuch defect, declared *void*, *Conſtit. Eccl. An. Dom.* 1597. Which manner of proceeding preſcribed by the Canon, 1. By way of *monition* and *counſel*, which differs from *divine Precept*: 2. By requiring a *bond* for the obſerving the *monition* (which uſeth not to be required, when the *divine Law* diſtinctly commands *obedience*) do ſeem to infer that this *marriage* after a *Chriſtian divorce*, is not looked upon by the Church as an *adulterous* Commiſſion, but rather as a *matter* of *dangerous conſequence*, if it ſhould be permitted.

Sect. 33.

'Tis true, ſome of the *Ancients* ſpeaking of this matter, ſeem to ſay, that theſe *ſecond* Marriages are againſt *Scripture*, *contra Scripturam quidem fecerunt*, ſaith *Origen*, *Thoſe Biſhops which, extra Scripturam, without authority of Scripture permitted a woman to mary, while the former husband lived, have* indeed *done contrary to Scripture.* And *Athenagoras* in his πρεσβ. *The Chriſtians* are commanded either to *remain ſingle*, ἢ ἐφ' ἑνὶ γάμῳ, or *to be content with one marriage*, affirming the *ſecond* to be εὐπρεπὴς μοιχεία, *a handſomer better ſort of adultery*;

adultery; and this on force of *Chriſt*'s words, that he *that putteth away his wife and marryeth another, committeth adultery.* And *Innocent* the firſt, *Biſhop of Rome, Qui interveniente repudio, alii ſe matrimonio copulârunt, in utraque parte adulteros eſſe manifeſtum eſt*, &c. *They that after divorce joyn themſelves to ſome other marriage, it is manifeſt they are adulterers on both ſides, according to that which we reade in the Goſpel, He that putteth away his wife and marrieth another, committeth adultery, and he that marrieth her that is put away, committeth adultery.* But of theſe and the like *teſtimonies* it may be obſerved, that moſt of them belong not to thoſe *Divorces*, which are in caſe of *fornication*, but (proportionably to *Chriſt*'s words in Saint *Mark*) to thoſe which according to the *Jewiſh* or *Imperial laws*, were allowed, in other caſes, than what either *Chriſt* or the *Primogenial Inſtitution* of *marriage* had allowed of. Of theſe we have reaſon to interpret many paſſages of the *Ancients*, ſometimes in reference to the *Imperial*, ſometime to the *Moſaical* practice of *greater liberty*. Of the former ſort are thoſe words of the firſt *Laodicean Canon*, Οἱ ἐλευθέρως καὶ νομίμως συναρθέντες δευτέροις γάμοις, *they that are freely and lawfully joyned in ſecond marriages*, i. e. after ſuch *Divorces* as are *legal* by the *Roman* practice and *laws*, but not by the *law* of *Chriſt*. And ſo in the *Nicene*, and *Ancyrane*, and *Neo-Cæſarean Councils*. Of the latter are the forecited words of Saint *Hierome*, l. 1. *adverſ. Jovinian. From the beginning of the world we uſed not Divorces*; where it is evident by the precedent words [*eloquium Salvatoris, our Saviour's command*] that he was to be underſtood in *oppoſition* to the *Moſaical* indulgence of greater *liberty*, not to the *Chriſtian* in that one caſe. And of theſe it is evident, and confeſſed by all *Chriſtians*, that the *marriages* after ſuch *divorces* are *adulterous*, but not ſo of thoſe other *marriages* of the *innocent* parties after thoſe other *divorces* in that one caſe of *adultery*. Nay even ſome *Canons* have been made with this *temperament* expreſly [*Except in the caſe of fornication*,] So in the *ſecond Canon* of the *Council* of *Vannes*, *Eos qui relictis uxoribus ſuis, ſicut in Evangelio dicitur, excepta cauſa fornicationis, ſine adulterii probatione alias duxerint, ſtatuimus*, &c. *They that have left their own wives, as it is ſaid in the Goſpel, except for cauſe of fornication, and without proof of adultery, ſhall have married others, we judge them*, &c.

Having ſaid thus much for the *ſatisfying* this *difficulty*: one advantage, I ſuppoſe, may be made of it, before we proceed any farther, toward the explaining the meaning of Saint *Paul's Canon*, or *direction* to *Timothy*, 1 *Tim.* 3. and 5. for the *choice* of *Biſhops* and *Widows*, that the *Biſhop be the husband of one wife*, and the *Widow be the wife of one husband*, viz. that in both places it be taken in the ſame ſenſe, in a notion of *ſecond marriages* (differing both from the ordinary *Bigamy* and *Digamy*) of thoſe that having *put away* their *wives*, or being *ſeparated* from their *husbands*; or any cauſe whatſoever, whether *Jewiſh*, *Roman*, or *Chriſtian*, have *married again*. *Sect.* 34. Saint *Paul's* Canon of the Biſhop and Widow.

To this purpoſe it muſt be obſerved, that the *having* or *living* with *more wives* at *once*, cannot be the thing there meant, becauſe the interdict lying equally to the *Biſhop* and to the *Widow*, this ſenſe is not appliable to *her*, becauſe it was never permitted by any *law* either of *Jews* or *Romans* (nor is it ſince by the *Mahomedans* themſelves) that a *woman* ſhould have and live with *two husbands* at once. As for the *Barbarians*, among whom there is mention of πολυάνδροι, a people where the *women* had *many husbands*, and ſo the *Medes* that dwelt in the *mountains*, among whom 'tis ſaid a *woman* had *five husbands* at once, theſe are too extravagant to be referred to by the *Apoſtle* in that interdict. *Sect.* 35. Three ſorts of ſecond marriages. Having two at once.

And for the ordinary *Digamy*, the *marrying* a *ſecond* after the *deceaſe* of the former, that that ſhould be ſo *reproachfull* and *blameable* in any, as to render one *uncapable* of *holy Orders* (which they are capable of, which have been *guilty* of ſome *faults*) this is not imaginable neither; It being ordinary for the *wife* to *die* ſoon after *marriage*, and without bearing of *children*, and in that caſe the *ſecond marriage* tending as much to the *ends* of the *Inſtitution*, as the former can be ſuppoſeable to do. And accordingly this *Prohibition* is not to be found in the *laws* of any *Nation*, and the *Apoſtle* is elſewhere clear, that *when the husband is dead, the woman is free to marry another man, Rom.* 7. 3. And accordingly *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Strom.* l. 4. ſpeaking of the great *reward* of thoſe that do διαλυθείσαν ἀπὸ τοῦ ζυγίαν ἀγάμου συνδήσεων, *marry no more after the death of the firſt wife*, doth yet acknowledge, that if he *marries* again οὐκ ἁμαρτάνει *he doth not ſin againſt the Covenant*, οὐ μὴν κακολύνται πρὸς τὸν νόμον, *for there is no prohibition of this by law*, onely, ſaith he, he doth not attain to that κατ' ἐπίτασιν τελειότητα, *higheſt perfection of the Evangelical courſe*, the very ſame which would be affirmed of *never marrying at all*, which is not *commanded* any, but looked on as the greateſt *degree* of *perfection*. *Sect.* 37. A ſecond after the deceaſe of the firſt.

Whereas this *third notion* will be very agreeable to the places, meaning this *marriage* after a *divorce*, This he that had been *guilty* of, by *humane Laws*, either of *Jews* or *Romans*, was under no *cenſure*, but by the *Apoſtle*'s direction is not thought fit to be received into *holy Orders*. As the *High-Prieſt* among the *Jews* might not be a *Polygamiſt*, might not *divorce* and *marry again*, nor marry one that was *divorced*, though other men were *permitted* to doe all theſe. And of this the *women*, and ſo the *widows*, were capable, as well as the *men*: *Salome* the *ſiſter* of *Herod* the *ſon* of *Antipater*, gave a *bill* of *Divorce* to *Cuſtabarus* the *Prefect* of *Idumæa* and *Gaza*, but this ἐ κατὰ Ἰουδαίους νόμους, *contrary to the Jewiſh laws*, ſaith *Joſephus*, l. 15. c. 11. And ſo *Herodias*, *Philip's wife*, as may be gathered out of *Joſephus*, *Ant.* l. 18. c. 7. And of the *marrying* of thoſe that were *put* away by their *husbands*, the *Canons* make frequent mention. *Sect.* 38. Marrying after an unlawfull Divorce. Women leaving their husbands.

Of this *ſex*, ſaith *Seneca*, *de Benefic.* l. 3. c. 16. *Numquid jam ulla repudio erubeſcit? Is any woman now aſhamed of leaving her husband?* And, *Nobiles fœminæ non conſulum numero, ſed maritorum, annos ſuos computant, they married and departed, and married again every year.* So *Plutarch* in his Ῥωμαϊκὰ mentions the *marrying* of *women*, whoſe *husbands* were *living*; and the ſame appears by *Juſtinian*, *Novel.* 117. And among the *Grecians* ἀπόλειψις is the word for it. *Sect.* 39.

Among *Chriſtians* (though by *Chriſt's law* the *wife* might not *put away the man*, nor *except* in one *caſe*, the *man* the *woman*: yet) ſome *examples* of the practice of it, by the *conſent* of parties, are to be met with; as appears by *Marculfus* his *formula*, l. 2. c. 30. directly to this purpoſe, *Dum inter illum & illam non charitas ſecundum Deum, ſed diſcordia regnat — placuit*, &c. *Seeing between him and her the charity according to God doth not reign, but diſcord, ſo that they cannot live peaceably together, it is agreed by the conſent of both, that they ſeparate from one another, and accordingly they have done.* A *formula* uſed among *Chriſtians*, as there is another, *Leg. Rom.* c. 19. and *Novel. Inſtitut.* 117. *Sect.* 40. Divorces practiſed among Chriſtians.

Sect. 41. [d] *Can.* 116. in Zonaras's account.

And being thus practiſed, the [d] *Council* of *Carthage* thought fit to make a *Canon* to *reform* it, and therefore appointed that the *Emperour* ſhould be deſired to enact an *Imperial Law* againſt it; and ſo doth the *Milevitan Council*, Can. 17. And accordingly one of the *Presbyters* that were brought to *witneſs* againſt *Marcellinus*, being found to have *married* after a *divorce*, *placuit reprobari*, ſaith *Alrodius*, *he was rejected.*

Sect. 42. [e] *Pandect. rer. judicat.* l. 6. tit. 1. c. 18.

To this ſenſe, I conceive, the like directions given both by the *Authour* of the *Conſtitutions*, and in the *Apoſtolical Canons* do belong. In the [e] *Conſtitutions*, they are thus enlarged, τοιοῦτον δεῖ εἶναι καὶ τὸν ἐπίσκοπον, μιᾶς ἀνδρα γεγυναικότα γυναικὸς μονογάμου, *Such an one ought the Biſhop to be, one that hath been the husband of one wife, and that wife the wife of one husband*, i. e. that he that is thought fit to be *choſen Biſhop*, ſhall be one that hath never *married* another wife whilſt his former *liveth*; and in like manner, that he ſhall not *marry* any woman, that hath parted with a former *husband*: ſo as μονόγαμος ſhall be one with μὴ ἀπολελυμένῃ in the 48 *Apoſtolical Canon*, *ſhe that hath not been put away.*

Sect. 43.

In the *Apoſtolical Canon* the words are more perſpicuous, Ὁ δυσὶ γάμοις συμπλακεὶς μετὰ τὸ βάπτισμα, ἢ παλλακὴν κεκτημένος, οὐ δύναται εἶναι ἐπίσκοπος, ἢ πρεσβύτερος, ἢ διάκονος, ἢ ὅλως τοῦ καταλόγου ἱερατικοῦ, *He that is joyned in two marriages after Baptiſm, or hath a Concubine, cannot be a Biſhop, or Presbyter, or Deacon, or of any ſacred Order.* Where the *ſecond marriage* being proportionable to *having a Concubine*, muſt in reaſon be the having *two wives living* at a time, onely one of them *put away* from him. Of this matter the Reader may ſee *Zonaras* on the 116 *Canon* of the *Council* of *Carthage*, *Radolphus Fornerius Rerum quotidian.* l. 6. c. 23. *Burchard.* l. 9. c. 72. and *Chriſt. Juſtellus* from the Notes of *Jacobus Leſchaſſerius*, on the *Codex Canonum Eccleſiæ univerſæ.* But this by the way.

Sect. 44.

Having gone thus far, I ſhould ſoon be at an end of my geſſes, were there not ſome *pretenſions* of other men, who like not to have their *liberties* retrench'd, though by *Chriſt* himſelf, which may deſerve to be a while conſidered. And the conſidering of them will be the moſt *ingratefull* part of this task; yet that which muſt be undergone, leſt, having offered their *reaſons* and *exceptions* againſt the *Doctrine* of the *Church*, and expreſly of *Chriſt* himſelf, they be permitted to that dangerous *temptation*, of thinking themſelves *ſucceſsfull* in the *attempt*, and ſo that prove to ſome men a more *perſwaſive* reaſon to *believe* their *wiſhes*, than any yet hath been produced.

Sect. 45. A plea for Divorces.

The firſt open attempt that I remember that way, was made in a Diſcourſe purpoſely on that *ſubject*, and preſented to the *Parliament*, at the beginning of theſe *licentious* times; and the *ſpecial* artifice made uſe of, was that, of bringing back *Chriſt* unto *Moſes*, of interpreting the reſtraint laid on this matter in the *New Teſtament*, by *analogy* with the *Judaical permiſſion* in the *Old.* After the ſame manner, as when the *municipal Laws* of a *Kingdom* are thought fit to be reduced to (and interpreted by) the *fundamental*; which is, by interpretation, as when the whole *pile* or *fabrick* being taken down, and *not one ſtone left upon another*, the appeal is made by reſort to the *firſt foundations*, which lying *under* the *ground*, and in the *dark*, will be more eaſily perſwaded either to *be* or to *appear*, whatſoever we *wiſh* they ſhould.

Sect. 46. The anſwers to it.

How *rational* a procedure this is in other matters, I have no temptation to enquire. Onely to the buſineſs of *divorces* it muſt be obſerved, how much more unreaſonably it is pretended, than in the *parallel*, of *humane Laws.*

Sect. 47.

For firſt, the *Law* of *Moſes* to the *Jews* was not the *fundamental Law* of all *mankind*, or that wherein all, or indeed any but they, were concerned. And 2. this *particular* of *divorces* being not a *perceptive law*, but a *permiſſive*, a *law* of *ſpecial diſpenſation* affixt to a former obligatory *law*, was, if we believe *Chriſt*, directly contrary to that, by which, thoſe *Jews*, with all men had formerly been regulated. And then 3. *Chriſt's ſuperadditions* in this matter are ſo far from being *interpretable* by, or *reducible* to that ſuppoſed *foundation*, that, as was ſaid, they are directly and purpoſely *oppoſed* to it. It is impoſſible that words ſhould be more *explicite* and *diſtinct*, *Matth.* 5. 31. *It hath been ſaid, Whoſoever ſhall put away his Wife, let him give her a bill of divorce. But I ſay unto you, that, whoſoever ſhall put away his Wife, ſaving for the cauſe of fornication*, &c. And c. 19. 9. *And I ſay unto you, Whoſoever ſhall put away his Wife, except it be for the cauſe of fornication, and ſhall marry another, committeth adultery: and whoſoever marrieth her which is put away, doth commit adultery.*

Sect. 48. Chriſt's doctrine againſt Divorces.

Is it poſſible this *artifice* could have been more providently foreſeen and prevented by *Chriſt?* Under *Moſes* they might *put away* upon *diſlikes*, founded in the matter of *Nakedneſs*: Under *Chriſt* they muſt not, ſave in the *one* caſe of *Fornication*: Under *Moſes*, the *man* that had given a *bill* of *divorce*, might *marry another*; but under *Chriſt*, if he do ſo, he *committeth adultery*: Under *Moſes*, the *woman* that had the *Bill* might go, and *marry any man* elſe, except that former *husband*, ver. 4. and the *High-Prieſt*, *Lev.* 21. 7. but under *Chriſt*, if ſhe do, ſhe *commits adultery*, and *he that marries her commits adultery*; and though ſhe do not *marry*, yet he that *puts her away*, being unable to give her *liberty* of *marrying* another, doth, as much as in him lies, *cauſe her to commit adultery.* And then ſure, 'tis but ſeaſonable to invert our *Saviour*'s ſpeech, *What man ſhall* dare *join*, *what God hath*, thus widely, *put aſunder?*

Sect. 49. The opinion of *Chriſt*'s adding nothing to *Moſes.* [f] *Note on Pract. Cat.* l. 2. Sect. 3. p. 50, 51.

The onely colour of *ground* for this pretenſion [*viz.* that *Chriſt* in the *Sermon* on the *Mount* makes no *addition* to the *Moſaical Law*, and therefore that here he doth not in this of *divorces*] hath in [f] other *papers* been evidenced from all *Antiquity* to be a *falſe* ground. And yet (to ſee the luck of it) if it ſhould be acknowledged a *true* one, it would preſently deſtroy the whole *pretenſion*: For then it muſt follow, that there was as much *interdicted* in *Moſes*, as is now forbidden by *Chriſt*; and thence again, that the *obſcure* words of *Moſes* did really *contain*, what the plain words of *Chriſt* do certainly *expreſs*, and then that the *matter of nakedneſs* there, muſt be *interpreted* by πορνεία or *fornication* here. And then the reſult will be, that even among the *Jews* under *Moſes's permiſſion*, thoſe *divorces* for any other inferiour cauſes were not *permitted*; which is the direct *contradictory* to that, which is pretended to be deduced from this way of probation.

Sect. 50.

For, of the opinion of thoſe that think *Chriſt* added nothing to the *Law of Moſes*, this is obſervable; That, to give it ſome *colour* of *truth* or *probability*, they have been forced to affirm that *Chriſt*'s whole deſign in that *Sermon* on the *Mount*, was to *vindicate* and *reſcue* the *Law* of *Moſes* from the *Phariſees gloſſes*, and onely to reſtore it to the *primitive* perfection and *luſtre*, that it had before it was ſo *maimed* and clouded by thoſe *Doctours*: which if it be true, then muſt that of permitting *divorces*, in other caſes beſide

that

that of *fornication*, be onely a *gloſs* of the *Phariſees*, and not the truth of the *Moſaical Law*; which, as long as it is granted, is the utter undoing of that *plea* for this *liberty* founded in, and deduced from the *Moſaical Law*.

To conclude, It is neceſſary by all laws of diſcourſe, that *Chriſt* being to vindicate the *Law* of *Moſes* from falſe interpretations, that vindication of *Chriſt*'s ſhould be received as the *interpretation* of the *Law* of *Moſes*, that was ſo miſinterpreted, and not the *Law* of *Moſes* be the interpreter of *Chriſt*'s vindication; It being an *axiome* known to all, that the *latter*, and more *perſpicuous*, muſt be the *interpreter* of the *former*, more *obſcure*, and not the *former*, and the *darker* be ſet blindly to *interpret* the *latter* and more *perſpicuous*, The *authentick paraphraſe* being the *comment* on the *Text*, and not the *obſcurer Text* on the *paraphraſe*. *Sect.* 51.

Another courſe of avoiding the force and perſpicuity of our *Saviour*'s words hath been taken by Mr. *Selden* in his *Uxor Hebraica* l. 3. 23. which it will not be amiſs to ſurvey a while, as *diſtinctly*, as my deſigned *brevity* will permit. *Sect.* 52. Mr. *Selden*'s attempt in this matter.

The firſt part of the attempt is to *diſpoſe* the Reader, and bring him to make ſome doubt or *queſtion*, what is the meaning of thoſe *plain* words of *Chriſt*, [παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας, *ſaving for the cauſe of fornication*] and [εἰ μὴ ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ, *except for fornication*] And that is endeavoured by theſe ways, *Firſt, by mentioning it as an* [g] *hnge difficulty, which is wont to torment Writers on this ſubject.* Secondly, by rendring two notions of the word *Fornication* among *Chriſtian* Writers, frequently in uſe, one belonging to the *unmarried*, the other to the *married*, and then (becauſe in the former of theſe notions *it cannot be taken, unleſs it denote ſome act committed before marriage*) enquiring whether among *any Authours*, either *more ancient*, or *contemporary* with the *Evangeliſts*, πορνεία do *manifeſtò & palàm, manifeſtly and openly* ſignifie *adultery*, as that is *ſignanter, Simply* and *Specifically* the *violation* of *marriage*. In this inquiry firſt he finds the word uſed in *Demoſthenes* for that which is not to be named, in *Philo* for *proſtitution*; but he ſuppoſes no man to think this applicable to this matter. Secondly, then he finds in *Heſychius* and the *Etymologiſt* μοιχὸς πορνὸς, and ſo, (that which was deſigned not to be found) *fornication* for *adultery*. [h] *But theſe*, ſaith he, *are recentiores, later Writers, and do not prove the uſe of the word among the ancients before or about Chriſt's time, any more than the fathers of the Chriſtian Church, which are alſo later than Chriſt's being here on earth, who uſe it and underſtand it for adultery.* To this thirdly, he adds, that it is ſtrange that *Matthew* ſhould in both places uſe πορνεία *fornication*, and not μοιχεία *adultery*, which yet in both places *Chriſt* uſes immediately after theſe words; and there being a third place in *Matthew* wherein both theſe words are uſed together, *Matth.* 15. 19. He obſerves fourthly, that the *Syriack* reads זנרא *adultery* onely. Fifthly, he ſuppoſes it acknowledged by all, that the ſame words are wont to be *diverſly* uſed in reſpect of the *diverſity* of the matters. Sixthly, he adds, that among the ſeveral opinions that were at that time abroad, there was no one of this ſort, that there was no place for *divorces, ſave in caſe of adultery*; The ſeveral opinions being reducible to three heads, firſt that of *Hillel*, that the *husband* might *divorce* for *any cauſe*, yet not meaning his own *bare will*: ſecondly, that of *Sammai*, for ſomewhat of *turpitude* onely: thirdly, that of *Aquiba*, that he might doe it on his *own will* for whatſoever he *pleaſed*. Nay ſeventhly, that *adultery* was to be puniſhed by *death*, and ſo not by *divorce*. Eighthly, that the *Phariſees* conſulted *Chriſt* temptingly and treacherouſly, and yet, that as ſoon as *Chriſt* had thus *anſwered* them, they were ſo *ſatisfied*, that they *oppoſed* not a word, which 'tis ſcarce *credible* they ſhould doe, if his anſwer had been ſo *new* and *unheard* of, diſtant from all the *three opinions* known among them: Nay that the *diſciples* ſeem not ſo to *underſtand* his anſwer as if it were any ſuch *new doctrine*, but ſuch as, though rejected by the moſt, was yet defended by others the *Scholars* of *Sammai* and his followers. Ninthly, That it is not evident enough by *Chriſt*'s expreſs words, whether the cauſe of *fornication* do not belong to the *husband* alſo, and not onely to the *wife*, that if he were guilty, or [i] *in danger* of being *guilty* of *fornication* through her *contumacies* or *moleſtations*, this were ſufficient for a *divorce*. Upon theſe premiſſes having ſufficiently prepared the Reader's *inclinations*, he then proceeds to a through examination of the matter by reducing all to three *Quæres*. *Sect.* 53. His preparations to it.

[g] *Difficultas maxima quâ cruciari ſolent hcic Scriptores.* p. 479.

[h] *Horum uterque recentiores ſunt, nec veterum ante, ſeu ſub Chriſti tempora uſum omnino probant, aliter atque patres Chriſtiani Chriſti in terris tempore ſæculis aliquot recentiores, quibus pro adulterio admittitur, uſurpatúrque.* p. 481.

[i] Πορνείας *propenſius fieret reus.*

But before I proceed to them, I ſhall reflect a while upon this προπαρασκευὴ or *preparative velitation* which I have thus largely and punctually ſet down, that it may appear what ſolidity there is like to be in that *pretenſion*, which was thus to be *uſhered* in. *Sect.* 54. An anſwer to them.

And firſt it is viſible to all, that this which he makes a *queſtion* of, and calls it a *greateſt difficulty*, which Writers on this *Subject* have been *tormented* with, is indeed no ſuch matter, but that all the *Chriſtian* Writers of any note from *Chriſt*'s time to this, have *uniformly* reſolved that *Chriſt*'s words of *divorce* do belong to that one caſe of *fornication* in the *Wife*. None ever doubting but that πορνεία doth there ſignifie *ſins* of *uncleanneſs*; onely ſome extending it, farther than *adultery*, to *unnatural* and *inceſtuous commiſſions*, which, it is certain, are called πορνεία alſo, and being of ſo *high* a nature, may well be thought fit to be comprehended in *Chriſt*'s words, and not *adultery* onely. *Sect.* 55. Πορνεία not Adultery onely.

This will anon appear on occaſion of ſome teſtimonies produced out of *Bede* and others, by Mr. *Selden*, to which we ſhall * then joyn that paſſage of Saint *Auguſtine* in his *Retractations*, by whom indeed it is ſaid to be *latebroſiſſima quæſtio & ſcrupuloſiſſima diſputatio*, a *very obſcure* and *ſcrupulous queſtion*, not, whether for other cauſes except that *one*, a *Chriſtian* might *divorce*, but, whether that one contain not other acts of *fornication* beſides *adultery*. *Sect.* 56. * *Sect.* 81.

Secondly, then for the uſe of this word πορνεία *ſignanter, ſimply* and *ſpecifically* for *adultery*, i. e. I ſuppoſe, ſo as to *exclude* all other ſorts of *uncleanneſs*, there is no need to produce any *teſtimonies*, of ſuch *ancient* Writers; If it be more largely extended, in like manner, as it is *Acts*, 15. in the *Apoſtles Canon*, to *inceſts* and *unnatural ſins*, &c. this is not it, wherein the *controverſie* conſiſts. And therefore for the notions of it in *Demoſthenes* for *pæderaſtia* or *unnatural filthineſs*, and the like alſo, but ſomewhat more *indefinitely* in *Philo*, if they be here taken in, it will no way advantage Mr. *Selden*'s pretenſions, which are for ſome *ſofter* notion of πορνεία, than the *Chriſtian* Writers beſtow on it, and that from *Demoſthenes* and *Philo* cannot be pretended. *Sect.* 57.

Sect. 58. Mean-while it is not obvious to conjecture, why, when it is by him acknowledged, that among the [k] *ancient Christians* πορνεία is used for *adultery*, and so in the [l] *Christian Translatour* of *Achmet*, and others the like, and indefinitely in the [m] *Christian Fathers*, none excepted, this should not be thought a competent means of judging what the *Evangelist* meant by πορνεία, but that it should be *sought* out of *Demosthenes* and *Philo*, rather than *found* in the *universal undoubted* use of *Christian* Writers. This cannot but be lookt on as a *symptome* of some *significancy*, that what was to be maintained by those means, is of such a nature, as, if the whole *Christian Church* might be heeded, could never be owned or believed by us.

[k] *Apud Christianos veteres, p.* 480. *l.* 8.

[l] *Oneirocriticis Græcè sed à Christiano ævi inferioris redditis, aliisque ejusmodi.* lb. *l.* 12.

[m] *Patres Christiani. p.* 481. *lin. ult.*

Sect. 59. And therefore when *Hesychius* (and also the *Etymologist*) have affirmed distinctly that πορνὸς doth signifie μοιχὸς, *an adulterer*, what an *injustice* is it, first *carelesly* to despise, and without any account or contrary affirmation of any other, *simply* to cast off the *authority* of that most excellent *Grammarian*, which is of all other *Glossaries* acknowledged by *learned men*, to have a peculiar propriety to the explicating of the *sacred dialect*, and then to reject in the same period all the *Christian Fathers* also, by saying that *Hesychius* and the *Etymologist* do no more prove the use of the word *before* or *under Christ*, than the *Christian Fathers* (no one, it seems, fit to be *excepted*) are able to doe? This again visibly sets this *pretension* in *competition*, and contention with the whole *Christian* World beside, and that is no very excellent character of the meekness, nor presage of the truth of it.

Sect. 60. This being thus premised, it is now far from strange, that Saint *Matthew's Greek* should make use of πορνεία, *fornication*, and not of μοιχεία, *adultery*, the reason being visible, because πορνεία was wider, and comprehended those other *sins* of *Incest*, &c. which as well as simple *adultery*, were just causes of *divorce*, and that μοιχεία, *adultery* was not fit to doe. And if *Matth.* 15. in stead of *fornication* and *adultery*, the *Syriack* hath used זנוה onely, this can signifie nothing to me, but that either they have omitted a word, which they should have *expressed*, or used a *comprehensive* word to signifie both; or by naming *adultery*, by *parity* of *reason*, or *à fortiori*, left the other to be understood also.

Sect. 61. And when 'tis added, that by the difference of the *matter*, words receive their different *significations*: as I acknowledge the truth of that, so I think it very competent to infer, that πορνεία being used of a *married couple*, must in reason signifie *adultery*, as that notes an offence against the *marriage bed* and *vow*, and not any inferiour *crime* or *infirmity*, which is not such.

Sect. 62. As for the next branch of his discourse, which would render it improbable that πορνεία, should signifie *adultery*, (because, there being three opinions of *divorces* among the *Jews* of that time, this of the *unlawfulness* to *divorce*, *save onely for fornication*, was none of these three) I suppose, the *answer* will be *unquestionable*, that *Christ* in his *Sermon* on the *Mount*, setting his commands in opposition to what had been formerly said among the *Jews*, did either add new *precepts* and interdicts to those that were before in force among them, or else vindicated the old *Commandments*, from the false opinions and *glosses* of men. And then will it be very unreasonable to oblige *Christ* to follow the known opinion of any sort of *Rabbins* among them, at that time when he *opposes* his *doctrine* to all that had been formerly said by them. And why may not *Christ* reasonably reject the *interpretations* and *indulgences* of men, of whatever *Jewish* School they were, as well as retrench the *indulgence* given by *Moses* from *God* (as in this matter it is apparent he doth, *Matth.* 19. 8. *Moses permitted — but from the beginning it was not so*: and, *But I say unto you*, ver. 9.) or pronounce of the *Sanhedrin* universally, that they *made void the Commandments of God by their Traditions*, Mark 7. 13.

Sect. 63. That *Adultery* was among the *Jews*, by their *law*, to be *punished* with *death*, is willingly granted; but that *concession* is far from inferring, That it was not reasonable in *Christ* to disallow all other *divorces* for lesser or lower causes. For 1. At this time wherein the *Pharisees* speak to him, the *capital* punishments were taken from the *Jews*, and the *Sanhedrin* confess *it is not lawfull for them to put any man to death*, John 18. 31. In regard whereof they brought the *adulteress* to *Christ*, John 18. 3. as thinking to have *ensnared* him by that also. 2. It was not necessary when the *Mosaical* polity was abolished, that all *Christians* to whom *Christ*'s words indifferently belonged, should enact the same *Judicial Laws*, that were in force among the *Jews*, nor consequently, that *adultery* should every where be *death*, though in *Judæa* it were. 3. *Christ*'s affirming that there was no cause competent for *divorce* but one, doth no way prejudge the punishing that one with heavier *punishment* than *divorce*. And 4. there is no reason imaginable, why *Christ* that thought *adultery* so much a greater offence against the *marital vow*, than other *faults* or *causes* were, for which the *Jews* ordinarily *divorced*, should, by omitting to specifie that, leave us to conclude that there was no *crime* at all, for which it was *lawfull* to *divorce*. For supposing any to be such, certainly *adultery*, which was so great a contrariety to the *conjugal* vow, and *injury* to the *husband*, as to be punished with *death* (that highest degree of *divorce*, *Excision* irreversible, not from his *flesh* onely, but from the *earth*) might deserve to be deemed such.

Sect. 64. Next: for the *Pharisees* being so satisfied with his *answer*, that they *opposed not a word*, It is far from inferring that his *answer* agreed with some one of the *three doctrines* of their *Rabbies*. For 1. if it be but remembred, what is by the *objecter* truly suggested, that they came *insidiously* to *question* him, then, as their *intention* to *ensnare* him by this *question*, is an *evidence*, that they believed his *doctrine* in this matter (delivered in the *Sermon* on the *Mount*) to be contrary to the *liberty* which they had by *Moses*, (for else how could this be a *tempting*, i. e. an *ensnaring* question?) so the more *contrary* his *answer* was to their *received doctrine*; yea, and to the *doctrine* which they were taught from *Moses*, the greater matter of *satisfaction* that would be to their design of *treachery*. The more liable he were supposed to have rendred himself to their *Laws* and *Censures*, the less need was there of *questioning* him any farther. As at another time, *Matth.* 12. where it is said expressly, that they *asked him a question that they might accuse him*, ver. 10. upon his *answer* they return not a *word* to him (and yet sure were not *satisfied* with him any otherwise, than as having now matter of *accusation* against him: for it follows, *ver.* 14. that *they went out and took counsel against him that they might put him to death.*) So again *Matth.* 26. the *High Priest* that *insidiously* examined him, upon his affirming that he was *the Christ*, ver. 64. answers, not by *opposing*, or questioning him any farther,

farther, but by addreſſing his ſpeech to the *Sanhedrin*, *What need we any farther witneſſes? behold, ye have now heard his blaſphemy.* Which yet is far from concluding that ſpeech of *Chriſt*, that he was the *Meſſias*, to contain no more in it, than ſome *Sect* of their *Rabbins* affirmed concerning him.

Sect. 65. Nay 2. the *reaſon* and *evidence*, with which *Chriſt* ſpake, might be, and certainly was ſuch, that the moſt *contrary* minded had nothing to oppoſe. As it is elſewhere ſaid, that *they could not reſiſt the power with which he ſpake.* And then certainly it will be a weak *argument* to infer, that ſome ſort of *devils* taught that *God onely* was to be *worſhipped* (or that the ſpeech of *Chriſt*, *Matth.* 4. 11. was agreeable to the *doctrine* of ſome of thoſe *learned Rabbies*) becauſe upon that anſwer of *Chriſt*, the *devil* had nothing to *oppoſe*, but *immediately departed from him.*

Sect. 66. Nay 3. it may moſt reaſonably be reſolved by way of *retortion* of this argument, that there being three opinions of the *Jews* at that time, one from *Hillel*, the moſt received, the ſecond from *Sammai*, that had fewer followers, the third of *Aquiba*: if *Chriſt* had taken part with that number of men, which were then *leſs* favoured by all, and particularly by the *Phariſees* that queſtioned him, his *authority* could not have prevailed ſo far, as to perſwade them preſently to *depoſite* their *opinion*, and inſtead of *treacherous* enemies, to become *obedient Converts* to this *doctrine*; and yet (after all this being thus prodigiouſly ſatisfied) never to give any word of *acknowledgment* that they were ſo.

Sect. 67. As for the *diſciples*, that they do not ſeem to underſtand his *anſwer* ſo, as if it were any *new doctrine*, but as that, which was *rejected* by ſome, but *defended* by others: It is affirmed without any ſhew of reaſon. For 1. in the *Sermon* on the *Mount*, if it were *new*, yet it was agreeable with other *precedent* parts of that *Sermon*, which were *new* alſo, and they which were *diſciples* of *Chriſt*, and believed him to be ſent from *God*, could believe what he ſaid without having the aſſiſtence of *Sammai*, or other *Jew* to countenance it. And beſides, that coming in the body of his *Sermon* (of all which they were *ſilent auditours*) how *new* ſoever they thought it, we cannot expect from them any *expreſſion* of it. And for that *Matt.* 19. to which I ſuppoſe Mr. *Selden* refers, it is pretty evident, 1. That they had *heard* it *before* from him on the *Mount*, and ſo that it was not now perfectly *new* to them: and 2. That their *objection* againſt it doth not argue that they took it for an *old doctrine*, for ſay they, *If this be the caſe of an husband with his wife, it is profitable not to marry*, ver. 10. which (by the way) would have been very cauſeleſly objected by them, if as *Sammai* had taught, ſo *Chriſt*'s ſpeech had been underſtood to extend no farther; That *turpitude* in the *greateſt latitude* and *comprehenſion* of the word, was of a *competent* width, and by being allowed a juſt cauſe of *divorce*, would not have concluded the conditions of that band of marriage very *ſtrict*, or *unſupportable.*

Sect. 68. Laſtly, it is a cauſeleſs exception againſt the words, or *ſtyle* of *Chriſt* or the *Evangeliſt*, to pretend it not *evident* enough by *Chriſt's expreſs* words, whoſe *fornication* it is (the *man*'s or the *woman*'s) which is there ſpecified: for certainly it is moſt *evident*, and never before *doubted* of by any, but that as the αἰτία, the *every cauſe* or *accuſation* preceding, was ſomewhat *diſliked* or *accuſed* in the Woman, and not in the *husband* himſelf, who would not probably be his own *accuſer*, ſo the *fornication* was to be conceived in the *woman* alſo, and if it be not *expreſly* ſaid [*for her fornication*] that *pronoun* is certainly ſpared, becauſe no ordinary Reader could make doubt of *underſtanding* it thus, and ſo that *expreſneſs* or *punctuality* was unneceſſary.

Sect. 69. Having now done with the *apparatus*, or lighter, I ſhall proceed to the *weightier* part of his impreſſion, and (becauſe he is pleaſed to adviſe others to *enquire*, and *examine* the truth of his *pretenſions*) it will not be *unſeaſonable* to follow his ſteps, and obſerve what matter of *conviction* there is in all which is propoſed by him. Mr. *Selden*'s farther pretenſions examined.

Sect. 70. His firſt attempt is (ſuppoſing *Matthew* to have written, and *Chriſt* to have ſpoken either in *Syriack* or *Hebrew*) to examine the uſe both of the *Syriack* and *Hebrew* word, and from thence to collect a greater *latitude* of ſignification, than that it ſhould be confined to *fornication* or *adultery*. If it were in *Syriack*, then, ſaith he, זניותא was the word; if in *Hebrew*, ערוה *turpitude*. For the firſt, the *Syriack* זניותא is, ſaith he, agreeable to the *Hebrew* זנה πορνεύειν, and therefore muſt have the ſame *latitude* with the *Hebrew*; and that, ſaith he, ſignifies either *primarily* and *ſtrictly* all *lying together*, which is not in *lawfull marriage*; and that again either all kind of *unlawfull conjunctions*, as in the ſtories of *Dinah* and *Thamar*; or elſe ſome particular ſorts of that kind, of which *adultery* is but one of many: Or *ſecondarily* and more *largely*, all things that are called *filthy*, as that is oppoſed to *honeſt*, and on theſe he inſiſts at large.

Sect. 71. For the former of them we need not to contend, not onely becauſe, howſoever *Chriſt ſpake*, yet 'tis certain Saint *Matthew* wrote not *Syriack* (and we have no way to gueſs of *Chriſt's words*, or *meaning*, but by the expreſſions which the *Evangeliſts* have given us of them) but alſo becauſe of Mr. *Selden*'s conceſſions. For if that *Syriack* be agreeable to the *Hebrew*, and that *primarily* denote all manner of *conjunctions* but that in *lawfull marriage*, it will be no way inconvenient for us to acknowledge, that *Chriſt* uſed that word in that ſenſe, but plainly conſequent thereto, that no *divorce* is now *lawfull*, but that for *fornication*, as that ſignifies *adultery* or other ſuch *foul* ſin of *uncleanneſs*. The onely teſtimony here, of which he deſires to make advantage, is that of *Lev.* 21. 7. where the *Prieſt* is *forbidden* to *take a wife which is a whore*. There, ſaith he, the *Hebrew* זונה is by the *ancient Jews* defined to be any that is not an *Iſraeliteſs*, or which being an *Iſraeliteſs*, hath been joyned in any *interdicted marriage*, or hath lain with any *Prophane* perſon, whoſe *marriage* with her was not *unlawfull.*

Sect. 72. To this affirmation out of the *ancient Jews*, I anſwer, That whoſoever thoſe *ancient Jews* were, I cannot think there is any truth in that, which is thus cited from them, that זונה which we render *whore*, ſhould denote one that were onely *not* an *Iſraeliteſs*. For in the ſame verſe, where he is forbidden to marry the זונה, he is alſo *forbidden* to *marry* the *prophane*, and that ſure is more probable than זונה to ſignifie her, that is *not* an *Iſraeliteſs*. And of this I am ſure, that the moſt excellent *Paulus Fagius*, and others moſt converſant in the *Jewiſh* Writers, interpret זונה an *adultereſs*, or *whore*, in that place, and even the word *prophane* may well belong to the ſame matter alſo, the *whore* being ſaid to *prophane* her ſelf and her *father*, verſe 9. and there לזונות is the word for *playing the whore.*

However

Sect. 73. However this, if granted, will be *impertinent* to *Chriſt's interdict* of *Divorces*, unleſs we believe that he made it *lawfull* to *put away* a *wife* for *not* being an *Iſraeliteſs*, (and then every *Engliſh woman* muſt be put away) or for not being born of *Parents* of the ſame true *Religion*. And then, as we know, the *daughter* may be of the true *Religion*, though the *mother* were not, (and ſo 'tis ſure many *children* of *heathens* became *Proſelytes* of the *Jews*) ſo even of thoſe *Wives*, that are not of the *true Religion*, but *unbelievers*, or *heathens*, S. *Paul* is expreſs, that if they will *live with their husbands*, they are not to *put them away*, 1 *Cor.* 7. 12.

Sect. 74. Now for the *ſecundary* notion of the word ערוה, that it ſignifies any *deviation* (at leaſt *heavier tranſgreſſion*) into any *ſins* or *turpitudes* whatſoever, that he endeavours to prove from the frequent uſe of it for *idolatry*, *fornicating after other gods*, *Exod.* 34. 15. and *following of Wizards*, which is *going a whoring after* them, *Lev.* 20. 6. and ſo the *ſins* of the *Jews*, and *Sodomites*, and *Samaritans*, Ezek. 16. 51. are called often *fornication* in that *Chapter*; and many the like. So *Numb.* 14. 33. *Your children ſhall bear your whoredoms*, is, ſaith he out of *Onkelos*, *ſhall bear your iniquities*. So *Philo* calls a *vitious mind* ψυχὴν πεπερ δμῶσαν a *fornicating ſoul*. So *Wiſd.* 14. 12. when 'tis ſaid of the deviſing of *Idols*, that it is ἀρχὴ πορνείας, *the beginning of fornication*, on which ſaith *Holkot*, that the *Scriptures* uſe to call by the name of *fornication*, *omnem illicitam corruptionem*, *all unlawfull corruption*, ſuch is *Idolatry*, and *Avaritia*, *Covetouſneſs*. So, ſaith he, S. *Paul* muſt be underſtood, when he calleth the *fouleſt inceſt*, *Fornication*, 1 *Cor.* 5. 1. And ſo the *Whore* in the *Revelation* is one guilty of all kind of *impiety*. From all which he concludes, that if *Chriſt* ſpake *Syriack*, then the word expreſſed by πορνεία *fornication*, may denote all kind of *filthineſs*, *ſeu quicquid* κακίας *ſeu vitii nomine venerit*, *whatever comes under the name of naughtineſs or vice*, and then the *concluſion* is direct, for any ſuch *vice*, *Chriſt* allows *divorce*, and *not onely in caſe of fornication*. And accordingly that πορναὶ *harlots*, are joyned with *publicans*, *Matth.* 21. 32. as ἁμαρτωλοὶ *ſinners*, *Matth.* 9. 11, *Mark* 2. 16. *Luke* 5. 30.

p. 494.

Sect. 75. Now to all this endeavour the *anſwer* will be brief and evident, by obſerving but two things, which quite take away all *force* of theſe *teſtimonies*. Firſt, that the people of the *Jews*, as ſince the *Church* of *Chriſt*, are figuratively and *myſtically* ſaid in *Scripture* to be *eſpouſed* by *God*, *married* to himſelf, and conſequently every degree of *Idolatry* or *Apoſtaſie* from him is, by the ſame *figure*, expreſſed by *fornicating*, or going a *whoring*, i. e. *breaking* that *Covenant* which they had made with *God*, reſembled by *God* to a *Marriage-Covenant*. And there is nothing more ordinary than ſuch *figures* as this in all manner of *ſacred* and *prophane* writings, which yet no way prejudge or hinder the uſe of the ſame word in the *proper* ſenſe without any *figure* in it, but contrariwiſe ſuppoſe this acception of it for the *violation* of the *marriage-bed*, or elſe there could be no place for ſuch *metaphors*.

Sect. 76. From hence therefore that which will be deducible is this, that where there is no place for the *literal interpretation*, there ſuch *figurative* notions are to be admitted: as when *Philo* mentions the *fornicating ſoul*, or the *Scripture*, *whoring after other Gods*, there it muſt be taken in the *figurative* ſenſe, becauſe *corporeal fornication* is not incident to *ſouls*, or faſtened on *Gods* or *Idols*. But when there is place for the *proper* or firſt ſenſe, then what reaſon can there be to prefer, or *ſubſtitute* the *figurative*? And ſo it is viſibly in *Chriſt*'s words, where the *man puts away the wife for fornication*. By this means *five* of the former *teſtimonies* are evidenced to be of no force, to infer the deſired concluſion; that of *Exod.* 34. *Lev.* 20. *Ezek.* 16. *Numb.* 24. of *Philo*; and perhaps a *ſixth*, that out of the *Revelation*, if it be taken to ſignifie any eminent *Idolater* or *Apoſtate*.

Sect. 77. But the ſecond obſervation will conclude this matter; It is this, that in the *Idol-feaſts*, and *Sacrifices*, and *Worſhips*, there was a great deal of *uncleanneſs* and *unnatural filthineſs* committed, and conſequently that *filthineſs* is ſometimes called *Idol worſhip* it ſelf, ſometimes it is ſet as an *effect* of it, and this literally and properly without any *figure*. So when πλεονεξία (which is ordinarily rendred *covetouſneſs*, but doth alſo ſignifie any *inordinate luſt*, *Eph.* 5. 3. and is oft in the *New Teſtament* uſed in that ſenſe) is ſaid to be *Idolatry*, *Col.* 3. 5. and *Eph.* 5. 5. that is clearly the meaning of it, that thoſe *inordinate luſts* were the way of their *worſhipping* their *falſe Gods*. And thus in the forecited place of *Wiſd.* 14. 12. it is evidently to be underſtood that ἐπίνοια εἰδώλων, *the deviſing of Idols*, is ἀρχὴ πορνείας, *the beginning of fornication*, or that which hath brought a great deal of *abominable filthineſs* into the world; and accordingly it follows, εὕρεσις δ' αὐτῶν φθορὰ ζωῆς, *the invention of Idols was the corrupting of life*, in that notion wherein [*corrupting*] is uſed for all ſuch *villany*, *Deut.* 4. 16. and 2 *Pet.* 1. 4. and 2. 12, 19. and as in *Philo*, φθορὰ, πορνεία, and μοιχεία are joyned together as *breaches* of the *ſeventh Commandment*.

Sect. 78. And ſo that place of *Holkot*, taken out of *Papias*, is to be interpreted alſo, that fornication ſignifies πᾶσαν ἀθέμιτον ἀδικίαν, *all abominable villany* or *corruption*, (a cleanly expreſſion of that which is not to be named) *ſicut eſt Idololatria*, *ſuch as is Idolatry*, and *avaritia*, in the notion of πλεονεξία (not *covetouſneſs*, as that ſounds with us a *love of money*, but) *inordinate luſt*, *which is Idolatry*.

Sect. 79. If there be any queſtion of this interpretation of the words of *Papias*, or *Holkot* out of him, I ſuppoſe a plain place in the *fragments* of *Polycarp's Epiſtle* (who lived in the ſame age with *Papias*) will make it clear, where ſpeaking of *Valens*, *Elder* of *Philippi*, and his having committed ſomewhat utterly *unworthy* of that *Calling*, by his example he admoniſhes others to *abſtain ab avaritia* (that ſure was in *Greek* ἀπὸ πλεονεξίας from *unnatural luſts*) *& ſint caſti*, *and that they be chaſte*; adding, that *whoſoever did not ſo abſtain*, *ab Idololatria coinquinabitur*, *& tanquam inter Gentes judicabitur*, *would be defiled by Idolatry*, *and judged as among the Gentiles*, i. e. fall into that ſort of *ſins* for which the *Gentiles* are *condemned*, and of which the *Apoſtle* ſaith, πρνὲς καὶ μοιχοὺς κρινεῖ ὁ θεὸς, *fornicatours and adulterers God will judge*.

Sect. 80. And by this may be underſtood alſo to how little purpoſe a like place is by * Mr. *Selden* produced out of *Bede* on the words in Saint *Matthew*, *Non hîc intelligitur tantùm fornicatio in ſtupro*, *quod in alienis viris aut fœminis committitur*, *ſed omnis concupiſcentia*, *vel avaritia*, *vel idololatria*, *qua hominem facit à lege Dei aberrare*. *Here is to be underſtood not onely that fornication in adultery*, *which is committed with others husbands or wives*, *but all concupiſcence* (not *covetouſneſs*, but) *inordinate luſt* (the note being taken out of ſome *Greek Scholiaſt*, which had πλεονεξία) *or Idolatry*, *which makes a man err from the law of God*. Where the [*all concupiſcence*] in the front is explained by the two latter, *inordinate deſire*, and *Idolatry*, both denote thoſe *filthineſſes* ſo ordinary among *Idolaters*. And accordingly it follows in *Bede*, *Si uxor hujuſmodi aliquid hominem cogat*, *If a wife bring her husband to ſuch courſes as theſe*, *ſeduce* him into the *heathen myſteries*, *qui talem dimittit*, *cauſa*

* p. 556.

cauſa fornicatoris dimittit, he that puts her away doth it for fornication, Illius, quia fornicatur, ſuæ, ne fornicet, for her fornication already committed, and for his own, that he may not commit it. All which clearly belongs to the *unclean commiſſions* among the *heathen worſhippers*, not to any other diſtant *ſin*, contained under that title.

Which indeed ſignifies it to be the ſenſe of *Bede*, and of that *Scholiaſt*, that *fornication* in *Chriſt*'s words is to be extended (beyond that of *adultery*) to all *unnatural filthineſs*, but not that it contains all other *vices* under it, as far diſtant from this, as *love* of *money* is from the *luſts* of the *fleſh*, *coveting* the *houſe*, from *defiling* the *bed*, the *worſhipping* the *Idol-falſe-Gods*, from the *violation* of the *vow* of *wedlock*, *impiety*, from *incontinence* or *impurity*. Of the laſt and higheſt of which (*idolatry* or *heathenism*) as the *Apoſtle*'s opinion is given, 1 *Cor.* 7. 12. that it is not a ſufficient matter for *divorce*, ſo the text of [μὴ γίνεσθε ἑτεροζυγοῦντες ἀπίστοις] which (by our rendring it, *Be not unequally yoked with unbelievers*) may be thought to ſound toward it, cannot without great impertinency be applied to that ſubject, for beſides that it would rather hold againſt *marrying* ſuch, than for *divorces* after *marriage*, it appears by the context to be *ſpoken* to the *Corinthians* in relation to their *falſe teachers*, the *Gnoſticks* (elſewhere called ἄπιστοι, *unbelievers*) not to *heathen idolatrous women*: and the [n] ἑτεροζυγία ſignifies onely too ſtrong [o] inclinations of *kindneſs* which they had to ſuch *ſeducers*, above the proportion which they allowed the *Apoſtles*, which converted them. *Sect.* 81.

[n] Ἑτεροζυγοῦσι σωμάσι is *trutina alterijugis*, a *balance weighing down one way*, oppoſed to ἰσόζυγοι, *equiliberated*. [o] So in *Clement*'s *Epiſtle* to thoſe *Corinthians*, ἐτεροκλινεῖς ὑπάρχοντες ἀφ' ὑμῶν, *inclining* the *other way*, not *to*, but *from the Apoſtles* and *Orthodox Chriſtians*.

What hath thus been cleared to be the ſenſe of the words in *Holkot* and *Bede*, will, I ſuppoſe, be appliable to the place in S. *Auguſtine*'s *Retractations*, l. 1. c. 19. *Cum velit Dominus intelligi fornicationem, propter quam liceat dimittere uxorem, utrum eam quæ damnatur in ſtupris, an illam, de qua dicitur, Perdidiſti omnem qui fornicatur abs te, in qua utique & illa eſt (neque enim non fornicatur à Domino, qui tollens membra Chriſti facit ea membra meretricis) etiam atque etiam cogitandum eſt, atque requirendum. When Chriſt affirms fornication to be the onely thing for which it is lawfull to diſmiſs the wife, it muſt be conſidered and enquired diligently, whether he mean that fornication which is condemned in adultery; or whether that, of which it is ſaid, thou haſt deſtroyed every one that committeth fornication from thee, under which that of adultery is contained, for ſure he doth fornicate from the Lord, that takes the members of Chriſt, and makes them members of an harlot.* Here the *queſtion* propoſed by S. *Auguſtine* (for the reſolving of which, he deſires that his *own judgment* may not be taken *alone*, [p] but *other mens thoughts* compared with it) is onely this, not whether *all* other *ſins* may come under the word πορνεία, uſed by *Chriſt* (for he preſently adds a *caution* for that, *non quia omne peccatum fornicatio eſt, all ſin is not meant by it*) but whether it be not taken in that *latitude*, wherein the *Pſalmiſt* uſeth it, *Pſal.* 72. 27. And it being by him expreſly affirmed, that that notion *contains adultery* under it, it ſeems to me moſt reaſonable to *interpret* S. *Auguſtine* to that ſenſe, which from thoſe other more *ancient* and *later Writers*, hath now been mentioned, ſo as *fornication* may contain all thoſe ſins of *uncleanneſs*, which the *Nations*, that *departed* from *God*, fell into, and for which they were deſtroyed expreſly, *Lev.* 18. and 20. Of which as *adultery* is one, ſo it is but one. And ſo *fornication*, that comprehends all *unlawfull luſts*, will ſtill be that onely head of ſins, for which *divorces* are imaginable to be allowed by *Chriſt*. And whether for all the ſorts of that, is it, which by that *Father* is ſtill called *latebroſiſſima quæſtio*, a *moſt obſcure queſtion*, and ſuch as he is not willing to define in it. *Sect.* 82.

[p] *Legat & alia ſive noſtra quæ poſtea ſcripta ſunt, ſive aliorum melius conſiderata atque tractata, &c.*

As for the place 1 *Cor.* 5. 1. It is moſt *manifeſt*, that *fornication* there ſignifies in the ſame extent, that it doth in the *Precept* to the *ſons* of *Adam* and *Noah*, and denotes all kind of *prohibited luſt*, and ſo comprehends *inceſt* under it, and cannot in any reaſon be farther extended to ſins of any other *claſſis*, or be rendred, as Mr. *Selden* would have it, *flagitium, crimen, & deviantis animæ turpitudo*, as if any ſort of *great fault*, or *turpitude*, *murther* or *ſacrilege*, &c. could be ſo called. The word and notion of *fornication* may certainly be allowed to be retained there, and acknowledged to expreſs fully, what the *Apoſtle* there meant by πορνεία. *Sect.* 83.

And for *Chriſt*'s joyning πόρναι *harlots* with *Publicans*, as elſewhere *ſinners* are joyned, that will prove no more, but that either πόρναι, as *whores*, were *ſinners*, and a groſs kind of *ſinners*, as they are acknowledged to be: or 2. that the word [*ſinners*] being ſet to denote *Gentiles*, (or, as 'tis elſewhere expreſly, *ſinners of the Gentiles*) *fornication* is noted as a *Gentile* ſin, very ordinary, as was ſaid among the *heathen*: or elſe 3. that ἁμαρτωλοὶ *ſinners*, may peculiarly denote that *kind* of *ſin*, as the γυνὴ ἁμαρτωλὸς the *ſinner woman*, *Luk.* 7. 37. is generally reſolved to have been an *harlot*, and ſo in many languages 'tis ordinary. And ſo ſtill this inſtance was fit to attend the former, having as little force or *propriety* as any, to conclude, That *all other ſins*, of what ſort ſoever, are called by, or comprehended under that title of *fornication*, or that all other *ſinners* may be called *harlots*, becauſe *harlots* are ſometimes ſtyled *ſinners*. *Sect.* 84.

After the view of the *Syriack* word, which *Chriſt* is ſuppoſed to have uſed, Mr. *Selden* proceeds to the *Hebrew*, or *Rabbinical*, wherein it is alſo imagined *Chriſt* might ſpeak (although that at the ſame time he ſpake both *languages* it is impoſſible, and very poſſible that, ſpeaking but one, neither of theſe ſhould be the true word) And then the word that is pitched on, is ערוה, the ſame that ſignifies *turpitude*, *Deut.* 24. 1. *Sect.* 85.

Of this I ſhall premiſe three things: 1. That there being other words ordinarily rendred by the *Septuagint* to this *ſenſe*, נאף, with its *conjugates*, *forty* times rendred μοιχᾶσθαι, μοιχεία, μοιχὸς, it muſt follow, that the *conjecture* that ערוה was the *very* word, which *Chriſt* uſed, is very *fallible*, and *unable* to *ſupport* what is built upon it: Or if it be ſaid, that נאף, which is ſo often rendred μοιχεία *adultery*, is yet never rendred πορνεία *fornication*, then as I acknowledge that, ſo I reply that ערוה, is never rendred πορνεία neither, but γόμφωσις, αἰσχύνη, &c. which ſignifies neither *fornication* or *adultery*. 2. That although that word were imagined to be uſed in that place of *Matt.* 19. where in oppoſition to πᾶσα αἰτία, *every cauſe*, *Chriſt* might poſſibly be conceived to determine the *cauſe* of *divorces* to that to which in *Moſes* it had been determined, yet it being alſo certain, that *Chriſt* had ſpoken formerly of this matter, *Matt.* 5. it is moſt certain, that the word uſed in *Deuteronomy*, could not in that ſenſe, that there belonged to it, be there uſed by him, and conſequently *Matt.* 19. where his ſpeech is by *Matthew* ſet down in the ſame manner, as *c.* 5. it had been, can it not with any reaſon be imagined to have been uſed by him. *Sect.* 86.

In

Sect. 87. In that place of *Matt.* 5. ערוה in the notion of *Deut.* 24. 1. cannot be ſuppoſed to have been the word. For there *Chriſt* beginning his ſpeech with a reference to that which had been *indulged* by *Moſes* in that place of *Deuteronomy*, *It hath been ſaid, that if a man put away his wife, let him give her a bill of divorce*; he preſently ſubjoyns, *But I ſay unto you, that whoſoever ſhall put away his wife, ſaving for the cauſe of fornication, cauſeth her to commit adultery*, &c. The latter part of this ſpeech of *Chriſt* is a direct oppoſition to that which he had cited in the former. The [ἐγὼ δὲ, *But I ſay unto you*] is a demonſtrative evidence of that: But this it could not be, if *fornication* were no more than the *turpitude* in *Deuteronomy*, for then as there a man might for *turpitude*, put away, ſo here for *turpitude* a man ſtill might, which is not an *oppoſition*, but *identity*.

Sect. 88. Thirdly, that whatſoever language *Chriſt* ſpake, or *Matthew* firſt wrote in, it is acknowledged, that this *Goſpel* was rendred into *Greek* by ſome *Apoſtle*, either *James*, or *John*, or *Matthew* himſelf, who muſt be ſuppoſed to know what that *Hebrew* word was, (which we can but *gueſs* at very imperfectly) and have *choſen* thus to *expreſs* it; and conſequently, that no farther advantage can be made of this, than if it had been firſt written in *Greek* by him, but that the word πορνεία muſt in all reaſon be underſtood in the ſame ſenſe, that either in all, or at leaſt in ſome places of the *New Teſtament*, or in the *dialect* of the *Helleniſts*, and *Tranſlatours* of the *Old Teſtament*, it had been taken, and by that meaſure ערוה (in the notion of the word, *Deut.* 24.) cannot be deemed the word which *Chriſt* uſed, being, as I ſaid, never rendred by πορνεία.

Sect. 89. For this matter it muſt be obſerved, that the *uncovering* the *nakedneſs*, or ערוה *Lev.* 18. is a very diſtant thing from the מצא בה ערוה דבר *finding any matter* or *accuſation of nakedneſs in her*, *Deut.* 24. The *uncovering*, or *diſcloſing* in *Leviticus*, contains all the *inceſtuous*, *prohibited marriages*, and other *breaches* of the *ſeventh Commandment*; but the *finding* ערוה in *Deuteronomy*, ſuppoſes not the *committing* of any *turpitude*, but the diſcerning that in the *wife*, which is made matter of ſome *accuſation* or *diſlike*.

Sect. 90. Of either of theſe affirmations, I ſuppoſe, there neither is, nor can be any doubt; and Mr. *Selden* hath acknowledged *l.* 3. *c.* 21. that the word ערוה, as it is uſed in this matter of *divorces*, and diverſely interpreted by the *School* of *Hillel* and *Sammai*, *Multum diſcrepat ab ea turpitudinis notione, qua inceſtus*, &c. *in Levitico deſignatur, Differs very much from that notion of turpitude, by which inceſt and adultery, and other unlawfull copulations, are expreſſed in Leviticus.*

Sect. 91. Which (although it be not *exactly* true, for *Inceſt* is not there called ערוה or *turpitude*, but the *diſcloſing* of ערוה the *uncleanneſs*, or *nakedneſs*, or *ſhame* of one that is *near* unto him, yet) being by Mr. *Selden* thus granted, and it being otherwiſe evident, that it is the notion in *Leviticus*, and not of the word *nakedneſs*, but the phraſe, *diſcloſing nakedneſs*, which is expreſſed in *Greek* by πορνεία, 1 *Cor.* 5. 1. and *Act.* 15. and elſewhere, There is little reaſon to doubt, but that, if ערוה were here uſed, and in like manner rendred by πορνεία *fornication*, it were in the ſenſe of *Leviticus*, and then this whole Controverſie is at an end. But yet to prevent all poſſible miſtakes, I ſhall farther deduce this matter.

Sect. 92. The word ערוה ſignifies *unclean* or *uncomely*, and it is applied ſometimes to *vices*, as *Deut.* 23. 14. any ערוה or *unclean thing*, i. e. any *ſin*, ſuch as *God* diſlikes to *ſee*, as any *pure eyes* muſt do, to behold another's *ſhame*, but moſt frequently the *uncomely parts* of the *body*. See *Habak.* 2. 15. where, *looking on their nakedneſs*, (the ſame that was *Cham*'s ſin againſt his *father*) is evidently in this ſenſe; and is anſwered, *ver.* 16. with a *like phraſe*, and *let thy foreskin be uncovered*. And thus 'tis generally uſed, when there is mention of *diſcloſing* or *uncovering* ערוה, which we ordinarily render *nakedneſs*, meaning that part which ought to be *covered*. In this *ſecond*, and moſt ordinary notion of the word, it is certain, that the phraſe *Lev.* 18. is to be explained; ſo as to *uncover nakedneſs*, is to *take to wife*, or uſe as ſuch; and agreeably, if the *woman* be ſuch as it is not lawfull for him to *marry*; then, and not elſe, the [*uncovering her nakedneſs*] is πορνεύειν, *to commit fornication* with her.

Sect. 93. And ſo 'tis plain that ערוה *nakedneſs* is very diſtant from the word πορνεία, *fornication*, and that the *uncovering* of *nakedneſs* is it, which is equivalent to *fornication*; and accordingly the title of the *Precept* to the *ſons* of *Adam*, which is rendred by [περὶ πορνείας *of fornication*] is על גלוי עריות *of the revealing*, or *diſcloſing of nakedneſs*, and not על עריות *of nakedneſs*, onely. And it is not impoſſible, but this may be the notion of the word in this place of *Deuteronomy* alſo, and ſo דבר ſignifying λόγος *thing* or *matter*; and again, αἰτία, *quarrel*, or *accuſation*, דבר עריות *matter of nakedneſſes*, will be a *civil* phraſe to denote any thing between *man* and *wife*, of that ſort, which is not *plainly* to be *named*, and the finding of that in the [*wife*] ſhall be the *diſcerning* of ſomewhat of that kind, after his coming near unto her, for which ſhe hath *no favour in his eyes*, and for which he *diſlikes* and *hates her*.

Sect. 94. And accordingly the former part of the verſe is rendred by the *Greek*, *If any man ſhall take a wife*, καὶ συνοικήσει αὐτῇ, *and cohabit with her*, and the *Targum* to the ſame purpoſe, noting this *diſlike* to be a *conſequent* of that.

Sect. 95. Againſt this underſtanding of the words, no inconvenience or difficulty can lie, whether we ſuppoſe דבר to ſignifie αἰτία, and αἰτία an *accuſation*, (as it oft doth ſignifie) or whether it be rendred *matter* onely. For then דבר will be *negotium nuditatis*, or, as *Tertullian* renders it, *impudicum negotium*, ſome *conjugal ſecret*, ſomewhat, I ſuppoſe, which appears *odious* to the *husband*, and may appear otherwiſe to another, to whom ſhe may accordingly be *married*. And as this is on all hands reſolved not to be *fornication*, ſo being not there rendred by πορνεία, or any word of that nature, but onely by αἶσχος πρᾶγμα, *ſome unclean matter*, or *matter of nakedneſs*, there can be no reaſon to believe, that that ſhould be the word uſed by *Chriſt*, which *Matthew* renders πορνεία.

Sect. 96. This will farther appear, if it be again remembred, that our *Saviour*'s words are ſet oppoſite *Matt.* 5. to the ἐῤῥέθη, *that which was ſaid* under *Moſes*, i. e. to the place of *Deuteronomy*, and all the interpretations of it; which is not poſſible, if ערוה there, were all one with πορνεία here, for then the ſame indulgence ſhould be allowed, and not any ſtricter *reſtraint*, inſtead of it.

Sect. 97. But then the *inconveniences* which would be ready to attend this, if it were admitted, are of an *high nature*, and may yet farther deſerve to be conſidered: For it is confeſſed by Mr. *Selden*, That among the *Jews* it was moſt *generally received* that for *light* cauſes, *diſlike* of *beauty*, *age*, and other ſuch things, *wives* might

might be *put away*. And he adds, *idque ex ſacræ legis mente, and this according to the ſenſe of the ſacred law* (*l.* 3. *c.* 18.) *i. e.* ſurely according to the ſenſe of the words in *Deuteronomy*. And of the *three opinions* in this matter, ſet down from the *Miſna*, of *Sammai*, that reſtrained it to *turpitude*, of *Hillel*, that extended it to *over-boiling* his *meat*, or any ſuch *light cauſe*, and of *Aquiba*, that if he found any *handſomer*, or *more agreeable* to him, he might put her away, It is apparent, and affirmed by the *Miſna*, that all of them grounded their *opinions* on theſe words of that Text, ערוה דבר, diverſly interpreted.

By which it is evident, what abſolute *unlimited liberty* is introduced, and conſequently how little the *bond* and *vow* of *marriage* ſhall ſignifie, if it be once reſolved, that πορνεια in *Chriſt*'s ſpeech, is the ſame with ערוה in *Moſes*. *Sect.* 98.

For then, as *Joſephus* ſaith, about *Chriſt*'s time, that a [q] *man might ſeparate from his wife for any cauſes whatſoever*; adding, πολλὰ δ' ἂν τις ἀνθρώποις τοιαῦτα γένοιτο, *and many ſuch cauſes there are which befall men*; and confeſſing of [r] himſelf, that he *put away his wife after he had three children by her*, μὴ ἀρεσκόμενος δὲ τοῖς ἤθεσι, *becauſe he diſliked her manners*: ſo muſt it be expected again, there being nothing imaginable to reſtrain *Chriſtians* from following the *Jews*, if *Chriſt*'s words were reſolved to be the ſame with thoſe, which the *learned* among them ſo generally interpreted to all this *liberty*. *Sect.* 99. [q] *Antiq.* 4. *c.* 8. [r] *in vitâ.*

Having premiſed thus much, 'twill now be eaſie to diſcern the no force of all the proofs which Mr. *Selden* adds to make it probable, that the ערוה in *Deuteronomy* ſhould be the word here uſed by *Chriſt*. As firſt, becauſe, ſaith he, this was the *form* uſed by the *School* of *Sammai*, that *divorce was not to be admitted, but for the* דבר ערוה *cauſam aut rationem turpitudinis, cauſe or reaſon of turpitude*. To this I anſwer, That *Chriſt* was no *diſciple* of the *School* of *Sammai*, but came with *Commiſſion* from *God* to *reform* both *Hillel*, and *Sammai*, and *Sanhedrin*, and *Moſes* himſelf, and to give ſtricter *precepts* and *interdicts* in this matter, than had ever been given by any of theſe, and ſo is not to be imagined to have uſed *Sammai*'s *form* of *ſpeech*, any more than to have taken his *doctrine* from him, but appears clearly (in his *Sermon* on the *Mount*, *Mat.* 5.) to have oppoſed his *new doctrine* [*But I ſay to you*] to the [ἐρρέθη, *it hath been ſaid*] by *Moſes* and others (none excepted of any later date) that were *before* him. *Sect.* 100.

His ſecond proof, becauſe the word ſignifies αἰσχυσσιν and αἴσχυνον πρᾶγμα, (I ſhall ſuppoſe it a ſlip of the *Printer*, for ασχημοσυνη and ἄσχημον, for, though there be οἰσχύνη from *another Original*, ſure there are no ſuch words) *ſhame*, and *ſhamefull things*, concludes as little. For we know, that the former of thoſe in *Greek* denotes the *hidden parts*, and the ſecond *any uncomely thing*, and neither of thoſe will be fitly rendred πορνεια, *fornication*. And though it be true, that *Deut.* 23. 14. it ſignifie an *unclean thing*, *i.e.* a *ſin*, yet that concludes as little, there being many *ſins* beſides πορνεία, whatever notion be aſſigned it. And indeed every *iniquity* is *unclean* and *filthy* in the ſight of *God*'s *pure eyes*, as *nakedneſs* is in the ſight of *men*, and ſo may fitly be expreſſed by that *phraſe*. The ſhort is, that the word ערוה is rendred ἀσχημοσύνη, γύμνωσις, αἰσχύνη, ἀσχημοσύνη, all words to denote *nakedneſs*, or *ſhame*, and ἀσελγεια *naughtineſs*, *Ezek.* 16. 36. where we rightly render *nakedneſs*, but never πορνεία *Fornication*, or *Adultery*, or any word of that *importance*. *Sect.* 101.

And when he farther pretends that the word in *Leviticus* ſignifies another man's *wife*, and all that are *forbidden* to be taken in *marriage*, Firſt, that it is not *true*, as hath been largely ſhewed: and Secondly, if it were *true*, it were far from proving, that it ſignifies πορνεία, the *perſon* and the *act* being not the ſame. And ſo again, when by the *Kareans* 'tis defined, *every thing that is uncovered, which ought to be kept cloſe*; that ſtill infers, that it ſignifies the *womans ſhame*, but not πορνεία, whatſoever that ſignifies. *Sect.* 102.

As for his third proof out of the *Prophets*, it infers nothing leſs, than what he would prove from it. For, firſt, that of *Ezek.* 16. 37. *I will uncover* ערותך *thy nakedneſs, and they ſhall ſee all thy nakedneſs*, is directly in the notion of *Leviticus* for the *ſecret parts*, the *diſcovering* of which is a *figurative* expreſſion; for the bringing one to *ſhame*, ἐκδικησαι, *puniſhing openly*, and there is no pretence that it ſhould ſignifie there *malitiam*, *flagitium*, *vitium*, *malice*, *ſin*, *vice*, or if it did, it muſt do it but by a *metaphor*, as a man's *ſin* is called his *ſhame*. *Sect.* 103.

So ſecondly, that of *Nahum* 3. 4. *I will ſhew the Nations* ערותך *verenda tua, thy ſhame*, 'tis evidently in the former notion; and if it refer to *latrocinia*, &c. *thefts*, *lyes*, *murthers*, with which *Nineveh* abounded, it is but by a *figure* again, as the [*ſhewing their ſhame to the Gentiles*] is the *puniſhing* their *ſins* in their *ſight*, as in the place even now cited out of *Habakuk* did appear. *Sect.* 104.

As for *Onkelos*'s rendring ערוה דבר in *Deuteronomy*, by *tranſgreſſionem aliquam*, *ſome tranſgreſſion*, that ſtill proves not that that *tranſgreſſion* was *fornication*, for it might be ſomewhat elſe, and it is clear by *Chriſt*, who oppoſes his *doctrine* to that in *Deuteronomy*, that it was. *Sect.* 105.

As for the concurrence of the opinions of *learned* men, *Arias Montanus*, *Scultetus*, *Grotius*, that the paſſage in the *Goſpel* referred or pertained to the Controverſie of the *Schools* of *Hillel*, and *Sammai*, Firſt, it is evidently *contrary* to the *Text*, (and cannot receive *aid* from any *opinion* of *three learned* men) where the *Phariſees queſtion*, *Mat.* 19. 7. τί οὖν Μωσῆς, [*Why then did Moſes?*] is a *proof*, that they underſtood *Chriſt*'s anſwer to be *contradictory* to *Moſes*, and *Chriſt*'s reply is a *conceſſion* of it: and *ſo evidently* in the other places. Secondly, if it be granted, that *Mat.* 19. the *Phariſees* queſtion was according to *Hillel*'s doctrine, whether *divorces* were *lawfull* κατὰ πᾶσαν αἰτίαν, *for every cauſe*, or *quarrel*, or *diſlike*, yet that is no *proof*, that *Chriſt* took part with *Sammai* againſt him, and commanded no more ſtrictneſs, than *Sammai* maintained. And as that is the onely thing to be proved, ſo I believe there is none of thoſe *Authours* have affirmed that; or if *Scultetus* have, his name will add little to Mr. *Selden*. *Sect.* 106.

This he again endeavours to prove from the words of *Origen* upon *Matthew*. It is a long paſſage, and I cannot think fit to ſet it down at length; when, by that which Mr. *Selden* hath cited, 'tis clear, that all that *Origen* doth, is to recite an *objection* of a *Jew* againſt *Chriſt*'s words, *viz.* that the *cauſe* allowed for *divorces* in *Deuteronomy*, was onely that of *fornication*; and conſequently that *Chriſt* allowing that one *cauſe*, did the *Jews* wrong in ſaying it was *for the hardneſs of their hearts* that that *liberty* was indulged them. To which I ſhall onely ſay, That if that *Jew* were not in the *right*, there is nothing to be gained from him; and if he were, then firſt was *Chriſt* in the *wrong* againſt whom he *objects*: and ſecondly, Mr. *Selden*'s whole *cauſe* is fallen to the ground unexpectedly, for if the *divorces* in *Deuteronomy* were allowed in *Sect.* 107. P. 497.

no *cauſe*, but that of πορνεία *fornication*, and if *res turpis, uncleanneſs*, there ſignified that, then queſtionleſs there is no pretence to be had from thence (or from any other *Topick* of *probation*) that we *Chriſtians* may *divorce* for any other *cauſes* but *adultery*. For that *Origen* there by [πορνεία] underſtands *adultery*, is preſently [f] confeſt by Mr. *Selden*: onely he adds, that *Origen* makes that but an example of other *ſins*, for which *divorces* were admitted, which though it no way appear by the words cited by him, yet if it were true, it no way follows, that that example muſt infinitely be extended, or farther than to other *ſins* of *uncleanneſs, inceſt, unnatural villany, &c.* to which the word *may*, and by ſome others *hath* been *extended*.

[f] *Nec* πορνείαν *ibi ſignificare vult aliud* Origenes *atque* adulterium.

Sect. 108. And as it will eaſily be granted, that thoſe are all contained under the word πορνεία in the *Goſpel*; ſo there is no *temptation* from thence to believe, that other diſtant Sins of what quality ſoever, ſhould be contained under it, much leſs all the *cauſes* of *divorce* allowed either by *Hillel* or *Sammai*, which are not all affirmed to be *ſins*.

Sect. 109. *Diſquiſivimus hoc tantum nos*, p. 4. 7. This is all that is in that *Chapter* propoſed by Mr. *Selden*, in favour of this greater *liberty*, and it was but neceſſary to add, That what was here propoſed, was but by way of *diſquiſition*, for it is far from *proving* any thing. I wiſh this may be of force to ſatisfie the inquiry, that what hath ſo diligently been ſought, is not to be found any where.

Sect. 110. But this is not all: For, *c.* 28. another *attempt* is made to obtain a greater *indulgence* and *liberty* in this matter, by ſurveying the *practice* and *uſage* of men, *firſt*, from *Chriſt*'s time to *Conſtantine*, then from *Conſtantine* forward, by theſe two *intervals* to *learn, how the doctrine of Chriſt and the Apoſtles was underſtood.*

Sect. 111. But to this I anſwer, Firſt, that the *practices* of *men*, even of *Chriſtians*, are a very infirm proof of the *doctrine* of the *Church* in any point, becauſe that which is moſt reſolved to be *unlawfull*, is yet many times *practiſed*: and ſecondly, that this *method* of inquiry, whether into *doctrines* or *practices*, by way of *hiſtorical diſſertation*, if it be partially managed, (by ſetting down what is moſt *favourable* to the deſired *Concluſion*, and omitting what is not ſo) is a ready art of *infuſing* and impoſing any thing on the *incautious* Reader, without rendring the *Authour* liable to *anſwer* for the unconcludingneſs of the *Mediums*, when they come to be examined. And accordingly it is here made uſe of: For, in that whole firſt *interval* or period of 300 years; *two examples* onely Mr. *Selden* brings of *Chriſtian women*, who gave *Bills* of *Divorce* to their *husbands*, (one, of her in *Juſtin*, *Apol.* 1. who when her *husband, being an unbeliever, and a very wicked perſon, had departed from her*, τὸ νεβρώδον παρ' ὑμῖν Ῥωμαϊκὸν δοῦσα ἔσχεδεν, *ſhe gave him ſuch a Bill of Divorce as the Romans uſe, and was ſeparated: and this about the year of our Lord* 150. The other, of *Saint Thecla*, the *Sponſa, or eſpouſed of Thamyris in Iconium, and Saint Paul's diſciple, who, ſaith he, would not marry him, but renounced her eſpouſals.*) And having named thoſe two, he then concludes, Firſt, That the *Cuſtoms* and *uſage* of this *interval*, are not ſo expreſly to be found in this matter: and, Secondly, that the way of conjecturing what their *practice* was, is by the *Laws* and *Sanctions* of *Princes* and *Emperours* in the ſecond *interval*, after that *Chriſtianity* was received into the *Roman Empire*, there being but a *ſmall handfull of writers that preceded, and few of them touching the matter of Divorces.* By which means he preſently takes liberty to ſpend the reſt of the *Chapter* in ſetting down ſeveral *Imperial Laws* in that matter.

Sect. 112. To this part of his diſcourſe I anſwer briefly by theſe degrees: Firſt, That if *two examples* of *Divorces* for other cauſes beſide *fornication*, were to be met with among *Chriſtians* in the ſpace of 300 years after *Chriſt*'s interdict, this would be no very *new* or *ſtrange* thing, nor argument that it was not deemed to have been *prohibited* by *Chriſt*, but on the *contrary*, it were much more difficult to pitch on any other *interdict* of *Chriſt*, which could not appear to be many times more eminently violated, in the *hundredth* part of that ſpace.

Sect. 113. Secondly, That neither of theſe examples are at all to the preſent purpoſe, theſe being of *women* giving *bills* of *divorce* to their *husbands*, for which there is no pretence of *liberty* from *Chriſt*, no nor under *Moſes* among the *Jews*, and not of *husbands putting* away their *wives*.

Sect. 114. And thirdly, that even of theſe *two examples*, the firſt being in caſe not onely of a moſt *flagitious*, as well as an *infidel husband*, but alſo of one *qui abſceſſerat, which had departed* from her, her *giving the Bill of Divorce*, and being *ſeparated* from him, is no *argument* or *example* of any great *liberty*, but agreeable to St. *Paul*'s determination, *If the unbeliever will depart, let him depart*; *a believer* οὐ δεδούλωται is not *inſlaved in ſuch a caſe*, 1 *Cor.* 7. 15. And for the ſecond, that of *Thecla*, beſides that Mr. *Selden* gives [t] no great heed to the ſtory, it was (ſaith *Baſil* of *Seleucia* that relates it) *before marriage*, and ſo onely a renouncing the *ſponſalia*, and *refuſing* to *marry* a perſon, that moſt *bitterly deteſted Chriſtianity*: and ſo Mr. *Selden* appeareth to acknowledge, when he firſt calls her *ſponſa eſpouſed* onely, not *married*, and adds *nuptias noluit, ſhe would not marry*, and *ſponſalibus renunciavit, ſhe renounced the eſpouſals*, which ſuppoſeth it to have proceeded no *farther*.

[t] *Hujus hiſtoriolæ fides penes autores ſit.* p. 558.

Sect. 115. But then fourthly, that the practice of thoſe times of the *firſt interval* ſhould beſt be judged of by the *Reſcripts* of the *Emperours* of the *ſecond interval*, this is moſt unreaſonable. 'Tis evident, that thoſe *Reſcripts* are *laws* to bind for the *future*, and not *Records* to teſtifie for the time *paſt*; and if, being delivered by *Chriſtian Emperours*, they did (as Mr. *Selden* ſaith) reſtrain the *liberty* formerly uſed, yet ſure that *liberty* was ſuch as was uſed in time of *Paganiſm* by *Infidels*, or elſe by *carnal Chriſtians*, not ſuch as was owned and taught by the *Governours* of the *Church* of *Chriſt*, which are known to have uſed a greater *ſtrictneſs*. And ſo there is little *pretence* or *colour* to be had from hence, that *Chriſt*'s words were in the *Primitive* times *interpreted* to a greater *liberty*. For if the *ſmall handfull*, as it is ſtyled, of *Chriſtian writers* of thoſe firſt 300 years, be compared with the *Reſcripts* of the *Emperours*, which are made uſe of after, Firſt, the *handfull* will not appear very *ſmall*, or *contemptible* in that *compariſon*: and Secondly, it might have been as *reaſonable* to have enlarged it by taking in the *volumes* of the *Chriſtian Fathers* afterward, as to inſiſt on thoſe *Reſcripts* of the *Emperours* which were afterward. The onely difference is, that by obſerving this *courſe*, the reſult would certainly have been this, the thing pretended to, would not have been had: All theſe *writers*, that ſpeak of it, aſſerting *poſitively* this one onely cauſe of *divorce*, that of *fornication*.

Laſtly

Laſtly, for the *Conſtitution* of *Conſtantine*, it is obſervable, Firſt, that it doth not define what ſhall be deemed *lawfull* in *divorces*, but onely in what caſe the *woman* ſhould be allowed a *dowry*, in what not, and in what caſe the *woman* ſhould be allowed to *marry* again; and ſuch indeed uſeth to be the matter of *Civil Sanctions*, even of *Chriſtian Lawgivers*, which extend onely to the *outer man*, inflicting of puniſhments according as the *temper* of the *people* requires or *permits*, and not in *defining* what is before *commanded* or *forbidden* by *Chriſt*. Secondly, the caſes wherein *Divorces* are by *Conſtantine* (I cannot ſay *allowed*, but) *mentioned* and *foreſeen*, as poſſible, do not imply any very great *liberty* to have been uſed in thoſe times (though alſo thoſe *liberties* that are moſt uſed among *wicked* men, are ſufficiently acknowledged to be *unlawfull*:) For they are but three on the *womans* ſide; *Si mœcha, ſi medicamentaria, ſi conciliatrix, If ſhe be a whore, or a witch, or a bawd*, and the *firſt* and the *laſt* fall directly under the caſe reſerved by *Chriſt*, the *bawd* being preſumed a *whore*, and ſomewhat more. And for that of *witchcraft*, or *practiſing* on the *life* of the *husband* by *poiſons*, *&c.* (for thoſe may be comprehended under the φάρμακα or *medicamenta*) although the caſe be ſomewhat changed, 'tis yet but little *mollified* by that. However, 'tis acknowledged in ſome of the *Reſcripts* of *Chriſtian Emperours*, the *reſtraints* are not made ſtrictly according to *Chriſt's model*, and therefore there is nothing ſtrange in that of *Conſtantine's*. *Sect.* 116.

And the reaſon is plain, becauſe the *Imperial Laws* were to comprehend all ſorts of men that were in the *Empire*; and though the *Emperour* were *Chriſtian*, and many of his ſubjects alſo, yet 'tis ſufficiently known that all were not, and accordingly to his mixt *dominions*, the ſtrict *Chriſtian Law* would not conveniently be adapted. The *writings* of the *Fathers* of the *Church* and *Canons* of their *Councils*, which are ſuppoſed to be written peculiarly to *Chriſtians*, are therefore the onely *Records* by which we may judge what was deemed the *Law* of *Chriſt*, and thoſe I am ſure, count many things *unlawfull* in this kind, which they acknowledge νόμιμα *legal* by the *Imperial Conſtitutions*. *Sect.* 117.

Of this we have had evidences enough already, and [v] Mr. *Selden* confeſſing *Tertullian, Chryſoſtome, alioſque non paucos, and not a few more*, to be of the opinion which the *Church* hath maintained, will ſave me that pains, eſpecially when he is not able to name any one to the *contrary*, which I conclude, becauſe he hath not done it. I ſhall but mention two *Teſtimonies*; one, which the *Edict* of *Anaſtaſius* the *Emperour*, produced by Mr. *Selden*, in favour of *divorces* for ſome *other cauſes*, put me in mind of, out of the *Epiſtles* of *Avitus Alcimus*, which were written about that very time, *Perſuaſum in Gallia fuiſſe, ſolum adulterium legitimam cauſam eſſe divortii, That the French were perſwaded that adultery was the onely lawfull cauſe of divorce*; and accordingly pronounced of *fornication*, that it is the *ſin, propter quod ſolum Deus ſeparari virum permittit à conjuge, For which onely God permits the husband to be ſeparated from his wife.* The other is that of *Gregory*, *l.* 9. *Ep.* 39. *Si dicunt religionis cauſa conjugia debere diſſolvi, ſciendum eſt, quia etſi hoc lex humana conceſſit, lex divina tamen prohibuit. Per ſe enim veritas dicit, Quos Deus conjunxit, homo non ſeparet, Quæ etiam ait, Non licet dimittere uxorem exceptâ cauſâ fornicationis. Quis ergo huic cœleſti legiſlatori contradicat? If they ſay that for Religion marriages ought to be diſſolved, they muſt know, that although the law of man hath granted this, yet the law of God hath prohibited it. For the truth ſaith, Whom God hath joyned, let no man ſever: and again, It is not lawfull to put away a wife, except for fornication. Who then can contradict this heavenly Law-giver?* *Sect.* 118. [v] p. 555. p. 570. Ep. 49. p. 110.

The Fourth *QUÆRE.*

Of the Baptizing of Infants.

IN the next place I ſhall proceed to the *Baptizing* of *Infants* (meaning thereby the *obligation* that lies on *Chriſtian Parents*, and *Paſtours*, the one to bring their *children* to *Baptiſm*, the other not to *reject* them when they are *duly* brought) and ſhew you the *baſis* whereon I conceive it is founded, and ſtandeth in the *Church* of *Chriſt*. *Sect.* 1.

Where firſt it being remembred (what hath in the firſt Diſcourſe been, I conceive, ſufficiently evidenced) that whatſoever *Command* or *Inſtitution* hath come from *God* the *Father* (by his *Angels*, or by his *Prophets*) from *Chriſt* (either *perſonally*, or through his *ſucceſſours* the *Apoſtles*) is of *infallible obligation* to all, to whom it was given, (and ſo every *Inſtitution* of *Chriſt's* to *all Chriſtians*) and that the particular manner of conveying it to our knowledge, whether by the *writings* of the *Old* and *New Teſtaments*, or by any other means, is but *extrinſecal* to any ſuch *Precept* or *Inſtitution* of *Chriſt's*, or his *Apoſtles*, It will be abundantly ſufficient to the ſatisfying of this *Quære*, if we ſhall by competent arguments evince, that in the *Inſtitution* of *Baptiſm*, as a *Sacrament* to be continued in the *Chriſtian Church*, *Chriſt* and the *Apoſtles* did not *reject infants*, but *entertain* and *receive* them to it. *Sect.* 2. Chriſt's inſtitution of Baptiſm.

And the *foundation* of this eviction may very fitly be laid in the *Cuſtomes* and *Uſages* then among the *Jews*. *Sect.* 3.

For that the *Inſtitutions* of *Chriſt* (who came firſt a *Meſſias* to the *Jews*, was *born* of that *Nation*, lived regularly under their *law*, obſerved their pious *Cuſtomes* (ſome, as the *Feaſt* of *Encœnia*, or *Dedication* of the *Altar*, 1 *Mac.* 4. 59. which had not been inſtituted by *God*, but by the *Jews* themſelves in time of the *Maccabees*) and onely meant to *reform* what was *amiſs*, and *heighten* that which was *imperfect*) were by him drawn from the former *practices* and *uſages* of the *Jews*, ſome mentioned, others not mentioned, in the *Old Teſtament*, and ſo were lightly *changed*, and *accommodated* to his own purpoſes, might eaſily be ſhewed through *many*, I ſuppoſe, through *all* particulars. *Sect.* 4. Founded in Jewiſh cuſtoms.

Sect. 5. Examples of Jewiſh Cuſtoms [a]commodated by Chriſt. Diſciples.

I ſhall not *inſiſt* on any other, but this of *Baptiſm*, yet ſhall I *mention* a few of them. Thus, 1. the *calling* and *receiving* of *diſciples*, or conſtant *attendants*, is anſwerable to the *diſciples* of the *Prophets* among the *Jews*, who were to *attend* on, and *miniſter* unto them. So *Joſhua* to *Moſes*, *Exod.* 24. 13. *Eliſha* to *Elias*, 1 *King.* 19. 2. and generally the *ſons* of the *Prophets*, ſo called, not onely as thoſe that were *taught* by them, but alſo as *attendants* on them, by that *Hebraiſm* whereby παῖδες and ὑπηρέται, *ſons* and *ſervants*, are of the ſame ſignification. And of theſe it is known, that they were wont to be *ſent* on their *errands*, that they went to take up *room*, and *prepare* for them: and accordingly when *John Baptiſt*, which was *Chriſt's forerunner*, ſaith of himſelf, that he was *unworthy* to *carry his ſhoes*, *Matt.* 3. 11. it is clear, that he *refers* to the cuſtome of *diſciples*, who were uſed to ſuch perſonal *attendances*, and *miniſteries*, and *went before the Prophets*. And ſo *Chriſt* is ſaid to *ſend* the *Seventy*, πρὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ, *before his face to every City whither he meant to have it come*, *Luk.* 10. 1. And ſo *Peter* and *John* go *before* him to *prepare* the *Paſſeover*, *Matt.* 16. 17. Thus, ſecondly, was the *donation* of the *Keys* of the *Kingdom* of *Heaven*, lightly drawn from the *conſtituting* the *Oeconomus* over the *King's houſe*, *Iſa.* 22. 21. and making him *father* of the *houſe* of *Judah*, by putting the *Key* of *David* on his *ſhoulder*. Thirdly, that of the *Sacrament* of the *Lord's Supper*, *inſtituted* in, and taken from their *poſtcœnium* and *Cup of bleſſing*, ſolemnly uſed by them at the cloſe of a *Feſtival*. Fourthly, the *Impoſition* of *hands* in *confirmation*, and *abſolution*, and *ordination*, from the manner both of *paternal bleſſing* by the uſe of that *ceremony*, as in *Jacob* to his *children*, and of aſſuming to the *dignity* of an *Elder* in the *Sanhedrin*, by the uſe of the ſame *ceremony*. Fifthly, the title of *Apoſtles* for *deputies* and *proxies*, ſent with *Commiſſion* or *Letters* of *Credence*, *Matt.* 10. 40. to ſupply *Chriſt's place*, and act here on earth in his *ſtead*. Sixthly, that of [a] *Biſhops* (anſwerable to the חנשיא and ἀρχισυνάγωγος, the *Prince* and *Head* of the *Sanhedrin* or *Conſiſtory*, and called ἐπίσκοπος, and the מפקד among them, the *Overſeer* of any *publick* buſineſs) and the ſame again ſtyled πρεσβύτεροι, *Elders*, anſwerable to the וקנים *Elders*, among them, either as *ſtewards* in the *houſe*, as *Eliezer*, *Gen.* 24. 2. is called πρεσβύτερος τῆς οἰκίας αὐτοῦ, and ἄρχων πάντων τῶν αὐτοῦ, *the elder of his houſe*, and *ruler of all that he had*, שליטא ſaith the *Jeruſalem Targum*, *ruler*, or *adminiſtratour*, *Gen.* 15. 2. or as the *rulers* of the *Tribes*, *chief* of the *families*, are called *Patriarchs*, and *Elders* of *Iſrael*, *Exod.* 3. 16, 18. and *Captains* of *thouſands*, i. e. *rulers* of *Cities*. Seventhly, the *Deacons* inſtituted by the *Apoſtles* parallel to the חוינים under the *Synagogue*, thoſe that provided for the *Poor*, χειροτονηθοὶ διακονίαι, *ordained Curatours*, in *Joſephus Azanita* from the *Hebrew name*, and from their *Office*, γαζοφύλακες, *treaſurers*, in *Epiphanius*, and διακονικὰς χρείας ἐπιτελοῦντες, they that *performed the miniſterial duties*, in *Philo*, and withall *waited*, and *attended* on the *Elders* in the *Sanhedrin*, as ὑπηρέται or *miniſters* there. Laſtly, the title of Ἐκκλησία the *Church*, in both notions of it, both for the *People* and *Rulers* of the *Church*, and thoſe *Rulers* either to *officiate* in the *ſervice* of *God*, or to *govern*, from their *aſſembling* both in their *Synagogues* to *hear* and *pray*, and in their *Town-halls* to *execute judgments*. To paſs by theſe, I ſay, and many more, I ſhall onely inſiſt on this one of *Baptiſm*, or *Waſhing*, a known Rite ſolemnly uſed among the *Jews* (as 'tis now among the *Chriſtians*) for the *initiating* of *Jews* and *Proſelytes* into the *Covenant* of the *Lord*, and ſo into the *Congregation* of the *Jews*, as among us it is into the *new Covenant*, and into the *Church* of *Chriſt*.

Power of the Keys.

The Lord's Supper.

Impoſition of hands.

Apoſtles.

Biſhops.

[a] See *Quare* fifth.

Deacons.

Ἐκκλησία.

Baptiſm among the Jews.

Sect. 6. [b] *Pract. Cat. l.* 6. *ſect.* 4.

Many branches of that Cuſtome there were, which have been [b] elſewhere mentioned. I ſhall here briefly gather them together, and farther teſtifie the truth of thoſe affirmations, which may any way ſeem queſtionable to any. Firſt then, *Baptiſm*, or *waſhing* of the *whole body*, was a *Jewiſh* ſolemnity, by which the *native Jews* were entred into the *Covenant* of *God*, made with them by *Moſes*. So ſaith the *Talmud. tr. Repud. Iſrael*, or *the Iſraelites, do not enter into Covenant but by theſe three things*, במילה ובטבילה ובהרציות הקרבן *by Circumciſion, and Baptiſm, and Peace-offering.* So in *Gemera ad tit. Cherithoth.* c. 2. אבותוכים לא יכנסו לברית אלה במילה וטבלה &c. *Your fathers*, i. e. the *Jews* of *old time*, *did not enter into Covenant but by Circumciſion and Baptiſm*, &c. and *tit. Jabimoth*, c. 4. *Rabbi Joſhua* ſaid, מצינו באימהות שטבלו ולא מלו *We find of our mothers, that they were baptized and not circumciſed.* So *Maimonides tit. Iſuri bia*, c. 13. בשלשה דברים נכנסו ישראל לברית &c. *By three things the Iſraelites entred into the Covenant, by Circumciſion, Baptiſm and Sacrifice.* And ſoon after, *What was done to you?* i. e. the *Jews in univerſum*, בטבילה וטבילה והרצאה קרבן *Ye were initiated into the Covenant by Circumciſion, Baptiſm and Sacrifice.* Nothing can be more clearly affirmed by them.

Baptizing into *Moſes*, 1 Cor. 10. 1.

Sect. 7. And that is the reaſon, I ſuppoſe, why the *Apoſtle*, 1 *Cor.* 10. 1. ſpeaking of the *fathers* (the *Iſraelites* that came out of *Ægypt*) which by *God's* mighty hand were redeemed to be a *peculiar people* to himſelf, and thereby *entred* into *Covenant* with him (*God* giving them an eſſay of his receiving them under his *wings*, by *covering* them with a *cloud*, and environing them with the *ſea*) ſaith, that they were *baptized into Moſes in the cloud and in the ſea*, ver. 2. *i. e.* were, (by thoſe two great *Solemnities*, the *cloud* that gave them *light* by *night*, and a *guard* by *day*, and the *ſea* that was a *wall* to *defend* them, and a devouring *deep* to their *enemies*) *received* and *initiated* into *God's Covenant* under the *conduct* of *Moſes*, as ſince they are wont to be *initiated* by *Baptiſm*.

Sect. 8. [c] See *Maimonides tit. Iſuri bia*, c. 13.

For the confirming of which *interpretation*, it may be remembred, Firſt, that they that *entred* into *Covenant* with *God* (of which *Baptiſm* was the *ceremony*) are by the [c] *Jews* ordinarily ſaid to be received תחת כנפי השכי ה *under the wings of the glory*, or *majeſtick preſence*, i. e. in plain words, under the *protection* of *God*, which is *metaphorically* expreſſed by the *ſhadow* of his *wings*. Secondly, that the *ground* of this *metaphor* was, *God's exhibiting* himſelf to his *ſervants* by the *apparition* of *Angels*, and thoſe *Angels*, both there and elſewhere coming in *bright ſhining clouds* (whence it is that *Exod.* 14. in this ſtory are joyned the *removing* of the *cloud*, and the *removing* of the *Angel* of *God*, v. 19.) and thoſe *clouds* hovering over their heads, and ἐπισκιάζουσαι, *overſhadowing*, *Matt.* 17. 5. (for which Saint *Peter* uſeth μεγαλοπρεπὴς δόξα, *the excellent glory*, 2 *Pet.* 1. 17. or *majeſtick preſence*, as the *Jews* call it) and ἐπιφαίνουσαι, *deſcending*, or *coming upon*, or *covering* them, as an *Eagle* doth with her *wings*; or (ὡσεὶ περιστερὰ) *as a Dove*, *Matt.* 3. 16. And therefore, thirdly, that *Baptiſm* being among the *Jews*, the known *Ceremony* of ſuch *initiation* into *God's Covenant*, under the *conduct* of *Moſes*, the *overſhadowing* of the *cloud*, and the *inviroming* of the *ſea*, which were really the receiving them into *God's protection*, *covenanted*, and *promiſed* from him by *Moſes*, *Exod.* 14. 13. &c. are fitly ſaid to be the *baptizing* them into *Moſes* (εἰς) *in* or *by* this *cloud* and *ſea*. And ſo this is a clear

Matt. 17. 5. 2 Pet. 1. 17.

inter-

interpretation of that obſcure place concerning the *Iſraelites* in *Aegypt*, ſuppoſing onely this *cuſtome* of *entring* the *Jews* into the *Covenant* by *Baptiſm* (which afterward came in, and was, I ſuppoſe, vulgarly known, when, and long before, the *Apoſtle* wrote) without which it will not be eaſie to give any probable account of it. For as on one ſide to apply it immediately to *Chriſtian Baptiſm* will be inconvenient, becauſe it is ſaid diſtinctly to be εἰς τὸν Μωσῆν, *into Moſes*, ſo to interpret it, with others, of the *fathers* that were *perſonally* at *Mount Sinai* at the time of receiving of the *law*; and, to that end, to affirm that the *ſea* is no more than any *receptacle* of *waters*, through which they that were to be *baptized*, were ſaid to *paſs*, and the *cloud* either nothing at all, or that wherein *God* ſpake to *Moſes*, which is nothing to this purpoſe, will be liable to many more *inconveniences*, which I ſhall not here make ſtay to ſhew, becauſe it is but incidental to this buſineſs.

Sect. 9. Baptiſm of Proſelytes.

Secondly, as the *native Jews* were thus entred into the *Covenant* by *Baptiſm*: ſo the *Proſelytes* of the *Jews*, thoſe that were taken in, as *Proſelytes* of *juſtice* or *righteouſneſs*, as profeſſing or undertaking *all* their *Law* (and not onely as *Proſelytes* of the *Gates*, to live among them) were received into their *Church* by *Baptiſm* alſo. So ſaith the *Talmud. tr. Repud.* of *Jethro*, *Moſes's father in law*, he was made a *Proſelyte* by *Circumciſion*, ובטבילה במים *and by immerſion*, or *baptiſm in waters*, and the manner of this *immerſion* is ſaid to be, that they ſhould ſit up to the *neck* in *water*, and *learn* in the while ſome *Precepts* of the *Law* both *hard* and *eaſie*. So the *Gemara ad tit. Cheritoth*, c. 2. *The Proſelytes entred not into Covenant* אלה במילה וטבילה והרצאת דמים *but by Circumciſion, Baptiſm, and ſprinkling of blood*; and *tit. Jabimoth*, *He is no Proſelyte, unleſs he be circumciſed and baptized, and unleſs he be* טביל *baptized, he is a Gentile.* So *Maimonides, tit. Iſuri bia*, c. 13. *In all ages whenſoever any Gentile was willing to enter into the Covenant, and to be gathered under the wings of the Schechina*, or *divine majeſty, and to undertake the yoke of the law,* צריך מילה ובטבילה והרצאת קרבן *he was bound to have Circumciſion, and Baptiſm, and a Peace-offering*, and if it were a *woman*, *Baptiſm*, and *Sacrifice*. And again, *the ſtranger that is circumciſed, and not baptized, or baptized, and not circumciſed, is not truly a Proſelyte, till he be both.* And the *Gemara* almoſt in the ſame words, *tit. Jabimoth*, c. 4.

Sect. 10.

A clear teſtimony of this we have in *Arrian* the *Stoick Philoſophers*, in his *Epictetus*, l. 1. c. 9. where the *Jewiſh Proſelyte* is by him called βεβαμμένος *dipp'd*, and ἐμβεβὼς *taken* into their *ſect*, or *religion*, and he that is ſo onely in *ſhew*, not in *deed*, ψευδοβαπτισμένος, a *counterfeit baptized* perſon.

Sect. 11. That of the Natives the pattern of the other.

The third thing obſervable in this *baptiſm* among the *Jews*, is, that the *baptiſm* of the *native Jews*, was the *pattern* by which the *baptiſm* of the *Proſelytes* was *regulated*, and wherein it was *founded*. This appears by the arguing and determining of the queſtion in the *Gemara*, *tit. Jabimoth*, c. 4. after this manner, *Of him that was circumciſed and not baptiſed, Rabbi Eliezer ſaid, that he was a Proſelyte, becauſe, ſaid he, we find of our fathers, (Abraham, Iſaac) that they were circumciſed, but not baptized. And of him that was baptized, and not circumciſed, Rabbi Joſua ſaid, he was a Proſelyte, becauſe, ſaid he, we find of our mothers, that they were baptized, and not circumciſed. But the wiſe men pronounced, that till he were both baptized and circumciſed, he was not a Proſelyte*: where the *example* of the *Jews* was the *rule* by which the obligation of the *Proſelytes* is meaſured. And the ſame is evident by the *reaſon* rendred by the *Jewiſh writers*, of their *baptizing* the *Proſelytes*, which is generally taken by them from that command, *Numb.* 15. 15. *One Ordinance ſhall be both for you of the congregation, and alſo for the ſtranger* (i. e. הגר the *Proſelyte*) *that ſojourneth with you, an Ordinance for ever in your generations, as ye are, ſo ſhall the ſtranger be before the Lord, one law, and one manner* (i. e. one νόμος, and one δικαίωμα, *Luke* 1. 6. one *law* for *moral* duties, and one *law* for *rituals* or *ceremonies*) *ſhall be for you, and for the ſtranger that ſojourneth with you.* Thus the *Gemara tit. Cheritoth*, c. 2. foundeth the *circumciſing* and *baptizing* of *Proſelytes* upon thoſe words, *As to you, ſo ſhall it be to the Proſelyte.* So *Maimonides, tit. Iſuri bia*, c. 13. *In like manner, through all ages, as oft as a Gentile will enter into the Covenant, and receive the yoke of the law upon him, it was neceſſary that circumciſion and baptiſm ſhould be uſed on him, beſide ſprinkling of the Sacrifice, and if it were a woman, Baptiſm and Sacrifice; According as it is ſaid (Numb.* 15. 15.) *As to you, ſo alſo to the Proſelytes*, &c.

Sect. 12. The original of it among the Jews.

Here the *original* of that Cuſtome, as far as concerns the *Proſelytes*, doth clearly appear, *viz.* that Command of *God*, *Numb.* 15. 15. founded in a former Cuſtome of *baptizing* the *native Jews*: As for the *original* of it among the *Jews* themſelves, their *writers* deduce it as anciently, as from before the *giving* the *law* in *Mount Sinai*, *Exod.* 19. 10. when *God*, to prepare them for the receiving of it, commands *Moſes*, *Go unto the people, and ſanctifie them to day and to morrow, and let them waſh their clothes.* So ſaith *Maimonides*, *Iſuri bia*, c. 13. *But Baptiſm was in the deſart, before the giving of the law, according as it is ſaid, Thou ſhalt ſanctifie them*, &c. And that agreeable to what we reade of *Jacob* to his *houſhold*, *Gen.* 35. 2. *Put away the ſtrange gods that are among you, and be clean, and change your garments.* So that as the *Covenant* made with *Abraham*, was *ſealed* by *Circumciſion*, ſo the giving of the *law*, which was the *Covenant* made by *God*, by the mediation of *Moſes*, with all the *people*, was thought to be *ſealed* by *Baptiſm*: And that, the *waſhing*, if not of the *whole*, yet of ſome *parts* of the *body* (ordinarily called קרושין *ſanctifications*) and the *waſhing* of their *garments* alſo. According to which we know it was anciently obſerved among *Chriſtians*, that *Baptiſm* ſhould be ſolemnized with the *ceremony* of *clean* and *white garments*: As the *Dominica in Albis* is a teſtimony.

Sect. 13. The waſhing of new born babes.

Beſide this *original* of the *Jewiſh Baptiſm*, referring to the time and occaſion of it, Another may be obſerved of the ſignificancy of this *ceremony*, viz. that it was taken from the Cuſtome of *waſhing babes new born*. Of that Cuſtome among other *nations*, we have many Records, that of *Ælian* of the Δαρδανεῖοι will ſerve for all, Τοὺς λαυσθαι μόνον (ſaith he, *Var. Hiſt.* l. 4. c. 1.) ἐξ ἀδίνων, γαμοῦντας, καὶ τεθνηκότας, *They are waſhed but thrice onely, from the pangs, when they marry, and when they are dead.* The firſt of which, being precedent to *marriage*, as that is to *death*, is not to be conceived to belong to the *woman*, that is newly paſt her *travail*, but to the *child* that is *newly born*. And ſo *Stobæus* hath it expreſly out of *Nicolaus* (*Damaſcenus*, I ſuppoſe) ὅταν γένωνται, &c. *when they are born*, p. 66. So *Chalcidius in Plat. Timæ. Aqua calida confoventur recens nati, children new born are cheriſht with warm water, refreſht* and *cleanſed* together, p. 257. And ſo of the Cuſtome among the *Jews*, *Ezekiel* is expreſs, c. 16. 4. *In the day wherein thou waſt born, thy navel was not cut, neither waſt thou waſhed with water.* And that this cuſtome of *waſhing new born children*, and not any other ſort of *purification*, was it, that this *Baptiſm* of *native Jews* and *Proſelytes* referred to, may

may appear by that which in the *Gemara* is ſaid of the *baptized Proſelyte*, that he was made כקטן שנולד דמי *as an Infant new born*.

Sect. 14. Having thus far inſiſted on this Cuſtome of *Baptiſm* among the *Jews*, theſe things are farther obſervable of it.

Sect. 15. The Infants of Proſelytes were baptized. Firſt, that of the *Proſelytes* 'tis confeſſed, that not onely they that were of age, but alſo their *infant children* were *baptized*. So the *Gemara Babyl. tit. Chetub.* c. 1. גר קטן מטבילין אותו *they baptize the little* or *young ſtranger* or *proſelyte*. And the *Gloſs* adds, that the *Rulers* of the *Conſiſtory take care of it*, and ſo *are made to him a father*. And *Maimonides* in the forecited place, *tit. Iſuri bia*, c. 13. *They baptize the infant or little ſtranger upon the knowledge* or *underſtanding of the houſe of judgment*, or the *Congregation*, i. e. on their *deſire* in behalf of the *children*, and their *promiſe* to let them know what they have undertaken. Agreeably to that of Saint *Auguſtine*, of the *Church* among us *Chriſtians*, *Accommodat illis mater Eccleſia aliorum pedes ut veniant, aliorum cor ut credant, aliorum linguam ut fateantur. Our mother the Church lends them other mens feet, heart and tongue; that they may come, and believe, and confeſs, and ſo be capable of baptiſm.*

Sect. 16. Baptiſm among the Jews not iterated. Secondly, that this *ceremony* of *Baptiſm* among the *Jews*, as that other of *Circumciſion*, was never *repeated* but received *once* for all the inſuing life. And this among them is acknowledged by all as unqueſtionable. To which our *Saviour* ſeems to refer, *Joh.* 13. 10. when he tells *Peter*, that ὁ λελουμένος *he that hath been waſhed*, i. e. *once waſhed all over, needs not, ſave to waſh his feet*; needs not to be *waſhed all over* any more, but is ὅλος καθαρός, *whole clean*, the νίψις will for the reſt ſerve the turn, the daily *waſhing* of *hands* and *feet*, which they call קרושים *ſanctifications*, the *purifying* more and more daily the frailties and imperfections, and *lapſes* of *weak* nature, thoſe *feet* of the *man* (σαρκὸς ἀσθένειαν, ſaith *Eulogius*) which are ſtill behind after *converſion*.

Sect. 17. The Proſelytes regeneration by Baptiſm. Thirdly, that they that were thus received as *Proſelytes* by *Baptiſm*, put off their former relations of *kindred*, &c. To which ſurely our *Saviour* refers, when he talks of *leaving father and mother*, *Mark.* 10. 29. And *Tacitus* the *Hiſtorian*, *Nec quicquam prius imbuuntur quàm exuere patriam, parentes, liberos, fratres vilia habere*, their *Proſelytes* are *firſt taught*, after *renouncing* the *gods*, *to put off their countrey, parents, children, brethren, to deſpiſe them all.* And the latter *Jews* have a ſaying, that he that hath *married* his own *ſiſter*, or entred any the moſt *inceſtuous* bands, by becoming a *proſelyte* ceaſeth to have that *near relation* of *blood* to her, and may now live with her, as with a *wife*: which falſe *ſuperſtructure* in them, is yet a *teſtimony* of the *truth*, whereon it is *falſly founded* by them.

Sect. 18. Fourthly, that they that were thus *baptized*, were ſaid to be *born again*; and that, as if born of a new *mother*, as it is oft ſaid in the *Talmud*, to which our *Saviour* refers, when he talks of *regeneration* (of which ſaith Saint *Paul*, *Baptiſm* is the *Laver*) of being *born again from above of water*, &c. *John* 3. 35. And this was ſo vulgar a notion among the *Jews*, that *v.* 10. *Chriſt* wonders at *Nicodemus*, that he *underſtood* it not: *Art thou a ruler in Iſrael and knoweſt not theſe things?*

Sect. 19. The application of all this to the Chriſtian Baptiſm. That theſe ſo many things obſerved of the *Jewiſh Baptiſm*, were really accommodated by *Chriſt* to this *rite* of our *initiation* to *Chriſtian* Religion, there is as little reaſon for us (that ſee the foot-ſteps of them in the *New Teſtament*, and the *continual practice* of the *Church*) to doubt, as, that a *picture* was taken from that *face*, which it reſembleth *to the life*. And then by this one means we ſhall have a clear *foundation* of all that is at this day practiſed in the *Church* of *God* in this matter of *Baptiſm*: Firſt, for the receiving all that come into that *profeſſion* from *heatheniſm*, by this *rite* or *ceremony*. Secondly, all thoſe that are born within the *pale* of the *Church*. Thirdly, their *infant children*, being undertaken for by *Godfathers*, who repreſent the *Congregation*. Fourthly, the *never-iterating* this *ceremony*, but (in caſe of falling into ſin after *Baptiſm*) ſubſtituting *Repentance* and *Abſolution* for it. Fifthly, the propriety of that phraſe ſo ſolemnly received into the *Church*, of *baptiſmal regeneration*, *new birth*, &c. noting thereby the goodneſs of *God*, to make this *new Covenant* of *Mercy* with us, and the ſtrict obligation that lies on all that are *baptized*, by that *grace* of *God* there made over to them, to *walk in newneſs of life*.

Sect. 20. The example of circumciſion. By all this appears, Firſt, how little needfull it will be to defend the *Baptiſm* of *Chriſtian Infants*, from the *law* of *circumciſing* the *Infants* among the *Jews*, the *foundation* being far more fitly laid in that other of *Jewiſh Baptiſm*, a *ceremony* of *initiation* for all, eſpecially for *proſelytes*, as well as that, and whereas that of *circumciſion* belonged onely to one, this other being common to both *ſexes*. And yet from that example of *circumciſion* among them, thus much muſt needs be gained to our preſent deſign, that the *child*'s not being able to underſtand the *vow* of *Baptiſm*, doth no way prejudice the *baptizing* of ſuch; for if it did, it muſt neceſſarily be an objection againſt the *circumciſing* the *Jewiſh child* at eight days old, who could then no more underſtand the *Covenant*, of which that was made the *Sign*, nor the wickedneſs that the entring into the *Covenant* obliged to abſtain from, than the *Chriſtian Infant* now can, and yet (under pain of *exciſion*) was commanded to be *circumciſed*, which being ſo far vindicated from being unreaſonable and incongruous, by that example of *circumciſion*, which is allowed of by all diſſenters, there will be little reaſon to fear the objections from *Reaſon*, or, upon that ſcore, to doubt of the *practice* of that, which is ſo *reaſonable*, when it hath, beſide the example of *baptiſm* among the *Jews* (from which it is immediately deduced) ſo adequately proportionable, and directly parallel to it.

Sect. 21. Of baptizing a whole houſhold, Acts 16. 13. So again, ſecondly, the mention in *Scripture* of the *Apoſtles baptizing* a *whole houſhold* at once, *Act.* 16. 13. is not of it ſelf demonſtrative, or convincing: becauſe, that wider phraſe may poſſibly be reſtrained to thoſe that *heard* and *believed* in that *family*. And although, when the *cuſtome* of the *Jews* (whence this *Chriſtian* rite ſo lately came) is remembred, that the *Proſelyte's children*, as well as thoſe of age, were *baptized*, and that that was ſo ordinarily known, that it needed not be more diſtinctly and particularly affirmed, there will be little *temptation* to doubt, but that the *Gaoler's infants*, if he had any, were compriſed under the πανσὶ ἀυτοῦ, *all his*, and were *baptized* alſo; (and ſo *Stephanas's infants* under the οἶκος, 1 Cor. 1. 16. *houſhold* of *Stephanas*, 1 *Cor.* 1. 16.) yet becauſe it is not certain of either of theſe, that they had any ſo *young* in their *family*, therefore 'tis confeſſed, that no *concluding argument* can be deduced from thence, and *unconcludent arguments* were in many reſpects much better waved, than made uſe of againſt *gainſayers*.

But

But then thirdly, that ſpeech of our *Saviour*, *Matt.* 19. 14. and *Mar.* 10. 6. which *concludes* that the παιδία or *little children* may, and muſt be *permitted* to be *brought* by others to *Chriſt*, and being ſo *brought*, yet are ſaid to *come* to *him* (ἐνδεῖν πρὸς, the very words of which *proſelyte* is made) and 2. his *bleſſing* them by *impoſition* of *hands*: and 3. his affirming that the *Kingdom* of *God*, the *Church* here, and *Heaven* hereafter, conſiſts of *ſuch* as they, are a conjunction of particulars, which although they come not home diſtinctly to *baptizing* of *Infants* (becauſe it is not affirmed he did *baptize* them) are yet a farther proof of the *uncharitableneſs* and unreaſonableneſs of the main objections (taken from the *Infants* not *hearing*, not *believing*, &c.) which are pretended to have force againſt this practice. For if thoſe that cannot *come*, may, and muſt be permitted, to be *brought* by *others* to *Chriſt*; if, at the youngeſt, they are capable of receiving *bleſſing* from him; if they are ſuch, as of whom peculiarly the *kingdom* of *God* conſiſts, then what hinders, but they may be capable of the early *charity* of the *Church*, in bringing and admitting them to *baptiſm* (though they do not underſtand the *vow*) and receive *benefit* and *advantage* by partaking of it? And the rather, when it is remembred, that *Chriſt*, that *baptized not at all*, John 4. 2. and ſo thought not fit to *baptize* theſe, did yet afford that *ceremony* to them, which in the *ancient Church* was *preparatory* and *antecedent* to *Baptiſm*; viz. *impoſition* of *hands* and *bleſſing* them. This, *Clemens*, or the Authour of the *Conſtitutions*, mentions, *l.* 7. *c.* 39. where having ſet down the ſeverals wherein the *Catechumenus* was to be inſtructed, he adds, *but let him that lays on hands adore God*, &c. And this, I ſuppoſe, it is that *Clemens Alexandrinus* refers to, *Pædag.* l. 3. c. 11. in theſe words, τίνι γὰρ ὁ πρεσβύτερος ἐπιτίθησι χεῖρας; τίνα δὲ εὐλογήσει; *On whom doth the Presbyter lay hands? whom ſhall he bleſs?* meaning, moſt probably, in that place, not the *nuptial benediction*, but the ſolemnity with which the *Catechiſt bleſſed* thoſe, that were *catechized*, preparatory to their *Baptiſm*. And ſo ſaith *Euſebius* of *Conſtantine*, l. 4. that to *prepare* for his *Baptiſm*, ὡμολογημένων τε καὶ χειροθεσίας εὐχῶν ἠξιώθη, *He made profeſſion, and then was vouchſafed thoſe prayers, which were given by impoſition of hands.* And thus the *Holy Ghoſt's falling* upon *Cornelius*'s family, *Acts* 10. 44. (which was wont to be an effect of the *Apoſtles impoſition of hands*, but of which we have no mention there) is by Saint *Peter* lookt on as an evidence, that *God* had accepted theſe *Gentiles*, and ſo that they were fit to be *baptized*, ver. 47. *can any forbid water*, &c.

Sect. 22. Chriſt's receipion of little children. Matt. 19. 14. Mar. 10. 6. John 4. 2. Impoſition of hands preparatory to Baptiſm.

But there is no need of laying much weight on this, or any the like more imperfect ways of *probation*. The whole *fabrick* being ſufficiently *ſupported*, and *built* on this *Baſis* (the *cuſtomary Baptiſm* among the *Jews*) and that diſcernible to be ſo, if we conſider it *firſt negatively*, then *poſitively*.

Sect. 23. The true *Baſis* of Infant-Baptiſm. 1. Negatively, that

Firſt, *negatively*, that *Chriſtian baptiſm*, which is an *inſtitution* of *Chriſt*'s, lightly changed from the *Jewiſh* cuſtome of receiving of *Proſelytes*, by him appointed in his life time, and ſettled a little before his *Aſcenſion*, hath nothing in the pattern whence it is copied out, nothing in the copy it ſelf, as it is ſet down in the *New Teſtament*, i. e. in the words of the *Inſtitution*, or in his or the *Apoſtles practice*, which doth any way exclude the *Chriſtians children* from being part of that indefinite number, that ought to be *baptized*, or for whom *baptiſm* was *inſtituted* by *Chriſt*.

Sect. 24. Chriſt's inſtitution of Baptiſm excludes not Infants.

That there is nothing *excluſive* of them in the *pattern* (the *Jewiſh* cuſtome of *baptiſm*) hath been ſufficiently evidenced by the ſeveral branches of that, already inſiſted on. And in the *New Teſtament*, I cannot foreſee any words that may come under ſuſpicion of doing ſo, but thoſe of *Matt.* 28. 19. *Go teach all Nations, baptizing them*, &c. And thoſe words being duly weighed, are far from doing ſo. For the phraſe which is there uſed in the *Original*, is a ſingular one, not duly expreſt by our *Engliſh* [*Teach.*] It is μαθητεύσατε, *make diſciples*, or receive into *diſcipleſhip all nations, baptizing them in the name*, &c. making this form of *baptiſm* their *ceremony* of receiving them. You may ſee the word explained in a parallel phraſe, *Joh.* 4. 1. *The Phariſees heard that Jeſus makes more diſciples and baptizeth, than John*, μαθητὰς ποιεῖ, καὶ βαπτίζει, where to *make diſciples*, and *baptize*, is all one with μαθητεύσατε βαπτίζοντες, where the *baptizing* being immediately annexed to the *making* or *receiving diſciples*, and the receiving *diſciples* not ſuppoſing any precedent *inſtruction*, but looking wholly on it as *ſubſequent* (in like manner, as in this place, *ver.* 20. διδάσκοντες [*teaching*] follows after βαπτίζοντες *baptizing*) all that are thus brought and receiv'd *ad diſcipulatum*, to be for the *future inſtructed* and inſtituted in the *Chriſtian faith*, may ſurely be received by *baptiſm*, the *ceremony* which is there preſcribed by *Chriſt*, with which to receive *diſciples*.

Sect. 25. Objection from Matt. 28. 19. Anſwered. Μαθητεύειν.

To which purpoſe I ſhall (in paſſing) add this one obſervation; 1 *Pet.* 3. 21. *Baptiſm* is defined to be ἡ ἀγαθῆς συνειδήσεως ἐπερώτημα εἰς τὸν θεὸν, we render it, *the anſwer*, but it is rather, *the queſtion of a good conſcience to*, or *toward God*. That ἐπερωτᾶν ſignifies to *ask*, or *demand*, and not to *anſwer*, is as certainly known, as that *quærere* and *inquirere*, to *inquire*, doth ſo ſignifie, and ſo it is uſed, *Matth.* 12. 10. and 16. 1. *Mark* 11. 29. *Luke* 17. 20. *Joh.* 18. 20. *Rom.* 10. 20. And there is no one place where it can poſſibly be otherwiſe taken. One thing onely there is peculiar ſometimes in the uſe of the word, which differenceth it from ordinary *queſtions*, that it is oft uſed for ſuch a *queſtioning*, as we mean by *conſulting*, a *conſulting God*, *conſulting* the *Oracle*, i. e. making *addreſs*, *asking counſel* of him. So *Hoſ.* 4. 12. where we reade, *My people ask counſel of their ſtocks*; the *Greek* hath, ἐν συμβόλοις αὐτῶν ἐπερώτων. So *Heſychius*, ἐρωτησόμεθα, πυθώμεθα, rendring it by that word which is ordinarily uſed for *conſulting* the *Oracle*, and from whence *Apollo* had his title of *Pytho*, and the *Diviners* of *Pythoneſſes*. So *Iſa.* 65. 1. (and out of it *Rom.* 10. 20.) their *not hoping* for *deliverance* out of *Antiochus*'s hand, and conſequently not *ſeeking* to, *conſulting*, *applying*, *addreſſing* themſelves to *God* about it, is meant by their *not asking*, or *enquiring of God*. And accordingly in that place of Saint *Peter*, the meaning of this definition or deſcription of *baptiſm* will be, that *baptiſm* is the *coming* and *ſeeking* to *God* as to the *Oracle*, to *inquire* for the whole future life, *applying* ones ſelf to God for his *directions* for all the *future* actions, with a, *Lord, what wilt thou have me to doe?* or, *Good Maſter, what ſhall I doe to inherit eternal life?* This is ἐπερώτημα εἰς τὸν θεὸν (but that including a *good*, and an *upright conſcience*, or [d] γνησία προαίρεσις, a *genuine ſincere purpoſe* to doe what is there required of him.) And accordingly Saint *Cyprian* hath *interrogatio baptiſmi*, *Ep.* 76. and 80. *the asking* or *inquiring of baptiſm*. From whence all that I have to conclude to the preſent purpoſe, is onely this not that *baptizing* of *Infants* is there ſpoken of, or ſo much as *intimated* by Saint *Peter*, but) that the proper ſignification of *baptiſm*, is the *entring* a *diſciple*, *initiating* a *proſelyte*, and doth no way *prerequire actual inſtruction*, but conſiſts in *coming* to *Chriſt*, and his *Church* to *receive* it, and *obey* it for the future: which though no *grown* man can be

Sect. 26. ἐπερώτημα. 1 Pet. 3. 21. [d] *Cyril. Hieroſoly.* προκατ. χ.

be ſaid to doe with a *good reſolution*, or *good conſcience*, unleſs he have an *explicit* or *implicit faith* of ſome part of the *Goſpel*, or at leaſt ſome grounds of *piety* toward *God*, which muſt make him content to be a *diſciple* of *Chriſt*, yet of *children* it is certain, that they may be thus brought by the *care* of their *parents* to this, as to other *ſchools* or *diſcipleſhips*, and delivered up to be *ſcholars*, before they know one *letter*, or have any *actual willingneſs* to acquire any knowledge. And thus we know *Chriſt's calling* and *receiving Philip* to *diſcipleſhip*, John 1. 44. did not ſuppoſe him to be *preinſtructed* by *Chriſt*; for there, after *Chriſt's* finding him, the next thing is his *ſaying* to him, *follow me*. And when the *Jews*, *Exod.* 19. 8. aſſumed to *obey all the Commandments* of *God*, which he ſhould give them, we do not ſuppoſe that the *Commandments* had been *formerly given* them, but were to follow, *c.* 20. In brief, the *one* thing prerequired to a *diſciple* (as to being [e] capable of *Chriſt's miracles*) is τὸ ἐπιτήδειον ἢ ὑπακοῆς, *the readineſs to obey*, and *receive* what is *delivered*, and a *non-reſiſtence* is ſome *degree* of that: and though the *child* which cannot *obey*, cannot be ſaid to have at preſent any of this, yet the *earlier* he is received into *Chriſt's School*, the *Church* (and we know from that place of *Matth.* 28. that *baptiſm* is the *ſolemn ceremony* of that) the ſurer he is to be *prepoſſeſt* with *Chriſtian knowledge*, and to receive thoſe *infuſions*, while he hath the leaſt *prejudices* and *obſtructions* againſt them. And that is the ground of haſtening *infants* to *diſcipleſhip*.

Learning is not prerequired to diſcipleſhip.

John 1. 44.

[e] *Jobius in Phot.* μυριοβ.

Sect. 27. To this may be added in the ſecond place, that his *receiving* of *diſciples* was the *receiving* of *proſelytes* to the *Covenant* and *Faith* of *Chriſt*, a *diſciple* and a *proſelyte* being perfectly all one, ſave onely that the latter denotes a *coming* from ſome other *Nation* or *Country*, which difference hath no place in this matter, where the *diſciples* are ſpecified to be received from all *Nations*.

Sect. 28. Infants capable of Proſelytiſm or reception into Covenant. Thirdly, that *Infant children* are not by their years rendred uncapable of reception to *Proſelytiſm*, i. e. of entring into this or any other *Covenant*, when by their *parents*, or the *congregation*, they are brought to it. That they are not uncapable, may appear by that example forementioned of the *Jews*, who received the *Infant children* of the *Proſelytes*, upon the *deſire* of the *Parents*, and the *profeſſion* of the *congregation*, and accordingly *baptizing* them alſo. Secondly, by *parity* of *reaſon* taken from the *Jewiſh Natives*, who *entred* and were *admitted* into *Covenant* with *God*, *the infants as well as men*. So *Deut.* 29. 10. *Ye ſtand this day before the Lord your God, your Captains of Tribes, your Elders, and your Officers, with all the men of Iſrael, your little ones, your wives, and thy ſtranger —— That thou ſhouldſt enter into covenant with the Lord thy God.* Where the *little ones* are part of the number of thoſe that *enter* into *covenant* with *God*, and ſo may enter into this *covenant* made in *Chriſt*, by the *parity* of *Reaſon*. And, thirdly, by the *origination* of the word *Proſelytes* (from προσελθεῖν) they that *come* unto *Chriſt*, which is the onely thing which *Chriſt* mentions concerning *little children*, *Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not*: which infers their capacity of *Proſelytiſm*, and the next words ſuppoſe them particularly qualified for it: *for of ſuch is the kingdom of God*; They, and *ſuch* whoſe *humility* and other qualifications reſemble them moſt *perfectly* to *children*, are the perſons of whom the *Chriſtian Church* is to be conſtituted.

Sect. 29. All which being ſuppoſed, *viz.* that there is nothing diſcernible from the *nature* of *Jewiſh baptiſm* (wherein the *Chriſtian* is *founded*) nothing in *Chriſt's inſtitution* of it, which can exclude the *Chriſtians infant children* from *baptiſm*, but all the circumſtances concurring moſt favourably to the *reception* of them, there is now but one thing wanting to remove all doubt in this matter, *viz. Chriſt's intention* in this. And the way to evidence that, will be the opinion and ſenſe that the *Apoſtles* (who were acquainted with *Chriſt's purpoſe*, and cannot be imagined to have *miſunderſtood* his words) had of the intention of *Chirſt* to include *Infants* in that *inſtitution* of *baptiſm* for *all Nations*, and not to exclude them from it.

Sect. 30. The poſitive part of the Baſis of Infant Baptiſm. The Apoſtles practice evidenced two ways. And this is the ſecond and *poſitive* part of the *Baſis*, whereon, I conceive, the *Baptiſm* of *Infants* to be *founded* in the *Church*. And that this was the *Apoſtles* ſenſe of *Chriſt's words*, and opinion of his *Inſtitution*, will appear by their own *uſage* and *practice*, two ways teſtified unto us. Firſt, by one conſiderable *remain* or *footſtep* of it, in Saint *Paul's Epiſtle* to the *Corinthians*. Secondly, by the *practice* of the *firſt* and *pureſt* ages of the *Church*, which received *Infants* to *baptiſm*, and either, by ſo doing, teſtifie the *Apoſtolical uſage*, tranſcribed by them, or elſe farther affirm, that they received it by *tradition* from the *Apoſtles*. And the brief clearing of theſe two evidences, is all that I ſhall think neceſſary to add for the aſſerting the *poſitive* part of this *doctrine*. What elſe may be fit to be taken in, will be added more properly by way of *anſwer* to the *Objections* which are producible againſt it.

Sect. 31. And firſt, the *remain* or *footſtep* of the *Apoſtolical practice*, is, A *reaſoning* of Saint *Paul's*, 1 *Cor.* 7. which ſuppoſeth it then received, and known in the *Church* (at the writing of that *Epiſtle*) that *Chriſtians children* were received to *Baptiſm*. The ſum of which will be beſt diſcerned by the ſetting down a few *verſes*, and a brief *Paraphraſe* on them.

1 Cor. 7. 12. explained.

12. *If any brother hath a wife that believeth not and ſhe be pleaſed to dwell with him, let him not put her away.*

If any Chriſtian husband hath an heathen wife, and ſhe be deſirous to continue with him, he ought not to put her away, unbelief being no ſufficient cauſe of Divorce by the Law of Chriſt.

13. *And the woman which hath an husband that believeth not, and if he be pleaſed to dwell with her, let her not leave him.*

And ſo in like manner for the Chriſtian wife, that is married to an Infidel, if he be deſirous to live with her, let her by no means ſeparate from him.

[f] ἡγίασται.

14. *For the unbelieving husband* [f] *hath been ſanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife hath been ſanctified by the husband: elſe were your children unclean, but now are they holy.*

For (beſide the command of Chriſt, *Matth.* 5. 32. which obligeth to this) other advantages there are of the believer's living with the unbeliever, worth conſidering. For by this means it hath oft come to paſs, that the unbelieving party hath been brought to the faith by the company and converſation of the believer; and, conſidering the *efficacy* of good *example*, 1 *Pet.* 3. 1. and ſeaſonable *exhortation* and inſtruction, on preſumption of the great *zeal* (and conſequent endeavours and *diligence*) that by the Laws of *Chriſtianity* the husband will have to the *eternal* good of any

ſo near him, as a wife is, there is great reaſon of hope, that ſtill it may be ſo, that their living together may produce this effect in the unbeliever, and the intuition of that (more than poſſible) effect, may reaſonably move the Chriſtian party not to forſake the other voluntarily. And this one conſideration, *viz.* the probability that the converſation of the believer, 1 *Pet.* 3. 1. ſhould *gain*, *i. e.* bring the unbeliever to the faith, and the reaſonable preſumption that it will be ſo, is the reaſon why the young children of Chriſtians, which cannot as yet be deemed believers, are yet admitted to Baptiſm, becauſe by their living in the family with Chriſtian parents, they probably will, and by the *obligation* lying on the *parents*, ought to be brought up in the faith, and kept from heathen pollutions; and the Church requiring and receiving promiſe from the Parents, doth reaſonably preſume they will. And upon this ground it is, that, though the children of Chriſtians are, yet the children of heathens are not admitted to Baptiſm.

That this is the true importance of the *Apoſtle*'s words, and force of his *arguing*, doth for the former part of it appear evident; Firſt, by the word ἡγίασται *hath been ſanctified*, which muſt needs refer to ſome *paſt*, known *examples*, and *experiences* of this kind, or elſe there could be no reaſonable account given of the *Apoſtle*'s ſetting it in the *preter* tenſe. Secondly, by the *phraſe* ἐν τῇ γυναικὶ, by, or *through the wife*. This the *preposition* [ἐν] ſo ordinarily ſignifies, that it cannot need to be farther teſtified, (and in this notion it is, that we here take it) whereas the notion, which by oppoſers is here affixt to it, that it ſhould ſignifie *to* (that *to*, which is a ſign of the *dative* caſe, *ſanctified to the wife*, (as *meat to the believer*) made *lawfull to* her to live with,] is never once found to belong to it, in the *New Teſtament*, nor can with any tolerable *congruity*, or *Grammatical analogy* be affixt to it. All the places that are produced for this ſenſe, are commonly miſtaken. So *Matth.* 17. 12. [ἐποίησαν ἐν αὐτῷ] is not *fecerunt ei*, *they have done to him*, but *on him*, or *againſt him*: ſo as ἐν is uſed for εἰς, which is an ordinary acception of it. So *Act.* 4. 12. *There is no name* δεδομένον ἐν ἀνθρώποις, it is not [*given to men*] but *among men*. And that is an ordinary notion of ἐν, for *among*, εἰ θεὸς ἐν ἡμῖν, *is God among us?* and χριστὸν ἐν ὑμῖν, *Chriſt among us*; and many the like. So 1 *Cor.* 7. 15. *God hath called us*, ἐν εἰρήνῃ· It is not *to*, as the note of a *dative* caſe, but *unto peace*, as ἐν is again taken for εἰς. So *Gal.* 1. 16. *to reveal his own Son* ἐν ἐμοὶ· It is not [*to me*] but, [by, or *through me* to others] as it follows, *that I might preach him*, and when it there follows, ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, it is not [*to*, but again, *among the Gentiles*.] And 2 *Pet.* 1. 5. χορηγήσατε ἐν τῇ πίστει ὑμῶν ἀρετὴν, is, *add unto your faith vertue*, &c. in the notion of ἐν for εἰς, *Unto your faith*, or *over* and *above* that, ἐπιχορηγήσατε ἀρετὴν, *ſuperadd vertue*, or *fortitude*, or *conſtancy*, that which in this time of *perſecution* and *ſcandal* of the *croſs*, they ſtood ſo much in need of. And ſo ſtill the rendring it [*to the Wife*] will be without any one example, and the turning it into quite *another* phraſe, as if it were γυναικὶ without ἐν; which to doe without any *neceſſity* or *reaſon*, (ſave onely δουλεύειν ὑποθέσει, to *ſerve* the *oppoſer*'s turn upon the place, and *ſupport* his falſe *opinion*) muſt needs be very unreaſonable. Thirdly, this appears moſt irrefragably, by the expreſs words added on this argument, *ver.* 16. where [the *unbeliever*'s having been *ſanctified* by the *believer*] (uſed as an argument why they ſhould *live together*) is farther explained by theſe words of an undoubted *perſpicuous* ſenſe, *For what knoweſt thou, O wife, whether thou ſhalt ſave thy husband? Or how knoweſt thou, O husband, whether thou ſhalt ſave thy wife?* where the word σώζειν [*ſave*] which ordinarily ſignifies to *reduce* (or as it is 1 *Pet.* 3. 1. κερδῆσαι *to gain*) to repentance from *heatheniſm*, or *wicked* life, is ſet *parallel* to ἁγιάζειν, *ſanctifying*, and makes it clear, what was meant by it.

Sect. 32. The confirmation of this interpretation, In the former,

Which being once yielded to be the true meaning of the *firſt* part, there will then be little *reaſon* to doubt, but that this, of the admiſſion of the *Chriſtian children* to *baptiſm* on this ſcore, is the importance of the *latter* part: That, and no other, being it, which exactly accords with the *former* reaſoning, and it being not imaginable, that this ſhould be here added in that *argumentative* ſtyle [ἐπεὶ ἄρα, *whereas*, (or, *for*) *elſe were*, &c.] if it were not an *inforcing* of the foregoing *poſition* thus proved by him.

Sect. 33.

What is thought fit to be brought for the eluding, and avoiding this interpretation, will be moſt fitly conſidered anon, in *anſwer* to the *Anabaptiſts Plea*. Meanwhile, for the confirming of it, it may be remembred, what ἅγιος, *holy*, is known to ſignifie in the *ſacred dialect*, not onely an *inherent*, but a *relative holineſs*, being ſeparate, or ſet apart to *God*, diſcriminated from *common*, ordinary things, or perſons, and as that belongs to higher degrees of *ſeparation*, the office of a *Prophet*, or the like, ſo the loweſt degree of it is that of being *received* to be *members* of the *Church*, into which all are *initiated* by *baptiſm*. And accordingly, all viſible profeſſours, and not onely thoſe that are *ſincerely* ſuch, are in *Ezek.* 9. 2. *the holy ſeed*, and in the *Epiſtles* of the *Apoſtles* called ἅγιοι, *holy*.

Sect. 34. And in the latter part of it.

And ſecondly, how the word ἀκάθαρτα, *unclean*, is uſed by Saint *Peter*, *Acts* 10. 14. for thoſe that muſt not (as he conceived) be received into the *Church*, as [*God*'s having *cleanſed*] is *God*'s reputing them fit to be partakers of that *privilege*. Whereby it appears, how fitly, *receiving*, and *not-receiving* to *baptiſm*, may be expreſſed by thoſe phraſes. Thirdly, how the word קדש, which is ordinarily to *ſanctifie*, doth among the *Jews* (whence this word ἅγια is taken) ſignifie to *waſh* (as when the *High-Prieſt*'s *waſhing* his *hands* and his *feet* ten times on the *day* of *Expiation*, is called עשרת קדושין *ten ſanctifications*, *Joma*, c. 3. *ſect.* 3. which being the word which denotes the *waſhing* ſome *part* of the *body*, may perhaps be an intimation, that the *Primitive Baptiſms* were not always *immerſions* of the *whole body*, but that *ſprinkling* of ſome *part*, the literal importance of the קדושין *ſanctifications*, might be ſufficient.

Sect. 35.

Fourthly, it is known of the *legal uncleanneſſes*, contrary to thoſe their *ſanctifications*, that they were the cauſe of *removing* men from the *Congregation*, they that were ſo, ἀκάθαρτοι, *unclean*, might not partake of the *privileges* of the *Temple*, till they were *waſhed* and *ſanctified*, and that is proportionable alſo to the notion here given of it, that the *Chriſtian's children* are *holy*, *i. e.* not *inherently* (they are not capable of that) but, in the account of *God* and *men*, capable of *ſeparation* for the *ſervice* of *God*, of being *entred* into the *Church*, into *Covenant*, which denominates men *holy*, (as the *Gentiles*, as long as they were out of it, were *unclean* and *unholy*, *Acts* 10.) *Now are they holy*, *i. e.* it is the preſent *practice* of the *Church*, that *Apoſtolical Church* of Saint *Paul*'s time, to admit to *Baptiſm* ſuch *Infant children* of *parents*, of whom one is *Chriſtian*, though not of others. And to put all out of queſtion, the *Ancient Fathers*, which certainly

Sect. 36.

tainly knew the *sacred dialect*, call *Baptism*, *Sanctification*. So *Cyprian*, *Ep.* 59. *Eum qui natus est, baptizandum, & sanctificandum, He that is born, must be baptized and sanctified*; where *baptizing*, is *sanctifying* of *Infants*. So *Greg. Naz. Orat.* 40. *Edit. Bill.* p. 658, Κρεῖττον ἁγιασθῆναι ἀγιασθέντας, ἢ ἀνιάσθην ἀπελθεῖν, 'Tis better to be *sanctified without sense of it*, i. e. *baptized* in *infancy*, when they are not *sensible* of it, *than to depart*, or *dye without the seal* of *baptism*. And again, *p.* 648. ὃν βούλεσθε ἁγιάσθω, *let him be sanctified from the Infancy*, i. e. *baptized* then. And many the like.

Sect. 37. This passage then being thus interpreted, is a clear proof of the point in hand. And were not this the importance of it, there were no privilege imaginable, no *sanctity* which could be attributed to the *Infants* of *Christians*, which would not belong to the *Infants* of *heathens* also, which yet is here directly affirmed of the one, and denied of the other by the *Apostle*. And as this evidently concludes such a *custome*, known and acknowledged among *Christians* at that time: so it is directly the thing that the *Jewish* practice, in which *Christ* founded his *institution*, hath laid the foundation of, in *baptizing Proselytes* and their *children*, and to which the *Primitive Church* conformed. And so though that *Judaical* practice, taken alone, were not deemed any demonstrative evidence, that *Christ* thus *instituted* his *baptism* for the *Gentiles*, yet being taken in conjunction with this *testimony* of the *Apostolical practice*, and the *Primitive usage*, it brings all the weight with it, that a *divine* testimony interpreted by *practice* can afford: which is as great as any such matter can be capable of.

Sect. 38. Testimonies of Apostolick practice. It remains then that I proceed to the *Testimonies* of the Ancient *Christian writers*, who have mentioned this, either as a *practice* of the *Church*, known in the first times, or moreover as *delivered* them from the *Apostles*.

Sect. 39. *Justin Martyr.* And first we have the words of *Justin Martyr*, *Resp. ad Orthod.* or whoever wrote that *ancient* piece, Ἀξιοῦνται τῆς διὰ βαπτίσματος ἀγαθῶν τὰ βέλτιον τῆς πίστεως τῶν προφερόντων αὐτὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος, *Children are allowed to enjoy the good things that come by baptism, by the faith of them that bring them to baptism*: directly agreeable to the force (and so very proper farther to confirm our notion and interpretation) of that place to the *Corinthians*, where, by reason of the *believing husband*, living with the *unbelieving wife*, and the presumption that one may doe good on the other, and bring her to the *faith* (and however bring up the *children* so;) the *children are holy*, i. e. *vouchsafed* the privilege of *baptism*, and the *advantages* consequent to it.

Sect. 40. *Irenæus.* Secondly, as we have that of *Irenæus*, that lived in the age of those that *saw* the *Apostles*, within the first *Century* after them, *l.* 2. *adv. hæres.* c. 39. who speaking of *Christ* that came, saith he, to *save* men of *all ages*, and specifying *Infantes & parvulos*, *Infants and little ones*, as well as *pueros*, *juvenes & seniores*, *boys*, *young men*, *and old men*, adds, *omnes*, *inquam*, *qui per eum renascuntur in Deum*, *all*, *I say*, *who by him are born again to God*, where the *Infants* being *regenerate*, and *born again into God*, must needs be interpreted after the *Scripture* notion of παλιγγενεσία, being *born again*, or *regenerate* by that *laver* of *regeneration*. And so 'tis known, that all the ancient *Church writers* understand *Baptism* by it, (*Dominicâ & Apostolicâ phrasi*, saith *Fevardentius* there, *after the style of Christ and his Apostles*) and accordingly he adds, *sanctificat Infantes*, *he makes Infants holy*, again in that sense that we had it to the *Corinthians*.

Sect. 41. *Tertullian.* Thirdly, for *Tertullian*, who lived also within that first *Century* after the *decease* of the *Apostles*, we have these words, *l. de Anima*, where, of the *fidelium filii*, *children of the faithfull*, he affirms, that they are, *sanctitatis candidati*, *& sancti ex seminis prærogativa*, *candidates of sanctity*, *and holy* as in other respects, so *from the prerogative of their birth*, which as it is again an exact parallel to that place of Saint *Paul*, 1 *Cor.* 7. 13. in our rendring and interpreting of it, and an evidence, that it was then understood thus in the *Church* of *God*, so is it a proof of the *practice* of the *Church* in his time, in receiving the *Christian children* to *baptism*. And although *l. de Bapt.* c. 18. he argue for the delay of *baptism* in some cases, when it is not *necessary* (*præcipuè circa parvulos*, *especially toward children*) meaning, most probably, the *children* of *unbelievers*, by others (as *sponsores* to *promise* for them) brought to *baptism*, as considering that those *Sponsors* might *dye*, or not be able to perform their promise, yet by that very passage produced out of him against *Pædobaptism*, it is most evident it was then *practised* in the *Church* on the *children* of *Christians*; and as evident, that the *Sponsores*, *Undertakers*, or *Sureties*, which have place onely in *baptizing* of *children*, were in his time known and customary in the *Church*. And of them it is accordingly affirmed by [g] *Platina* out of the ancient *Records*, that *Hyginus* the *Bishop* of *Rome*, and *Martyr*, An. Dom. 144. *voluit unum saltem Patrinum*, *unamque Matrinam baptismo interesse*, *appointed that there should be at least one Godfather and one Godmother present at baptism*: *Sic enim*, saith he, *eos appellant*, *qui Infantes tenent dum baptizantur*, *for so they call those that hold Infants when they are baptized*.

The antiquity of *Sponsores* or Godfathers.

[g] *In vita* Hygini.

Sect. 42. *Origen.* Fourthly, *Origen*, immediately after *Irenæus* and *Tertullian*, is expres not onely for the *practice* (*secundum Ecclesiæ observantiam etiam parvulis baptismum dari*, *according to the custome of the Church*, *baptism is given to Infants*, on *Lev.* c. 12. 13. *Hom.* 8. and again, *Quia per baptismum nativitatis sordes deponuntur*, *propterea baptizantur & parvuli*, *because by baptism the filth of our birth is taken away*, *therefore are children baptized*, *Hom.* 14. *in Luc.*) but also for the *Tradition* from the *Apostles*, in *Rom.* 16. *Ecclesia ab Apostolis traditionem suscepit etiam parvulis baptismum dare*, *The Church received tradition from the Apostles*, *to give baptism also to little ones*. Nothing can be more expres to the whole matter. And though we have not that piece of *Origen* in *Greek*, yet being translated by Saint *Jerome*, and so owned by him in his *Epistle* to *Heraclius*, prefixt before the *Commentary*, we have his *authority* to secure us, that these are *Origen*'s words.

Sect. 43. In this place I shall add a *testimony* out of that *Authour* of the *Ecclesiastick Hierarchy*, arguing for *Pædobaptism*, c. 7. Πάλιν γὰ δὴ κἀκεῖ τὰτα ταῦτα φαμὲν, ἅπερ οἱ θεουργοὶ ἡμῶν ἱερουργοῦσαι, παρὰ τῆ ἀγγελικῆς αὐτοπτίσεως ἐδιδάχθησαν, εἰς ἡμᾶς περήγαγον, *Of this we say the same things which our divine Ministers of holy things*, *instructed by divine Tradition*, *brought down to us*. That this *writer* was *Dionysius* the *Areopagite*, mentioned in the *Acts*, I do not pretend to believe; yet as Mr. *Casaubon* saith of him, that he was *scriptor antiquissimus*, *& elegantissimus*, *a most ancient and most elegant writer*: so it appears out of *Photii Bibliotheca*, that the question whether these were the *genuine* works of that *Dionysius*, lay under *debate*, about the *year*, 420. For at that time *Theodorus Presbyter* alledged the *arguments* on both sides, for and against that *assertion*: By which it appears sufficiently, that the *Authour* was very ancient, when so long since, this was matter of

The Authour of the Ecclesiastick Hierarchy.

question

queſtion concerning him. And after the ſame proportion, I might here reaſonably add the words of the *Author* of the *Conſtitutions*, l. 6. c. 15. *Baptize your little ones, and educate them in the diſcipline and precepts of the Lord*: For although I am not perſwaded that they were written in the *Apoſtles* time by *Clemens Romanus*, yet there is ſufficient reaſon to aſſure us, that they were very *ancient*. Of the Conſtitutions.

In the next place Saint *Cyprian's authority* comes, backt with the force of an *African Council*, which, ſaith he, determined what is affirmed by him, *Ep.* 59. *Quantum ad cauſam infantium pertinet, quos dixiſti intra ſecundum & tertium diem quo nati ſunt conſtitutos baptizari non oportere ——— longè aliud in Concilio noſtro omnibus viſum eſt; univerſi judicavimus nulli hominum nato miſericordiam Dei, & gratiam denegandam, &c. As to the caſe of Infants, which thou ſaidſt were not to be baptized within two or three days after birth ——— It was far otherwiſe determined by all in our Council, we all judged that the mercy and grace of God was to be denied to none that was born of men.* And again, *A baptiſmo atque à gratia Dei neminem per nos debere prohiberi. Quod cum circa univerſos obſervandum ſit atque retinendum, tum magis circa infantes ipſos & recens natos obſervandum putamus, &c. None ought to be hindred by us from baptiſm and the grace of God, which as it is among all to be obſerved and maintained, ſo it ought the rather to be obſerved among Infants, and thoſe that are newly born, who by their tears, with which they begin the world, might in reaſon obtain more from our help, and the Divine Mercy.* *Sect.* 44. S. *Cyprian.*

So after him Saint *Auguſtine* of the *Tradition* from the *Apoſtles*, *Ser.* 10. *de verb. Apoſt.* and more expreſly *de Bapt. cont. Donatiſt.* l. 4. c. 24. *Nemo nobis ſubſurret doctrinas alienas. Hoc Eccleſia ſemper habuit, ſemper retinuit, hoc à Majorum fide accepit, hoc uſque in finem perſeveranter cuſtodit, Let no man whiſper to us other doctrines. This the Church hath always had, always retained, this it hath received from the faith of the predeceſſours, this it keeps perſeveringly to the end. Quod univerſa tenet Eccleſia, nec conciliis inſtitutum, ſed ſemper retentum eſt, non niſi authoritate Apoſtolica traditum rectiſſimè creditur, That which the Univerſal Church maintains, and was not inſtituted by Councils, but always continued, is moſt rightly believed to be delivered by the Apoſtles authority.* And *lib.* 10. *de Gen. ad literam*, c. 23. *Conſuetudo matris Eccleſiæ in baptizandis parvulis nequaquam ſpernenda eſt, nec ullo modo ſuperflua deputanda, nec omnino credenda, niſi Apoſtolica eſſet traditio, The cuſtome of our Mother the Church is by no means to be ſcorned in baptizing of children, nor yet to be accounted ſuperfluous, nor at all to be believed, if there were not Apoſtolical Tradition for it.* So *l.* 1. *de pecc. mer. & remiſſ.* ſpeaking of the *Pelagians*, *Parvulos baptizandos eſſe concedunt; qui contra authoritatem Univerſæ Eccleſiæ proculdubio per Dominum & Apoſtolos traditam venire non poſſunt, They grant that children are to be baptized, becauſe they cannot contradict the authority of the Univerſal Church delivered by the Lord and by the Apoſtles.* Theſe two *laſt authorities* receive ſome farther weight, by conſidering that they are by him urged to his *adverſaries*, on whom he would not have preſſed this *Tradition* as *Apoſtolical*, if in that age there had been any *ſuſpicion* to the *contrary*. *Sect.* 45. S. *Auguſtine.*

From him, and all the *Eccleſiaſtick Writers* and *Councils* after him, I need not heap *teſtimonies* in this matter; it being known and acknowledged by all, how frequently they are to be met with; and that this was one great aggravation charged on *Pelagius's hereſie*, that by conſequence from his *doctrine*, he denied the *baptiſm* of *Infants* for the *remiſſion* of *ſins* (which they that did, have been *cenſured* by the *Church* for *Hereticks* in all ages) as may appear both by S. *Ambroſe Epiſt. l.* 4. *Demetriadi virg. Hinc evacuatio baptiſmatis parvulorum, qui ſolâ adoptione donari, nullo autem reatu dicerentur abſolvi. From Pelagius's doctrine follows the evacuating of the baptiſm of Infants, who ſhould, by his opinion, be ſaid to be adopted, but not abſolved from any guilt.* And in like manner by the definition of the *Milevitan Council*, Can. 2. where ſpeaking of the *Catholick Church's* underſtanding of *Original Sin*, we have theſe words, *Propter hanc regulam fidei, & parvuli, qui nihil peccatorum in ſemet ipſis adhuc committere potuerunt, ideo in peccatorum remiſſionem veraciter baptizantur, &c. Upon this rule of faith* (the ſenſe of the *Catholick Church, ubique ſemper, every where*, and *always*) it is, that *Infants are baptized into remiſſion of ſins, that what they have contracted by generation, may be purged by regeneration.* And yet of *Pelagius* himſelf it is the affirmation of *Euſebius Emiſſenus*, *Hom.* 5. *de Paſch.* that he aſſerted the *baptizing* of *Infants*, though not *propter vitam, for life*, yet *propter regnum cœlorum, for the kingdom of God.* Nay, S. *Auguſtine* cites it out of *Cœleſtius* the *Pelagian*, *Infantes baptizari in remiſſionem peccatorum, ſecundum regulam univerſalis Eccleſiæ, & Evangelii ſententiam, That Infants are baptized for remiſſion of ſins, according to the rule of the univerſal Church, and the appointment of the Goſpel*, l. 2. *cont. Pel. & Cœl.* c. 5. *Sect.* 46. The *Milevitan* Council.

18. This *poſitive doctrine*, I ſuppoſe, will not need farther *confirming*, it being their part, that attempt to invalidate a *cuſtome* or uſage, ſo *authoritatively* introduced, and ſo long continued, to maintain their *improbable* plea with *demonſtrative* arguments. And till that be done, as in our Nation it is acknowledged, that *common uſage* is *common law* and *poſſeſſion* time out of mind, is not onely *eleven*, but the whole *twelve Points* in *Law*; So in the *Church* of *Chriſt* (whoſe *univerſal* Rule hath always been that, which the firſt *Nicene Council*, hath made familiar with every man, τὰ ἀρχαῖα ἔθη κρατείτω, *Let the ancient uſages continue in force*) the proof of the uſage, or *practice*, is all that can be expected for the vindicating of an *Inſtitution*. *Sect.* 47.

The one thing then remaining, is to examine the *arguments*, that are produced againſt *Infants Baptiſm*, whether they have any thing in them thus demonſtrative, or no; and, till ſomewhat appear of that nature, to reſolve they are but ſuggeſtions of *Schiſmaticks*, which prefer their own *ſingular*, or *private ſpirits*, before the *common ſpirit* of the *Apoſtolical Church* of *God*. *Sect.* 48.

And of theſe arguments, the moſt diligent Collections that I ever met with, is that of my very *worthy* friend, Dr. *Jer. Taylor*, in his *Book* of *Liberty* of *Prophecying*, where he hath ſo *impartially* inforced the *arguments* of his *adverſaries*, that I know not where to furniſh my ſelf with ſo *exact a Scheme*, and ſhall therefore, upon that one account, chuſe to follow that *path* which he hath traced before me. And theſe [h] *arguments* begin firſt *Negatively*, or deſtructively, by taking away the force of other arguments produced before in behalf of *Pædobaptiſm*. To which, firſt, I anſwer in general, that my preſent engagements give me no *neceſſity* of replying to this ſort of the *Anabaptiſts arguments*, becauſe they *impugn* not the grounds which have been laid in this *diſcourſe*, but onely are brought to oppoſe thoſe *arguments*, which either I uſe not at all, or onely by way of *analogy* and *accommodation*. And yet becauſe I am not willing, that ſuch *fallacious* *Sect.* 49. Dr. *Taylor's* Collection of the Anabaptiſts arguments.

[h] Διολογ. διαλ. p. 228. Numb. 13.

reasonings should impose on any, I shall endeavour, in some *instances*, to shew the *frivolousness* of them, so far as the *Reader*, or this former *discourse*, can be any way concerned in them.

Sect. 50. First then, when he invalidates the *argument* taken from *Circumcision*, my answer is, That I have not used that *argument* any farther than thus, that by *analogy* with what was done in *Circumcision*, 'tis concluded reasonable, from *God*'s own judgment (in a case directly the same) that those may be entred *sacramentally* into a *Covenant*, which do not at that time actually *know* or understand the condition of the *Covenant*, as is clear, in the *child*'s being circumcised. Now against this pretension of ours from *Circumcision* to *Baptism*, none of his exceptions do at all conclude.

Sect. 51. As first, That *Types prove nothing, except a commandment go along with them, or some express to signifie such to be their purpose.* To which I answer, That I do not make *Circumcision* a *type* of *Baptism*, much less prove any thing by its being such, I take *circumcision* to be one *Institution* of *God*'s, a *ceremony* of admitting *Jews*, and their children, into the *old Covenant*, and I pretend *baptism* to be another; in this agreeing with it, That it is a *ceremony* of *admitting Christian Proselytes*, and their *children*, into a *new Covenant*, not after the manner of the *circumcision*, but of the *baptism* of the *Jews*. For the truth of which pretension, if I had not other evidence, beyond that of the *Jewish children*'s being *circumcised*, *viz.* the *practice* of the *Apostles*, *testified* by themselves, and their *successours* of the *first* ages of the *Church*, that received it from them, I should never conclude it from *circumcision*: Because, though by the *example* of *circumcision*, it were vindicated from many of the *exceptions* that are thought to lye against it, yet I know it doth not follow, That whatever is not *absurd*, must presently *be*; that every thing is true, which is possible, or that what is *lawfull*, was certainly *instituted*. And so against this stating of the matter, neither is [*the unagreeableness of the flood with baptism, in that one was a prodigy, the other not; nor of the Passover and the Eucharist, in that one had no prescription of sacramental drink, as the other had*] of any force at all, partly because a *parallel Institution* is more capable of being *argumentative* to all particulars, than a *type*, so remote, as the *flood* is from *baptism*, and partly because, as the *Eucharist* is a *ceremony* founded in the *Jews postcœnium*, and not in their *Paschal Lamb* (which by the way, I suppose, *Christ* ate not at that time, the day before his *crucifixion*, because the time of eating the *Lamb* was not come, till the *evening* after his *death*, but onely had a *commemorative Passover*, at the beginning of the *Paschal* νυχθήμερον, and therein *instituted* the *Sacrament*, being himself the true *Paschal-Lamb* that the day after was slain for us) and in that *postcœnium* there was a *cup of blessing*, as well as *bread* to be broken: so the *Christians baptism* is founded in (and is the accommodating of) the *baptism* that was among the *Jews*, and not in *circumcision* at all, as having no likeness with it, save onely in some *extrinsecal* circumstances, as being both *ceremonies* of *initiation* into a *Church*, &c. In which consequently it may well *agree* with it, and (when the *reason* is absolutely the same) must; though in other things, where the *reason* is varied, it be allowed to *disagree*.

Sect. 52. So again, when 'tis said, that *though there be a correspondence of analogy betwixt circumcision and baptism, yet there is no correspondence of identity*, though I confess I understand not what is meant by the latter of those *phrases*, yet I acknowledge not to believe the *correspondence* to hold in all things, among other *reasons*, for this, because I know *females* were not *circumcised*, which lying not against the *baptism* of the *Jews*, any more than it doth against the *Christian*, I there chuse to fasten the *correspondence*, where I find so much more *reason* to do it.

Sect. 53. *Num.* 13. In this matter there is a reason of difference pretended, why *circumcision should be proper for children, and baptism not, because circumcision left a character in the flesh, which being imprinted on Infants, did its work, when they came to age; and baptism imprixts nothing that remains on the body.* But this, though it be already wholly avoided, by founding the *Christian* in the *Jewish baptism*, which had no external *character* on the *flesh*, and not in *circumcision*, which had; yet I will not cast it off so, but if it shall appear to have any force in it, acknowledge that it will hold in some degree against our *pretensions*. But, I suppose, it *really* hath none.

Sect. 54. For although there be that *accidental difference* between *circumcision* and *baptism*, that one *mutilates*, the other onely *washes* the *body*; the one *woundeth*, the other lightly *toucheth*, and *cleanseth*; yet sure that *difference* is of no force in this matter, for in respect of all others, but onely the *child*, i. e. in respect of *God*, and the *Congregation*, there arises no *difference* from hence: for, in respect of *both*, both are *equally signs* of the *Covenant*, and, in respect of *men*, the *Registers* being kept among *Christians*, as they were among *Jews*, the *baptism* of each will there be recorded, though it be not read in the *forehead*. And for the *difference* in respect of the *child*, 'tis certain that at that time, when it is given, to him it signifies nothing, because at that time he hath not the *gift* of interpreting the *Character*. And that afterward he is able to doe it, is certainly from *advertisement*, and *instruction* of others: For the *Character* of *circumcision* signifies not naturally, but onely voluntarily, or by *Institution*; nor else were the *Ishmaelites*, &c. within the *Covenant*: and accordingly the *child* understands it not by strength of *common notions*, or as a conclusion from any *principle* in *Nature*, but as he is told by others, both what was done to him, and what was the meaning of it, and therefore the same Law that commanded the *Jews* to *circumcise*, commanded them also to *teach* their children; and of that *information*, and *instruction*, the *Christian*, that was *baptized* in his infancy, is as capable, as the *Jew* that was *circumcised*, and the care of the *Church* may be as punctual now, as it was of the *Synagogue*: and if that were really conceived to be an objection, it would both give the advantage on the *Church*'s side, (which appoints *Undertakers* and *Sureties*, which in *circumcision* was not appointed, and adds the *promise* of the *Godfathers*, to the *duty* of the *Parents*, to secure *instruction* to them) and would rather perswade the providing of more *Godfathers*, or laying a stricter charge on them, than the removing of that *Christian*, ancient, innocent *ceremony* out of the *Church*, or those *Godfathers* that we have already.

Sect. 55. *Num.* 13. And if [*the word*] which in *baptism* is joyned with the *water*, be also made known to the *child*, when he comes to age, as well as the *nature* of the *Covenant*, into which he was entred, there will then be as little force in the second part, or *suppletory* to the *argument*, as there was in the first, supposing [*the word*] to be a part of the *Sacrament*, and to signifie the *words*, that are used in *Baptism*, the form of

Baptizing

Baptizing in the name of the Father, and Son, and Holy Ghost. But, I conceive, [*the word*] which when it is joyned with the *Element*, is by the *Fathers* frequently ſaid to make up a *Sacrament* (*Accedat verbum ad Elementum & fiet Sacramentum*) may more properly ſignifie *Chriſt's Inſtitution* of *Baptiſm* (for that is it that makes *dipping* or *ſprinkling* with *water*, a *Sacrament*) and proportionably to that, the *Text of Scripture*, that gives *commiſſion* to the *Church*, to receive, and embrace *Chriſtians children*. And if that ſhould be the notion of [*verbum*, *the word*] it is then the *Congregation* onely, that is concerned in that, and thereby receives *warrant* for what they doe, and the *child's* want of *underſtanding* is no hindrance to it, any more than it is to the *efficacy* of the *prayers* of the *Congregation*, for the obtaining from *God* all thoſe *Chriſtian* graces, that, as ſoon as the *child* is capable of them, *God* can early grant, and, when they are received, the *child* make uſe of.

So when he proceeds farther to *invalidate* the parallel betwixt *Circumciſion* and *Baptiſm*, in theſe two reſpects: Firſt, *Becauſe the Chriſtian Infants are not baptized ſtrictly on the eighth day, as the Jews were circumciſed*; Secondly, *That the females are baptized, which were not circumciſed*: It already appears, That this is not of force againſt me, who do not undertake to make *Chriſtian Baptiſm* parallel to *Circumciſion*, but to the *Jews baptizing* of *Proſelytes*, and that ſure belonged to their females, as well as *males*, and was no more bound to the *eighth day*, than our *baptiſm* is, but yet was conſtantly allowed to the *Proſelytes children*, as well as to themſelves that were of *full* age. *Sect.* 56.

As for the placing the *analogy betwixt Circumciſion and Baptiſm* (and ſo betwixt the *adherences* of both) *in the letter of the one, but in the ſpirit and ſignification of the other, that as Infants were circumciſed, ſo ſpiritual Infants ſhould be baptized*, i. e. *that they that are baptized ſhould be children in malice*, &c. That is, firſt, but a *fancy*, and a new way of making *parallels* betwixt *Sacraments*: for *Sacraments*, as ſuch, are all *ſignificative*, and ſo are both theſe, and in that ſenſe both *ſpiritual*, and not *one* to be taken in the *letter*, and the *other* in the *ſpirit*. And indeed, *baptiſm* is no more *ſpiritual circumciſion*, than *circumciſion* is *ſpiritual baptiſm*, but both of them are *rites* of *Initiation* among the *Jews*, and one of them by *Chriſt* continued among *Chriſtians*. And ſo for the *adherences* of them; The *baptizing* of *children* may as well ſignifie, that the *men* that are *baptized*, ought to be *like children* (or, as *Chriſt* ſaith, *enter the kingdom of God as that little child*, i. e. be *children in malice, regenerate and born again*) as the *circumciſing of Infants* may be ſaid to *fore-typifie* it. The truth is, the *ſpiritual child*, i. e. the *pure*, and *innocent*, is equally the *ſubject* of both. All which, though it make it moſt reaſonable, that they that are not *circumciſed*, or *baptized* till full age, ſhould then with *vows* of new life enter the *Covenant* of *Mercy*, that belongs to none, but to ſuch as do ſo, and undergo thoſe *ſignificative* rites accordingly; yet doth it no way *prejudge* the *receiving* of *real Infants* alſo, who (as *children* in *wickedneſs*, as well as in *age*) have as yet a ſmall *proportion* of either, and ſo are as capable in that ſenſe, as the others *repentance*, and *vows* of *new life*, have rendred them. *Sect.* 57.

And if the *Primitive Church did give milk and honey to the baptized, with that intention, to ſignifie, that if they were men in age, they ought yet to be children in wickedneſs*: All that that will conclude is, That the *little children* were propoſed to the *men*, as their patterns, if they *aſpired* to *baptiſm*: and if theſe *qualifications* were neceſſary to be tranſcribed from them, to give the men a capacity of *baptiſm*, ſure they, who had them in the *originals*, would not reaſonably be thought *uncapable*, unleſs ſome other *incapacity* were proved againſt them, which is not yet pretended in this reaſoning. *Sect.* 58.

The next *attempt* is to invalidate the inference, which is ſaid to be made from *Chriſt's bleſſing of Infants*: Where, if the inference were, that all *Infants* are, *i. e.* ought to be *baptized*, upon *this* (and no other) *ground, becauſe Chriſt bleſſed them*, I ſhould acknowledge the *concluſion* to be weakly built: But when (as it hath formerly appeared) all the *concluſion* inferr'd by us hence, is onely this, That the *Infants* are capable of being *bleſſed* by *Chriſt*, though they underſtand not what *Chriſt* is; and conſequently that it muſt be *uncharitable* in thoſe, who deny them this means of *Chriſt's*, for deriving this *bleſſing* to them, upon no other *reaſon*, but becauſe they do not *believe*, or *underſtand*. And when the contrary concluſion (pretended to be more probably inferr'd) [that *becauſe Chriſt bleſſed theſe Infants, but diſmiſſed them without baptiſm, therefore Infants are not to be baptized*,] is ſo very far from being inferred probably. Firſt, becauſe from a *particular* omiſſion, to conclude an *univerſal* unlawfulneſs, is moſt *unreaſonable*; as if one ſhould thus argue [*Chriſt, when he prayed in the Mount, did not then preach, but onely pray, therefore 'tis not lawfull to preach.*] Or, ſecondly, becauſe though *Chriſt baptized* not *thoſe Infants* before mentioned, yet 'tis for all that poſſible he might *baptize other Infants*. And thirdly, becauſe *Chriſt* did not, that we know, *baptize* himſelf at all, *Joh.* 4. 2. but appointed his *diſciples* to *baptize*, as the *Biſhop* now ſeldom *baptizes*, but *ordains* others to that function. Therefore, I ſay, for all theſe reaſons, I ſuppoſe, the pretenſions of that *Section*, *Numb.* 14. are no way inferred againſt us, who do not ſo confine the *power* or *mercy* of *Chriſt*, as if he had no other way of *bringing Infants to heaven*, but onely by *baptiſm*, but acknowledge, that when the *Sectary* himſelf may for his *ſchiſm* and *uncharitableneſs* fall under the diſpleaſure of *Chriſt*, the poor *Infant*, which is no way guilty of the parents pertinacy, or unkindneſs, may be abundantly ſupplied by the Covenant and *grace* of *Chriſt*, without receiving this ſign of it, and wanting the *ordinary* means, may be allowed *extraordinary*. *Sect.* 59. *Num.* 14.

And the ſame reply is ſufficient to all that is added, *Num.* 15. for we that think and pronounce, that *God* may bring *children* to heaven which are not *baptized*, and acknowledge the *unbaptized Infant*, to be in that perfectly *guiltleſs*, and ſo unpuniſhable in the *juſtice* of *God*, for the *omiſſion* of the *parents*, do not conſider or aſſert the *Inſtitution* of *baptiſm*, as the *appointing of a rule, without which the ſupernatural end cannot be attained*, and therefore are guiltleſs of having *argued invalidly* in that particular. And if we were as confident, that *God* hath *commanded Infants* to be *baptized*, as againſt us 'tis pretended for the *Anabaptiſts*, that *they are ſure, he hath not commanded it*, yet we that think no perſon *puniſhable* for the breach of a *command*, but him who knowingly hath *deſpiſed*, or *omitted* it, muſt conclude nothing, but good *hope* of the *unbaptized Infant*, and onely deſire to reduce the *Parent*, or the *Congregation*, or *Curate* of the place, to the acknowledgment of their *duty*, which if neglected, may juſtly become *blameable*, and *dangerous* to them, who have neither the *ignorance*, nor *impotence* of the *child* to plead for them. *Sect.* 60.

And

Sect. 61. And this, as it is a full answer to that branch of the arguing (*Numb.* 15.) so it is acknowledged as undeniably true, and built on *Num.* 16. *viz.* that whatever the consequent of *Original* sin is, either it shall not be charged on *Infants*, or that *God*'s goodness will *secure them, if he take them away, before they can glorifie him with a free obedience*: which, and all the rest, which is added to that sense, in *Num.* 16. we acknowledge most true, as far as concerns the *Infants* present interest toward *eternal life*, (for we are far from the opinion of him, whose doctrine of the *efficiency* of that *instrument*, so *signal*, that where it was omitted, there was no place for *hope*, justly intituled him a *hard father of Infants*;) but yet conceive there are other *reasons* beside those there named, why *Infants* should be *brought*, and received to *Baptism*, wherein, as the *Infants* imperfect condition secures them from being blamed, or mulcted for the *omission of Baptism*, so they that are of age to know what *kindness*, and *obedience* signifies, and so are capable of the crime, and guilt of being *unkind*, and *disobedient*, may fitly be admonished of their own *sin* and *danger*.

Sect. 62. One sort of those reasons I suppose my self to know, *viz.* that *children* may be thus early received into the *Covenant*, and thereby, First, by *Oath*, and all other the most pretious concernments and obligations, *pre-engaged* to the actions of a pious *Christian* life (assoon as they can be instructed in any part of this *Oath*) without ever being adventured to the *hazards* of the contrary *infusions*, that the timely taking into the *Church*, may prevent the *pollutions* of the *world*, and *Satan* be supplanted by this speedy giving up the name unto *Christ*. And secondly, that by the *Promises* of *God* also signed in that *Sacrament*, they may be more solemnly secured of a right in the *inward* assistences of the *spirit* of *Christ*, (which yet I hope will not without their *guilt* be withheld from them, in case they be not *baptized*) and the *outward* advantages, and *prerogatives* of being members of his *Church*, (such are *participation* of the *prayers*, and *instruction* of the *Ministery*, and other *benefits* of *confirmation*, and the *Lord's Supper*, which certainly belong not to them that are not *baptized*) assoon as ever they are capable of receiving them. And that certainly is much earlier for most of them, than that part of the age, wherein they can be supposed (by having been sufficiently *instructed* in the whole *Christian* doctrine, and having in full purpose of mind undertaken *Christ*'s yoke) to be voluntarily, and by *free choice* (without this obligation) rendred capable of that *baptism*, which belongs to those of full age, and for which the *Anabaptist* pretends. To these I may farther add, that as *baptism* is to Infants an *Institution of Christ*, so it gives a *virtue* to the *external* act, and *words* pronounced by the *Minister*, so far as to make them *members of Christ*, *and children of God*, *and heirs of his kingdom*. And this hath been the *doctrine* of the *Church* of *God*. Besides, the *fear* of being continued in the *state* of *Original* guilt, is to be considered also, and hath by the *Fathers* been generally considered in this matter, and without defining the *damage* to those, who have been, without their own *fault*, detained from it, the *Church* hath delivered it for certain *doctrine*, that *children being baptized*, *have all things necessary to their salvation*, and are *undoubtedly saved*.

Sect. 63. And though I could name no more of those reasons, yet as long as I ought to suppose an *Institution* of *Christ*, or *practice* of his *Apostles* to be founded in weightier reasons: then 'tis certain (or necessary) that I know, there will be no way to disprove the *reasonableness* of the *practice*, but by taking away the *Apostolicalness*, of the ground, and so the *no-fear* of the *Infants* losing heaven by the *parents* unkindness, will never prove, That there is *no need* of *baptizing Infants*, which is the sole pretension of the 16. *Numb.*

Sect. 64. And truly, that *parents*, who in this *Section* are supposed to *convey Adam's sin and punishment to their Infant-children*, and do also *know that it is taken away by Christ*, but withall, that *Christ* commands all that desire to be partakers from him of that benefit, to be *baptized*, and so *born anew of water and of the holy Ghost* (though they, whose *fault* it is not, that they are not *baptized*, shall, I hope, never be *punished*, or deprived, without all guilt) should not contribute their utmost to the cure of this *hereditary* evil, and be *instruments* of conveying to them the *Antidote*, as they have been the *conduits* of the *Poison*, and so joyn as far in the latter, as they are by the disputer confessed to be engaged in the former part of the *solemnity*, seems either a great *sloth*, or a great *unkindness* or an *itch* of *disputing*, and *innovating*, and is indeed much more *heinous* than any of these, a causless *disrelish*, and fastidious *contempt* of an *Institution* of *Christ*. For all which, they that have no weightier *exceptions* against an act of *charity*, and another of *obedience*, than what are here produced, have sure no competent *reward* in their prospect, to *recommend* such unamiable, and unnecessary *vices* to them.

Sect. 65. This clears us from the reproach of the *narrow conception of God Almighty*, *that because he hath tied us to the observation of ceremonies of his own Institution*, *therefore he hath tied himself to it*] No, our *doctrine* is not pressed with any *danger*, or fear of such inconvenience; all that we conclude, is, That if *God* have *tied us*, we are *bound* to *obey*. And as, when we are allowed to acknowledge that *God* can bring a *child* into the World without the help of a *Midwife*, we yet think our selves doubly obliged both to the *mother* and the *child* in the womb to bespeak a *Midwifes* presence and assistence to the first *throw*: so need we not be suspected to *shorten God's hand*, or prejudge his *power* or *goodness*, if, as soon as the child is born in the World, we desire by the *Minister's aid*, to help it to a *new birth*, and introduce it into the *Church* also.

Sect. 66. That which is added in the close of that number, that *'tis most unreasonable on our own head to carry Infants to God this way without his direction*] signifies little to us, who do not, what we contend for, in this matter, *on our own heads*, having certainly the continued *example*, and *practice* of the *Church* to go before us in it, nor, as we suppose, without his *direction*, which we think we can better infer from the *Apostles practice*, and clear that *practice* by greater evidence, and consequents from *Scripture*, than any man can pretend to do the contrary. And yet let me add, *ex abundanti*, that they that from *analogie* of an *indefinite* command of *Christ* (that of *baptizing* all *Nations*) shall extend that *command* to the *baptizing* the *Infants* of the *converted Nations*, when, if the *analogy* doth not exactly hold, yet it is *thought* to hold so far as it is extended (and for so *thinking*, the *opinion* and *practice* of the *whole Church* of *God* for so many hundred years is produced, and no shew of *prohibition* can be by any pretended against thus *extending* it) cannot, with any shew of *reason*, be censured for *most unreasonable*; many things being very lawfull to be *practised*, which are neither *commanded*, nor *directed* by *God*, as long as the *contrary* is not *directed*: and if such be *practised* upon grounds of supposed *obedience*, either to *Christ*, or his *Apostles*, or the *Church of God*, and upon *charitative* ends, they will be found as commendable, and as highly *reasonable*, as either *disobedience*, or *uncharitableness*,

ritableneſs, are *unreaſonable*. So far is the conceit we defend, from being *poor*, and *low* (as, if it undertook to retrench *God's power*, it might juſtly be ſuppoſed) or the action conſequent to it, to be *too bold* and *venturous*, unleſs exceſs of *meekneſs*, and *fear* of offending, may be ſtyled *too bold*, or abundance of *caution*, and charitable *care too venturous*.

The ſame argument is again repeated *Num.* 17. without any farther improvement, and every word of it being wholly ſpent on *God's care of Infants, the Infants incapacity of doing acts in order to ſalvation, God's immediate mercy to them, without any external act or miniſtery*, or confinement to *particular rite*, and this as well now, as *before the Inſtitution of Circumciſion or Baptiſm*] may very ſecurely be acknowledged by us, as far as concerns the *child*. Onely let me demand, whether the caſe were not ſomewhat altered in reſpect of a *Jewiſh parent*, after the inſtitution of *Circumciſion*, from what it was before? and whether, if upon the wilfull omiſſion of *circumciſing* the *child* on the *eighth day*, the *Angel* ſhould come and kill the *child*, (though the *devils* did not ſeize on him to *torment* him eternally) that *mother*, and that *wife*, that were *guilty* of this omiſſion, were not a *bloudy mother*, and *wife*, and, the death of this *child* being a *puniſhment* to the *father*, whether that *parent* that were thus *puniſhed*, were not thereby ſuppoſed *criminous*, though the *child* were but haſtened to *heaven*, and not hindred by this means? If this queſtion cannot be anſwered *Negatively*, as I ſuppoſe it cannot; and if the *Inſtitution* of *Chriſt* extended to *Infants*, as I ſuppoſe it doth, and hath formerly been *teſtified* to extend, there will then be nothing left that can be thought to need *anſwer* in the 17 *Num.* *Sect.* 67.

This again is the argument of the 18. *Num. There is no danger that Infants ſhould periſh for want of this external miniſtery, much leſs for prevaricating Chriſt's precept of* [*Unleſs a man be born again*, &c.] And 'tis already evident, that this is granted by us, and that it yields the oppoſers no kind of *advantage* againſt us. And when the *concluſion* is ſafely granted, the pains of confuting the *reaſons* that are uſed to infer it might, one would think, be ſecurely ſpared alſo. But there are many things in that 18. *Num.* which are not rightly ſuggeſted, which, if they were, might be thought to have ſome validity in them, farther than the inferring the *Concluſion*, which they are produced to confirm: As firſt, That *water and the ſpirit, John* 3. 5. *ſignifie the ſame thing, and by water is meant the effect of the ſpirit, cleanſing and purifying the ſoul.* Theſe words I conceive to be ſo far from bringing any evidence of *truth* with them, that they do, one branch of them, ſufficiently confute the other; for if the *water* were acknowledged to be *really an effect of the ſpirit*, yet would that be far from concluding thoſe two words [*water* and *ſpirit*] the ſame thing, becauſe never any thing is the *cauſe* or *effect* of it ſelf; but when 'tis onely pretended, that by *water* is meant that *effect*, *i.e.* that the *cleanſing* and *purifying* of the *Soul*, which really is an *effect* of the *ſpirit*, is onely *ſignified* by the *water*, this is as far from proving the words to ſignifie the ſame, as our affirming *water* to be the *Sign*, and *purifying the ſoul* the *grace*, and *baptiſm* the *rite* of conveying that *grace*, can be deemed to conclude it our opinion, That *water*, and *grace*, and *baptiſm*, are all one. And then the onely thing to be interpoſed in this matter, will be; That men ought to be wary, that they do not ſuffer *different* things to be impoſed on them, as if they were the *ſame*, nor believe a *propoſition* to be evidenced by that *explication*, by which it is really *confuted*. If the meaning be no more than this, that the *water* ſignifies the *ſpirit*, conſidered in one *effect* of it, of *cleanſing the ſoul*, then, (though I think it ſignifies ſomewhat more alſo, *a death unto ſin, and a new life unto righteouſneſs*, in the ſenſe that is affirmed by our *Church*, and interpreted * elſewhere, yet) I think, 'tis from thence clear, that it *ſignifies* not the ſame thing that the *ſpirit* doth, any more than a *ſign*, and the thing *ſignified*, ſignifie the ſame. The *ſign* ſignifies the *ſubſtance* or *grace*; but the *ſubſtance* or *grace* is it, and doth not *ſignify* it. And this is no nicety, but the very thing wherein the *difficulty* (all that is in this matter) conſiſts. For, ſuppoſing the *water* to be the ſign of the *cleanſing power of the ſpirit*, and ſo *baptiſm by water* the thing inſtituted by *Chriſt*, to *ſignify* the neceſſity of our being *waſhed ſpiritually*; *Chriſt*'s affirming the no-poſſibility of *entring the kingdom of God*, without being *born again*, both of *water*, and of the *holy Ghoſt*, and not onely of *one* of them, though it exclude not thoſe that are guilty of no fault, in not being *baptized* with *water*, cannot yet be doubted to make *baptiſm* by *water* regularly *neceſſary*, and ſo (though not *excluſive* of all other means of *God*'s beſtowing heaven on *Infants*, yet) unfit to be adviſedly laid aſide, *omitted*, or contemned by any, either for themſelves, or for others, that are by *God* or *Nature* committed to their truſt. * *Pract. Cat. l. 6. ſect.* 155. *Sect.* 68.

But afterward, when it is alledged, that the *equipollence* of theſe two, *water* and *ſpirit*, *appears in its parallel place of Chriſt's baptizing with the ſpirit and fire*, I profeſs to believe it evident that thoſe places are not *parallel*. The mention of *Baptiſm* with *water* and the *ſpirit*] was made by *Chriſt* to *Nicodemus* in a wide *indefinite* latitude [*Except a man be thus regenerate, he cannot enter*, &c.] *Joh.* 3. 5. and it referred clearly to the *initiating* men *indefinitely* (*i.e. all men*) into the *Church*, (proportionably to the *Baptiſm* among the *Jews*, which was the ceremony of admitting *all*, both *natives* and *proſelytes*, and their *children*) and belonged to all that *would enter into the Kingdom of God*, to every *Chriſtian*. But that of *baptizing with the holy Ghoſt, and with fire, Matt.* 3. 11. was ſpoken by *John Baptiſt* of *Chriſt*, and by *Chriſt* to the *Apoſtles*, and refers to the *deſcent* of the *Spirit* upon *them*, and not upon *all Chriſtians*. And what if, *beſide the literal fulfilling of it at Pentecoſt, there be morally more in it? i.e.* though it ſignifie the effect of the *holy Ghoſt*, and his *productions on the ſoul*; Yet, firſt, it *ſignifies* not the ſame *production* that *water ſignified*, the *water* was preſumed to ſignifie *ſanctifying grace*, the *fire*, in *form of tongues*, ſignified the *gift of tongues*, that was given in it, and perhaps more, the *fire*, that ſhould ſoon come out, and *devour the gainſayers*, the *deſtructions* that are elſewhere deſcribed by *fire* (and ſo in that place, *ver.* 12.) that were ſoon after to fall on *unbelievers*, when this laſt method was fruſtrated, and as *Chriſt* long before, ſo now the *holy Ghoſt blaſphemed* alſo. And ſecondly, this doth not prove that *water* was not a *ceremony* inſtituted by *Chriſt*, to ſignifie that *production*, which were the onely thing for the *Anabaptiſts* intereſt to be concluded by it. *Sect.* 69.

And whereas it is added, that *Chriſt baptizes all that come to him, with the holy Ghoſt and with fire*; and that attempted to be proved, becauſe *John tells the Jews, not Chriſt's diſciples, that Chriſt ſhall baptize them with fire and the holy Spirit, Mat.* 3. 11. *i.e. all that came to him, as John did with water, for ſo lies the Antitheſis*,] *Sect.* 70.

To

To this I anſwer, Firſt, that *John*'s ſaying theſe words unto the *Jews*, doth not conclude, that all the *Jews*, that ſhould come to him, ſhould be *baptized with fire*, 'twere ſufficient to the verifying of the words, that ſome of them, eſpecially choſen, and for the uſe of all the other, were to be thus *baptized*, ſignally conſtituted *Apoſtles*, by that means, to preach to them, and all *nations*; and the *Antitheſis* being acknowledged to be by way of *compariſon* betwixt *John* and *Chriſt*, not by way of *contrary oppoſition*, might be very well made up thus. *John* uſed no higher *element* than the *water* in *Jordan*, but *Chriſt* ſhall ſend *fire from heaven*, a much more convincing evidence of his *power*, on the heads of *elect* witneſſes to give them (more than an entrance of *Proſelytes*) a *commiſſion of Apoſtles* and *Governours* of the *Church*. And this is ſufficient to ſhew the unconcludingneſs of that pretended parallel.

Sect. 71. But I conceive it is yet farther diſtant from the truth, and that by the *fire*, which *John* tells the *Jews* they ſhall be *baptized with* by *Chriſt*, after the coming of the *holy Ghoſt* in *tongues as of fire*, and being *contemned* by them, was (as was before noted) meant the *deſtruction* of the obdurate *Crucifiers*. For ſo the two verſes immediately incompaſſing thoſe words, do ſeem to incline it, *The ax is laid to the root of the tree, therefore every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down and caſt into the fire, v.* 10. that ſure is a *fire* of *deſtruction* among the *Jews*, and upon that [*I indeed baptize with water, &c.*] a *quenching* as well as a *cleanſing element*, and if you repent timely, I aſſure you from *God*, the impendent ruine ſhall be averted; [*but he that cometh after me is mightier than I*] and may in reaſon be expected to doe more than I have done, *baptize you with the holy Ghoſt*, uſe all *powerfull* means to bring you to *repentance* by the *Apoſtles* preaching over all your Cities, after your crucifying the *Meſſias*, and if all that doe no good, then *baptizing* you with *fire alſo*, *immerſing* and *overwhelming* you over head and ears in that *fiercer element* (as afflictions are elſewhere deſcribed by βαπτίζεσθαι, being *baptized*, *Matth.* 20. 22.) and accordingly it follows, *ver.* 12. *whoſe fan is in his hand, and he ſhall throughly purge his floor*, that is the *previous* work of the *Spirit*, to *purge*, and *ſeparate* the *penitent* from the *impenitent*, but the *chaff ſhall he burn with unquenchable fire*. And if, as the *context* inclines, and the event was agreeable, ſo that be reſolved to be the meaning of the *baptizing them with fire*, then, as it may belong to the *Jews* indefinitely, *i.e.* the *impenitent Jews* of all ſorts, ſo will it take away all appearance of validity from the *objection*. And I ſhall be content to conclude thence, that as the *Infants* of the *believers* were then to be *baptized* with *water*, ſo the *unbelievers*, or *obdurate*, ſhould paſs through, or rather periſh in the *fire* alſo. But this *ex abundanti*.

Sect. 72. And whereas the *argument* proceeds to acquire more ſtrength from St. *Peter*, *who when he had ſaid, that Baptiſm ſaves us, adds by way of explication, not the waſhing of the fleſh, but the confidence of a good conſcience toward God, plainly ſaying, that it is not water, or the purification of the body, but the cleanſing of the Spirit that does that, &c.* I conceive the *concluſion* to be much larger than the *premiſſes*: For all that St. *Peter* ſaith, is, either to *deny*, and *exclude* the external *ſacramental Baptiſm* from being available to *ſalvation*, without the addition of a *good conſcience*, which I do not pretend it is) or to define that *Baptiſm*, which is available, to be compounded of an inward, *ſubſtantial* performance, as well as an outward *ſignificative rite*, or to attribute more to the *good conſcience*, or the ἐπερώτημα of that (not the *confidence*, but the *enquiring*, or *ſeeking to God*, as hath been ſhew'd) than to the bare *outward waſhing*, which ſtill is no way of prejudging the uſe of that *ceremony* (any more than the *precept* in *Joel*, of *rending the hearts and not the garments*, was a prohibition or interdict of that *outward* expreſſion of *mourning*, the *rending* of the *garments*) but onely the due preferring of the more *ſubſtantial* part, and requiring that we do not leave out, through over-valuing the *ceremony*, the more *pretious inward* part of that *Sacrament*.

Sect. 73. And therefore if our *Saviour's ſpeech to Nicodemus* be ſuppoſed to be *expounded, by analogy to this of Peter* (by the way, it hath already appeared, that that other of being *baptized with fire*, is far from any neceſſity of paſſing for ſuch a *parallel*) it will no-way be conſequent from thence, what is pretended [*that it can conclude for no man, that he is obliged to the right of Baptiſm*] nor will the ſame be at all made probable by *Chriſt's ſpeaking thoſe words*, *Joh.* 3. *before Baptiſm was ordained*. For, firſt, though *Baptiſm* being ſuppoſed an *Inſtitution* of *Chriſt*, cannot ſafely be neglected by thoſe, that have received the *faith* of *Chriſt*; yet we do not think, that it will be available to him that doth not *obey* that *Doctrine* (which is the ſum of St. *Peter*'s words) and ſecondly, *Baptiſm* being before this time, even among the *Jews*, the *rite* or *ceremony* of receiving *Proſelytes*, and ſo of a *metaphorical new birth* (and therefore *Chriſt* wonders at *Nicodemus* a *ruler in Iſrael*, that he *underſtood* not thoſe words of his) It is no way improbable, that our *Saviour* having before thoſe words *Joh.* 3. received *Proſelytes*, called, and entertained *diſciples*, had accommodated this *ceremony* of the *Jews* thereto, and received them by *Baptiſm*. For ſo we ſee it (*Joh.* 4.) ſpoken, as of a thing paſt, that the *Phariſees* had heard, that *Jeſus* made, and *baptized more diſciples than John*, whoſe title yet it was to be the *Baptizer*. And though it be added *ver.* 2. that *Jeſus baptized not, but his diſciples*: yet certainly what they now did, was by *Commiſſion* from him, as his officers, and *miniſters*, and therefore though at his departure from the world the *Commiſſion* was given them in a larger manner, as far as extended to *all* the *world*, *Gentiles*, as well as *Jews*, yet 'tis evident that *ceremony* was already ordained by *Chriſt*, as the rite of receiving *believers* into the *Church*, and conveying *remiſſion* of *Sins* unto them, and being ſo uſed by the *diſciples* of *Chriſt*, might very properly be mentioned to *Nicodemus*, as every ones duty, that would *enter* into the *Kingdom of God*, though not ſo, as to exclude any that were not *guilty* of the *neglecting* of it, or as to avail any that were not *inwardly purified*, as well as *externally baptized*.

Sect. 74. And when 'tis added in the ſame *Num.* that *the words of Chriſt to* Nicodemus, *do no more infer a neceſſity to give Infants Baptiſm, than thoſe other words, Except ye eat the fleſh of the Son of man, and drink his bloud, ye ſhall not enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, infer a neceſſity to give them the holy Communion, and that thereupon the ancient Church did with an equal opinion of neceſſity give them the Communion*] To this I anſwer, by theſe degrees; Firſt, that thoſe words *Joh.* 6. 59. of *eating the fleſh of the ſon of man, &c.* do no-way appear to belong to the *Sacrament* of the *Euchariſt*, it being apparent, that at the ſpeaking of thoſe words that *Sacrament* was not *inſtituted*, nor till long after (the night before his *crucifixion*) and therefore that they are not at all appliable to this matter.

And

And indeed from the whole context, *Chriſt*'s comparing and preferring himſelf before the *Jews Manna*, in reſpect of the miraculouſneſs of the deſcent, and efficacy to nouriſh their ſouls, it is ſo unavoidably inferred, that their feeding on his *fleſh* is their believing his *doctrines*, and nothing elſe, that the *Romaniſts* whoſe pretenſions for the *fleſh* and *bloud* of *Chriſt* in that *Sacrament*, would be much favoured by this interpretation of this Text, do yet (the learnedſt of them) diſclaim it: and indeed St. *Chryſoſtome*'s way of interpreting the 63 verſe, *It is the ſpirit that quickneth*, &c. is moſt clear, that as the *ſoul* is that which *enlivens*, and not the *body*, ſo 'tis not the *fleſhly* hearing that profits any, but his *doctrine* received into their *hearts*, and not onely into their *ears*, that will quicken them into a *ſpiritual life* here, and that prove a foundation of *eternal life* hereafter. *Sect.* 75.

Secondly, ſuppoſing, what the *objection* doth not prove, but ſuppoſe, that the place did belong to the *Sacrament* of the *Euchariſt*, and that the words were *excluſively* ſet, as thoſe others of *Baptiſm*, that whoſoever received not that *Sacrament*, were not capable of *eternal life*, yet ſeeing many circumſtances are neceſſary to be taken in, to diſcern the full importance of any obſcure place, it will appear in many reſpects very reaſonable to make ſome difference between the *perſons* to whom thoſe *Sacraments* belong. For firſt, *Baptiſm* being founded in the *Jewiſh* rite of receiving *Proſelytes*, may reaſonably be thought to belong to all, that among the *Jews* were uſually *baptized*, i. e. (as it hath already appeared) to the *Infant-children* of *Proſelytes*, and agreeably it hath been deduced from the *Apoſtolical* practice, that *Infants* were *baptized*, whereas on the other ſide, that other *Sacrament* being inſtituted in their *poſtcœnium*, in all reaſon was to belong to none, but ſuch as thoſe that were at that, or are uſually preſumed to come thither, and thoſe are not wont to be *Infants*, but onely thoſe of *full age*: Or if the *Euchariſt* were ſuppoſed *anſwerable* to the *eating* of the *Paſchal Lamb* (as indeed it is not, it being the *commemorative Paſſover* onely, in the cloſe of which this was *inſtituted*, and the *Lamb* not eaten till the *evening*, after *Chriſt our Paſſover was ſacrificed for us*) yet *Infant-children* cannot be ſuppoſed partakers of that, becauſe they could not come up to *Jeruſalem*, where onely this *Lamb* was eaten, no more than they could *eat ſtanding*, which was a *rite* of that *Paſchal* Supper. And laſtly, the *Euchariſt* being ordained to be obſerved in *remembrance* of *Chriſt*, the *Infants* could not be due partakers of that, as in *Baptiſm* (ſuppoſing it the *Sacrament* of *initiation* into the *Church*) 'tis manifeſt they might be then *initiated*, that age being as capable of receiving ſuch *benefits*, as it is of *food*, but no more capable of performing *actions* of *piety*, commemorating of *Chriſt*, &c. than it is of *acting*, or *ſpeaking*, &c. *Sect.* 76.

And therefore, thirdly, if in any age of the *ancient Church*, that cuſtome prevailed, of [i] *communicating Infants*, it is apparent, that, as that was without any obligation, from that place, *Joh.* 6. (and yet in all probability from a miſunderſtanding of that place) ſo the *univerſal Church* of *Chriſt*, which afterward diſcerned that miſtake, and diſuſed that *practice*, did ſtill continue that other of *baptizing Infants*. And if they that did thus, did ſo punctually *define* and diſtinguiſh in this matter, and were not at all moved by the arguments upon which they left off *communicating* of *Infants*, to leave off the *baptizing* of *Infants*, (but were rather more ſtrict in obſerving it) Then what reaſon can be brought from hence, why they that deſire to make uſe of the *practice* of that *Church* in the one, the leaving off to *communicate Infants*, ſhould not think themſelves obliged to obſerve it in the other; or indeed, that they that neither follow that *age*, nor that *Church*, where *children* were both *baptized* and *communicated*, nor that, wherein *communicating Infants* being upon reaſon laid down, *baptizing* them was thought ſufficient, ſhould yet think fit to draw arguments againſt us from the *practice* of the *Church*, whereby they will not themſelves be *obliged*, and never conſider what the *Church* hath done, to *imitate* it, but onely to furniſh themſelves with *pleas* to *divide* from it? *Sect.* 77.

[i] *Paulinus* Ep. 12. *Inde parens ſacro ducens de fonte ſacerdos Infantes, niveos corpore, corde, habitu, Circunclanſque rudes feſtis altaribus agnos, Pura ſalutiferis imbuit ora cibis.* Vide Vincent. Rich. ad Or. 14. Procli. p. 413. &c.

Fourthly, if the *ancient Church*, having no *Precept* from *Chriſt*, nor *Practice* from the *Apoſtles*, were ſo tender, leſt they ſhould deprive *Infants* of any the moſt improbable part of their due, that they *communicated* them, and cannot truly be charged of a crime, though perhaps of a *miſunderſtanding* of an obſcure *Scripture* in ſo doing, (for ſure to give them *bread* or *wine*, was an indifferent *ceremony*, and as much in the power of the *Church* to uſe, as the giving them *milk* or *hony*) then what ſhall be ſaid in excuſe of an *uncharitable* age, that will rather venture to unravell all, to oppoſe an *univerſal cuſtome* at leaſt, nay an *Apoſtolick practice*, and as we have all reaſon to think, an *Inſtitution* of *Chriſt*, than retain an *harmleſs* innocent *ceremony*, of bringing their *children* into the boſome of the *Church*, to receive thoſe *benefits*, of which they are capable at the preſent (ſuch acknowledgedly is *Chriſt's benediction*) and to be in a poſture of receiving all others, as ſoon as ever they are capable? *Sect.* 78.

Fifthly, to ſpeak yet ſomewhat more particularly of the *ancient Churches communicating* of *Infants*, As it is certain that St. *Auguſtine*, interpreting that paſſage of *Chriſt*'s, *Joh.* 6. literally of the *Sacrament*, founded on it the *neceſſity* of *exhibiting* it to *Infants* newly *baptized*, and preſſed the *Pelagians* with this, as *Eccleſiæ totius dogma, the opinion of the whole Church*: So theſe two things are obſervable of it, Firſt, the *original*, from whence this was firſt *derived* to *Infants*, viz. the *cuſtome* (very *proper* and *laudable*) of adminiſtring the *Lord's Supper* to all *adulti*, or *grown men* and *women*, preſently (the ſame *day* at leaſt) after their *Baptiſm*, from whence it came by degrees to *Infants* alſo. But then ſecondly, this was done with a conſiderable difference: Thoſe of *age* received that *Sacrament*, *ſub utraque ſpecie*, *under both kinds*, both of *bread* and *wine*, but *Infants* onely under that of the *wine*, if *Hugo de Sancto Victore* may be credited (*Pueris recens natis ſacramentum in ſpecie ſanguinis eſt miniſtratum*) adding that reaſon for it, *quia tales naturaliter ſugere poſſunt, becauſe ſuch are naturally able to ſuck*. Thirdly, that when this of *communicating Infants* was left off, yet the cuſtome of giving the *Sacrament* to the *Adulti* immediately upon *Baptiſm*, laſted longer in the *Church*, and is mentioned by *Theophylact* on the 10*th* of *Luke*: and ſo as this came in by *miſtake*, it was *deliberately*, and upon grounds of *knowledge* left off again. Fourthly, that even in the ages wherein this was uſed, and with ſome earneſtneſs urged by St. *Auguſtine* againſt his *adverſaries*, it is by him mentioned but as a *dogma* or *opinion* of the *Church* (ſuch are all the *ceremonies* of the *Churches conſtituting*) and neither as a *Doctrine* of *Scripture*, nor *Tradition* from the *Apoſtles*, as by the ſame St. *Auguſtine*, and thoſe which are *ancienter* than he, the *baptizing* of *Infants* is affirmed to be. *Sect.* 79.

L. 1. [d] *de Sacr.* c. 20.

Sect. 80. Laſtly then, I conceive, that the giving of *wine* to the *baptized Infants*, differs much from admitting them to that *Sacrament*, and was at the moſt but an occaſion of allowing them the *Prayers* of the *Church*, that they might be partakers of the *death* of *Chriſt*, and all the *benefits* thereof, which ſtill was but the kindneſs and *charity* of the *Church* toward them. But then it is evident, that beſide this, there is much more in that *Sacrament*, and particularly the *offering* to *God* our *reaſonable ſacrifice*, and *plighting* of our *charity* one to another, and of taking up *Chriſt's Croſs*, and ſo *communicating* with his *ſufferings*. And to this it is not pretended that *Infants* were admitted, either by themſelves or their *Sureties* (as in *Baptiſm* they are *perſonally* admitted to the *benefits* of the *Covenant*, and by their *proxies* they *vow* the *duties* of the *Covenant*) nor conſequently that they were brought to the *Lord's Table* at the uſual times of thoſe *adminiſtrations*, but onely were allowed ſome minute parts of the *holy wine*, in imitation of what was *ſolemnly* done to the *adulti* on the day of their *Baptiſm*, and in compliance with the *literal* ſound of the *words* of *Chriſt*, *Joh.* 6. 53. And on the other ſide, through the moſt *flouriſhing* ages of the *ancient Church*, we know that thoſe that had been *baptized* in their *infancy*, but were not yet ſufficiently *inſtructed*, were ſolemnly *diſmiſt* out of the *Church* when the *Lord's Supper* was to be *celebrated*, moſt ſtrictly interdicted to be preſent to *ſee*, or *approach* thoſe *holy Myſteries*, As is known by the *Ite miſſa eſt*, the younger ſort were to depart, when the *offertory-ſervices* began.

Sect. 81. In the next place *Num.* 19. is attempted the diſproving of all argument brought in defence of *Pædobaptiſm* from *Peter's words*, *Act.* 2. 39. *The Promiſe is made to you, and to your children.*] To which I anſwer, That if any have made uſe of that very unconcludent *argument*, I have nothing to ſay in defence of them; I think the *practice* is founded on a better *baſis* than ſo, and that the word *children* there, is really the *poſterity* of the *Jews*, and not peculiarly their *Infant children*.

Sect. 82. As for the anſwer that *Num.* 20. is rendred to that place (on which I acknowledge to lay ſome weight) 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. [*but now are your children holy*] I am obliged to examine that, and view it in its utmoſt force. The anſwer is, that [*thoſe words ſignifie nothing but that they are holy by deſignation, juſt as* Jeremy *and* John Baptiſt *were ſanctified in their mothers womb*, i. e. *deſigned and appointed for holy miniſteries, but had not the Promiſe of the Father, the gift of the holy Ghoſt for all that ſanctification, and juſt ſo the children of Chriſtian Parents are ſanctified*, i. e. *deſigned to the ſervice of Jeſus Chriſt, and the future participation of the Promiſes.*] The invalidity of this anſwer will be diſcerned, Firſt, by the method of the *Apoſtles* arguing in that place, for the cohabiting of the *believing wife* with the *unbelieving husband*, &c. becauſe the *unbelieving husband hath been ſanctified by the believing wife, or elſe were your children unclean, but now are they holy:* That muſt needs be this, Unleſs there were ſome hope that the cohabiting of a *believer*, ſhould be a means to bring an *unbeliever* to the *faith*, 'twould certainly follow, That their *children were unclean*. Now I demand of this pretended interpretation, whether it be poſſible that St. *Paul*'s argument ſhould conclude, being underſtood in *this* ſenſe? Suppoſe *Jeremy*'s, or *John Baptiſt*'s parents had been one a *believer*, and the other an *unbeliever*, could it of them be concluded, if they did not, upon the hope of doing good one upon the other, cohabit, *their children* could not be *ſanctified by God*, i. e. *ſecretly deſigned to any holy miniſtery*? This were abſolutely to confine *God's deſignations*, and *predeſtinations* of this kind, to none but the *children* of *believers*, as if the child of *parents*, either, or both *heathen*, could not by *God* be made uſe of to his higheſt *miniſteries*, as well as a *blaſpheming* and *perſecuting Paul*, who yet, we know, when ſuch, was ſo *predeſtinate*.

Sect. 83. It is known that *Jeremy*'s and *John*'s *ſanctification*, or *deſignation* to *holineſs*, was a work onely of *God*'s, and that depends not upon ſuch accidental conditions, as is the *cohabiting* of the *parents*, and therefore cannot have place in this matter. And if it be ſaid, that the meaning of the word is, that the *children of ſuch are not actually holy*, but onely by *deſignation*, meaning by that, the *deſignation* of the *Church*, as *Jeremy* was *ſanctified* by the *deſignation* of *God*, and that the [*as*] is to be extended no farther, than to compare them in reſpect of *deſignation*, and not in reſpect of thoſe, by whom they were *deſigned*, then indeed as this is the onely way I can think of, to avoid the former abſurdity, ſo it is in effect the confeſſion of what we pretend to be the force of theſe words. For all that we underſtand by *holy* in that place, is, *holy* by *deſignation* of the *Church*, i. e. by *Baptiſm*, to which when they are brought by the *Congregation*, and admitted by the *Miniſter*, they are thus *conſecrated* and *devoted* to *God*; and if this be the onely way of avoiding our concluſion from that Text, the *concluſion* will be the more eſtabliſhed, inſtead of being weakened by it.

Sect. 84. And herein it is farther to be obſerved, that in fitting the *parallel* betwixt the *holineſs* of the *children* in St. *Paul*, and of *Jeremy* or the *Baptiſt*, this difference is acknowledged, that they two were *deſigned to holy Miniſteries, and theſe to the ſervice of Jeſus Chriſt, and the future participation of the Promiſes*] which again ſeeing it cannot be ſaid of *God's ſecret deſignation* (for ſure he may deſign thoſe to this end, whoſe *parents* are neither of them *Chriſtian*) muſt needs be applyed to the *deſignation* of the *Church*, and then that is the very thing I mean by bringing, and receiving them to *Baptiſm* (which is the deſigning, or *devoting* them to the *ſervice* of *God*, and *future participation of the Promiſes*) and is all that I pretend to conclude from that place.

Sect. 85. There is but one thing in which that *anſwer* can be thought to be uſefull to the *Anabaptiſts* purpoſe, *viz.* that as *Jeremy*'s being *ſanctified* in the *womb*, was his being *deſigned* onely to receive, and not his having *actually* received the *gift* of the *holy Ghoſt*: So the *ordinary Infant's* being *ſanctified*, is onely his being *deſigned* to the *grace* of *God*, not his having *actually received* it. To which I anſwer, that this *concluſion* with ſome limitation (and that *equal* on both parts of the compariſon) will be ſafely acknowledged by us, *viz.* that as *Jeremy*, and the *Baptiſt* had not from the womb the *gift* of the *holy Ghoſt*, neceſſary for their *Prophetick* office, as being at that time, through want of underſtanding, uncapable of exerciſing it, but yet had at that time that ſpecial *favour* of *God* (vouchſafed to, though unknown by them) of being *deſigned* to that ſpecial office of dignity; ſo the *Chriſtian Infant-children* have not the *gift* of *faith*, &c. infuſed into them, as long as they are uncapable of *exerciſing* it, but yet have the favour from *Chriſt* and his *Church*, the *favour* of being *deſigned* to the *participation*

partem of that, and other the like graces neceſſary for their ſtate, as ſoon as they are capable of receiving them, unleſs they by [k] ſatisfying their part of the *Covenant*, diſengage *God* of performing his part of it. [k] falſifying, or failing in.

To the anſwer (inſiſted on *Num.* 21.) to the words of St. *Peter* [*be baptized, and ye ſhall receive the holy Ghoſt*] viz. that *the receiving the holy Ghoſt there was the rite of Confirmation, and that not as an effect of Baptiſm, but onely a conſequent of it*] I ſhall make this return, that if the whole arguing be admitted, and granted by us, and ſo the concluſion from it, that thoſe words recited, are incompetent to prove that the *holy Ghoſt* (which is there mentioned as conſequent to) is received *in Baptiſm*, this will be far from aſſiſting the *Anabaptiſts* againſt us: For firſt, we muſt have leave to take notice, that by this anſwer, the rite of *Confirmation*, and that intitled a *myſtery*, is aſſerted from St. *Peter's words* (though *Baptiſmal grace* be not aſſerted) and I ſhall believe, that the acknowledgment of the *Apoſtolicalneſs* of that rite, may ſtand the *Church* in as much ſtead againſt the *Anabaptiſts*, as any other advantage, that could be pretended to from thoſe words. For certainly, if the *holy Ghoſt* be given in *Confirmation* in that richer latitude, (as the ſtate of the perſon confirmed is more capable) Then nothing hinders, but that by *Baptiſm* (an *inſtitution* of *Chriſt* himſelf, which is thereby to have the *precedence of Confirmation*, that pretends onely, though from, and under *Chriſt*, yet no otherwiſe than as by *Apoſtolical inſtitution*) ſuch lower *graces* may be given as that lower ſtate is capable of: Or however the very receiving into *Covenant*, and being made capable of ſuch ſuperinveſtitures, as this of *Confirmation* is, and with it of the *holy Ghoſt*, of which without *Baptiſm* they are not in that Text ſuppoſed capable, is a *gift* and *benefit*, and ſo a *grace* of *Baptiſm*, very well worth the valuing. Secondly, that which of *Baptiſm* is not proved by thoſe words there repeated, may yet (as far as by our former *anſwers* it appears to be aſſerted by us) be proved by other Texts, either *ſingle*, or in *conjunction* with one another, as by that of the *childrens being holy*, in reſpect of their *Baptiſm*, by that title of *Baptiſm* that it is the *laver of regeneration*, compared with *Chriſt's* words, *Except ye be born again of water and the ſpirit*, &c. *Sect.* 86.

But I ſhall not need to go farther than this Text it ſelf, when it is recited intire, as now it was uſefull to the *Anabaptiſts* pretenſions that it ſhould be mutilated. For St. *Peter's* words are, *Act.* 2. 37. *Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of the Lord Jeſus to the remiſſion of ſins, and ye ſhall receive the holy Ghoſt:* Where, though the perſons to whom he ſpake are not imagined to be *Infants*, but thoſe that were *pricked at the heart*, ver. 37. yet to this point, of *Baptiſm* being the means to convey the *Promiſes*, for which the argument ſets indiſtinctly the *holy Ghoſt*, meaning thereby not all, but ſome *graces* of the *holy Ghoſt*, theſe words are a pregnant evidence. For leaving the λήψεσθε, *ye ſhall receive*] in the *future*, to the rite of *Confirmation*, yet ſtill at preſent this *Baptiſm* is εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, *to remiſſion of ſins*; That *pardon of ſins*, which is certainly a principal *Promiſe*, and a ſpecial and moſt valuable *gift* of *God*, is ſet down as an effect of *Baptiſm*. And though for *actual* and *habitual* ſins, ſuch as are there ſpoken of, *Repentance* be alſo required, as to prepare for *Baptiſm*, ſo to make capable of *remiſſion*; yet in *children* that are not *guilty* of thoſe ſins, nor capable of that *repentance*, there is little appearance of reaſon from that place either to exact *repentance*, to qualifie for *remiſſion*, or to doubt, but, as *habitual* ſins may be remitted by *Repentance* and *Baptiſm*, ſo, *Original* ſin may be remitted by *Baptiſm* alone without *Repentance*, the very *receiving* into the *Covenant* of *Grace*, the *Evangelical Covenant*, which is the effect of *baptiſm*, being *interpretatively* the quitting us from that *debt*, and ſetting us right in the *favour* of *God*, and giving us title to the peculiar *cuſtody* and *protection* of *Angels*, *Matthew* 18. 10. till by our wilfull *breaches* and *perjuries*, we again forfeit our Tenure. *Sect.* 87.

I cannot diſcern any thing more in this 21. *Num.* which looks like an advantage againſt us, and may conſequently want any reply. For that *they that are capable of the ſame grace, are not alway capable of the ſame ſign, as females among the Jews, that were not capable of Circumciſion*] is of no force againſt us, who know that *females* were *initiated* among them by *Baptiſm*, and that that is the thing for which we contend: And again, that beſide the *capacity* of the *grace*, the *Inſtitution* of the *ſign* is alſo required to make any thus *capable* of the *ſign*, and conſequently that though they, for whom a *ſign* is not *inſtituted*, are not capable of *that ſign*, yet of another *ſign* they are *capable*, which was *inſtituted* for them. *Sect.* 88.

And ſo likewiſe, that [*God doth not always convey his graces in the ſame manner, but to ſome mediately, to others immediately,*] 'tis not our intereſt to queſtion, who contend onely for the *Chriſtians* obſervance of the *Inſtitution* of *Chriſt*, and ſo for the bringing all to *Baptiſm*, who are allowed to be *admitted* to it, and not for the *confining* the *graces* or *mercies* of *Chriſt* within any limits of ours, or the *annexing* them to the *miniſtery* of others ſo *inſeparably*, that they that are not involved in the *guilt*, ſhall be involved in the *ſufferings* or *puniſhments* of their *neglects*. *Sect.* 89.

To the 22. *Num.* which ſuppoſes the aſſertors of *Pædobaptiſm* to *complain againſt God, and not to be content with him, unleſs they may baptize their children, taking exceptions that God did more for the children of the Jews*] the anſwer will be brief, that there is no ſuch *complaint* made by any of us, nor imaginable cauſe for ſuch complaint, in caſe it were *true* (as we pretend it moſt *falſe*) that *God* had *excluded our children from baptiſm*. For truely we look upon *God's inſtitutions* not as *natural*, but as *moral inſtruments*, and conſequently no farther neceſſary to us, than *God* hath will'd they ſhould be, and therefore conclude that *God*, who *inſtituted Circumciſion* among the *Jews*, a *ſeal* of their *Covenant*, but not *inſtituted* it to us, will make good his richeſt *Promiſes* to us, though we be not *circumciſed*. All our *complaint* is of *men*, not of *God*, in reſpect of him we look upon it as a *mercy*, not an *unkindneſs*, that our *children* are not obliged to ſuch a *bloudy rite*, as *Circumciſion* was, and ſhould confeſs our ſelves *an adulterous generation indeed* (though we conceive *Chriſt's* words do little belong to that *matter*) if we ſhould *ſeek after that ſign*. But of men, who being freed from a *bloudy ceremony* (by the *bloud* of *Chriſt*, who was himſelf *circumciſed*, and therein *ſhed bloud*, but ſoon after *nail'd* that to his *Croſs*) will not yet allow *Chriſt* to continue a much more *gentle rite*, and that alſo of old required of them, while they were under that *heavier* yoke, and who being ſo guilty themſelves, *complain* of us for *complaining*. Of theſe, I ſay, though it be not very ſeaſonable to *complain*, *Sect.* 90.

we may have leave to requeſt this one favour, That we may not be deemed their *enemies*, *becauſe we tell the truth*, and have no other deſign imaginable in this diſpute, but to reduce them to a due *value* of, and *obedience* to *Chriſt's Inſtitution*.

Sect. 91. For the other particulars in that 22. *Num.* which make a *difference betwixt Circumciſion and Baptiſm, in reſpect of the remanency of the ſign in the fleſh, but not of this*, &c. we have already ſpoken ſufficiently. But when in the cloſe it is pretended, That we are guilty of the *greateſt vanity in the World, in affirming, that unleſs the mercies of God be conſigned in Baptiſm, we ſhall want the comfort of it*; I muſt, as formerly I have done, *anſwer* this, by *diſclaiming* the *argument* which the *Padobaptiſt* is ſuppoſed to uſe, and to which this is juſtly *objected*. For, as in reſpect of *God*, if it were granted, that his *Promiſes* were made without any *ſign* at all, we could *abſolutely* rely on his *Word*, and never think he could falſifie that, and ſo want no comfort in reſpect of that; ſo now that we are perſwaded, he hath *inſtituted* this *ſign*, we ſhall never be deprived of our comfort, by being deprived of the *ſign*, unleſs when it is done by our own default, and ſo we are deprived of our *innocence* alſo. For if through the preſentneſs of *danger*, we are intercepted the *liberty* of calling for the *miniſter*, from him regularly to receive this *ſign*, or when by his *unkindneſs*, or neglect of his *duty*, or by an in-rode of *Schiſm* we are deprived of, and denied that *privilege* of bringing our *Infants* to *Baptiſm*, we can very comfortably depend on the *Promiſe* of *God*, that our *infelicities* ſhall not be our *guilts*, much leſs the *injuſtices* of others, the betraying of thoſe *innocents*, and ſo we ſhall not want *comforts*, either when we look on our *unbaptized children*, or reflect on our *ſelves*, who diligently ſought it for them. All the *uncomfortableneſs* of our condition is, to ſee the *Inſtitution* of *Chriſt* laid aſide, the *practice* of the *Apoſtles*, the perpetual uſage, and *Canons* of the *Church* deſpiſed, and our ſelves ſcoffed at, as *Formaliſts*, or *Impoſtors*, that deſire to reduce our *brethren* to the *unity* of the *Church*, from whence they are departed, and to the *obedience* of *Chriſt*, in all his *Ordinances* and *Inſtitutions*, which is a part of that *meekneſs*, and *charity*, and *peaceableneſs*, that was ſo paſſionately by *Chriſt* recommended to his *diſciples*, and without which no man hath right to that appellation.

Sect. 92. The 23. *Num.* begins thus, *Now ſince there is no ſtrength in the doctrinal part, the practice and precedents Apoſtolical and Eccleſiaſtical, will be of leſs concernment, if they were true, as is pretended, becauſe actions Apoſtolical are not always rules for ever.* That the *Practice Apoſtolical* ſhould not be of much concernment in this matter, will appear ſtrange to any that remembers but this one thing, That *Baptiſm* is a *Sacrament*, that *Sacrament* an *Inſtitution* of *Chriſt's*, *that Inſtitution* not founded in any *reaſon* of *immutable truth*, but onely in the *poſitive Will of Chriſt*, and ſo that there is nothing conſiderable in this queſtion (or any of this nature) but how it was *delivered* by *Chriſt*. And when any *queſtion* ariſes of that, or ſuch like fact, and that not fully determined by the words of the *Inſtitution* ſet down in the *ſtory* of *Chriſt*, Is there, or can there be any thing of ſo much concernment imaginable, as the *Apoſtles practice*; and, after that, the *Precedents Eccleſiaſtical*? When, concerning the other *Sacrament* of the *Euchariſt*, any queſtion is made of the meaning of the *words* of the *Inſtitution* in the *Goſpel*, can there be any better way of judging, than by knowing the *Apoſtles* ſenſe of ſuch words, or ſurer way of diſcerning that, than by their *practice*, eſpecially if it be ſet down by themſelves? Certainly, this is not a matter for *Reaſon* to judge in, unleſs it be by deducing conſequences from *Chriſt's* words, or the *Apoſtles*, or one or both of their *practices*. For matters of *fact*, as theſe are, *Teſtimonies* are our onely *Arguments* of probation: And of them, whoſe *Teſtimonies* are *authentick*, and who cannot be deemed to have regulated their *practice* by any *rule*, but that of *Chriſt's Inſtitution*, nor to have been *deceivable*, or fallible in judging of that, *Practice* is the moſt *lively*, and infallible *Interpreter*.

Sect. 93. And if the rule be not univerſal, that *All actions Apoſtolical are always rules for ever:* yet when the *actions* are of ſuch a *ſacred*, and *publick nature*, that all the ſucceeding world are as much concerned in them as they, and when it is the action not of *one Apoſtle* alone, upon ſome private impellent, but of *all* in conjunction, doing the ſame thing, and when in a matter of *divine Inſtitution*, wherein to doe any thing contrary to the intention of *Chriſt*, is to violate that truſt repoſed in them, as *Proxies*, and *Commiſſaries*; and *laſtly*, when there is no *character* in the *action*, nor *propriety* in the *circumſtances* of it, to conclude their *practice* a *temporary practice*, deſigned for the preſent onely: When, I ſay, all theſe *concur*, (and when nothing interpoſes to the *contrary* to make their *practice* a rule for the future *Church*,) there is little gained by pretending againſt us, that *actions Apoſtolical are not always rules for ever*; when the *practice* is once granted (and in this part of the diſcourſe it is ſuppoſed) then to render it *unconcludent*, or no *rule for ever*, it would be neceſſary to ſhew the grounds of doing it, *proper* to thoſe circumſtances, and not *competible* with others, and not to throw off, upon a bare *poſſibility* or *probability*, that it *may*, that which no way appears to *have* been deſigned *temporarily*. Nay, that what was done by the *Apoſtles*, if it were not *a rule for ever*, was yet an effect of ſuch a *rule* formerly given by *Chriſt*, and interpretable by this *practice* to be ſo, there cannot be a better way to proye than the *conſtant practice* of the *following Church*, who, if it were but a *temporary Inſtitution*, cannot be deemed ignorant of that, or fit to be inſtructed by us in it, and who cannot be imagined to have *univerſally* joyned in a *conſpiracy*, to retain that *for ever*, which they knew to be otherwiſe deſigned by thoſe, from whoſe *practice* they took it.

Sect. 94. One reaſon or motive is offered us in that 23 *Num.* why the *baptizing* of *Infants*, might be *convenient* in the *Apoſtles* times, *till they had engaged a conſiderable party*, and not after, becauſe 'twas then the *new-ſpring of Chriſtianity*, and ſo it might be uſefull, by this means to *make them parties againſt the Gentile ſuperſtition*, and, *by preoccupation, to aſcertain them to their ſect, when they came to be men.* And truely, if this were a motive for the *Apoſtle* to *baptize Infants* at that time, to keep them by this *early preoccupation* from being *heathens*; then, Firſt, there is to be acknowledged ſome uſe of *baptizing Infants*, though they *underſtood* not then what is done to them, nor yet have any *remanent durable* quality *impreſſed* on their *fleſh* (which was formerly argued againſt:) And ſecondly, 'tis evident, That that *reaſon* is ſtill as perfectly in force, as ever it was, the danger being ever ſince as great among us, that *vicious practices* (as contrary to the Law of *Chriſt*, and irreconcilable with the *Promiſes*, as the *heathen*

ſuper-

ſuperſtition was) will earneſtly, and irreſiſtibly *inſinuate* themſelves, if there be not *early* means uſed to *prevent* them. And the *vow of Baptiſm* is as diſtinctly oppoſed to theſe, and the *Grace of Chriſt* (implored and beſtowed there) as effectual to the *preventing*, or ſupplanting of them, as of *heathen ſuperſtitions* it could be ſuppoſed to be.

Sect. 95. And for any *other reaſon not tranſmitted to us.*] I confeſs not to be moved with ſuch remote, and onely *poſſible* fears, nor to *apprehend* (any more than I can be bound to *anſwer*) the force of a *reaſon* before it be made *known* to me. And the rather upon this confidence, that if this *reaſon* in the *Clouds*, this *reaſon not tranſmitted to us*, had yet been *tranſmitted* to *former* ages, and by thoſe accounted to be of any weight, It is not imaginable, that through all time, that *reaſon* would have been oppoſed by the *contrary practice* of the *pureſt*, as well as leſs *pure* ages, and never have prevailed with any, till it met with an *handfull* of men in theſe laſt and worſt days, to whom alſo 'tis ſuppoſed in the argument, that the *reaſon was not tranſmitted*, to which it is conſequent, that it did not *come* down to them.

Sect. 96. In the cloſe of that *Num.* 23. 'tis again interpoſed, that *the queſtion of fact it ſelf is not ſufficiently determined, and the precept of baptizing all nations doth as little advantage to prove it, as any of the reſt, becauſe other parallel expreſſions of Scripture, expound themſelves to a ſenſe that includes not all abſolutely, but onely thoſe that are of a capable condition, as* [*Worſhip God, and, Sing to him all the nations*.] To which I anſwer, Firſt, that I do not believe, or pretend that that precept of *Chriſt* doth neceſſarily infer (though it do as little deny) that *Infants* are to be *baptized*, and ſo this *argument* thus produced for the *Padobaptiſt*, is another of the *blind* and the *lame*, that are of more uſe to betray and loſe, than defend and ſecure that *fort*, in which they are placed. Secondly, it is leſs reaſonably pretended, that we ſhould think this place, which is onely a *Precept*, to be a *Proof* of the *fact*, as that ſignifies (and ſo it muſt) the *practice Apoſtolical:* And yet thirdly, the *inſtance* that is produced to hinder this *Text* from concluding, is very *infirm* alſo: for though in a *command* to *Sing* and *Worſhip*, given to *all nations*, they that can doe neither, cannot be ſuppoſed included, yet in a command of doing that to others, of which all others are equally capable from thoſe, to whom the *command* is given (as ſure 'twas as eaſie for the *Apoſtle* to *baptize* the *Infant* as the *grown* man) there is no *reaſon* to determine or reſtrain it. And that is the caſe in hand, where the command is not given to *all nations* to *ſeek*, or *prepare* for *Baptiſm*, but to the *Apoſtles* to *gather* and *baptize* them, and of being carryed and waſhed the *child* is capable, though of *acting* and *adoring* it be not capable.

Sect. 97. To the *anſwer Num.* 24. rendred to a like argument, pretended to be urged by us from the mention of *Stephanas*'s *family* [*that it is but conjecture at the beſt*] I return my explicit conſent, and think it unreaſonable that the *Apoſtles* bare mention of *baptizing* his *houſhold*, 1 *Cor.* 1. 16. ſhould be thought competent to conclude, that *Infants* were *baptized* by him, when it is uncertain, whether there were any ſuch at all in his *houſe*. What uſe is to be made of ſuch *teſtimonies* as theſe hath formerly been ſet down, ſo as to yield them *unconcludent* to this matter; and therefore I ſhall not need to ſay any more of that, but that *inconcludent arguments* are more advantageous to the enemy, than to any man elſe, and are the moſt favourable account that can be given of the *Anabaptiſts Schiſm* from the *Church*, that ſeeing ſome ſuch arguments inſiſted on, which they juſtly believed to be of no force, they likewiſe perſwaded themſelves that others of *greater* ſtrength, were of as *little*, and though not by them, were yet by ſome other as eaſily to be avoided, and anſwered alſo.

Sect. 98. The 25 *Num.* proceeds to conſider *Tradition* in this matter; and, Firſt, to *diſclaim all value of that allegation, Tradition being rejected by the reformed Churches:* And ſecondly, to *demand how, if the Topick from the Tradition were good, Tradition could be truely pretended for this?* To both of theſe the anſwer muſt be joyntly given, firſt, by *defining*, then by *diſtinguiſhing* of *Tradition*.

Sect. 99. Of Tradition. For firſt, the word *Tradition* ſignifying no more than *delivering*, and that *metonymically* taken by Saint *Paul* for the *thing delivered*, i. e. either for *practices* or *doctrines delivered* by *word of mouth*, or by *Epiſtle*, and yet farther brought by *cuſtome* of ſpeech, to denote thoſe peculiarly, that were *delivered* by *word of mouth*, though not by *writing*, It is evident that what is thus *truly delivered*, is of the ſame *authority* with that which is *truly written*, ſuppoſing the perſon that ſpeaks or writes, and the deliberation uſed by him to be the ſame in both caſes. Thus it is certain, that what is *ſpoken*, and ſo *delivered* by Saint *Paul*, is as truly the *doctrine* of Saint *Paul*, and alſo that what is *ſpoken* by him hath all the *authority* that belongs to him, as much, as what is *written* by him.

Sect. 100. A *Tradition* then being thus defined, that it is either a *practice* or *doctrine delivered* by *word of mouth*, it muſt in the next place be *diſtinguiſhed*, and that firſt, in reſpect of the *perſons*, whoſe *practice* or *doctrine* it is pretended to be; and ſecondly, in reſpect of the *means* by which it appears to be *truly* his, whoſe it is pretended to be. In the firſt reſpect it may be either the *doctrine*, or *practice of Chriſt*, or of his *Apoſtles*, or of ſome following *Governors* of the *Church*, or of ſome other either later, or *inferior* to them. In the ſecond reſpect, it may be either, *ſufficiently*, or elſe *inſufficiently* teſtified, to be the *practice* or *doctrine* of thoſe, whoſe it is pretended to be.

Sect. 101. This *definition* and *diſtinction* being thus premiſed, and it being moſt improvident to *define* any one thing of that, which contains things ſo diſtant under it, it will be as unreaſonable to make uſe of the *authority* and *practice* of the *Reformed Churches*, to abandon or caſt off *Tradition* in general, and without diſcrimination, all *Traditions*, as to conceive that they that rejected *errors* for appearing to be ſuch, reſolved, whenſoever they ſhould find *truths* miſcalled by that name, to *reject* them alſo.

Sect. 102. The firſt queſtion then will be, What ſort of *Traditions* have been rejected by the *Reformed Churches*? and then, Whether the *baptizing* of *Infants* be of that ſort? and if it be, to give over all farther pleading for it.

Sect. 103. Firſt then, I ſhall ſuppoſe, that whatſoever doth ſufficiently appear to be the *practice* or *doctrine* of *Chriſt*, or his *Apoſtles*, howſoever it appear, or by what way of conveyance ſoever it comes to us, will not by the *Reformed Churches* be rejected under the notion of *Tradition*. For this I am ſure was wont to be the *queſtion* betwixt the *Reformed* and the *Roman Church*, not whether that were

to

to be *received*, as *Christ's*, &c. which did sufficiently appear to be his, though it were not *written*, but whether many things were not falsly affixed to *him*, and the *Apostles*, as *delivered* by them, which did not sufficiently appear to *descend* from them. Or again, in matters of inferiour nature, Whether that which is by the *Romanists* affirmed to be the *practice*, or *doctrine* of the *Governours* of the *Church*, the *Apostles successours* in the *Primitive* times, can sufficiently be approved to come from them; or whether it be not of some inferiour or later *original*, to whom that *authority* and *reverence* is not due, which is acknowledged, and willingly paid to the former.

Sect. 104. And therefore, having no necessity to descend to any more *minute* considerations, the whole *matter* will be resolved into this one enquiry, Whether the *baptizing* of *Infants* doth sufficiently appear to be of the *institution* of *Christ*, or *Practice Apostolical?* and if it do, we have all that we pretend to upon the score of *Tradition*; and if it do not, we are obliged to disclaim that means of maintaining our plea, or inferring our *Conclusion*.

Sect. 105. And because the way of satisfying this enquiry, is but the saying over again all that hath been formerly said on this subject, this whole discourse having laid the weight of all upon this one *basis*, the *Institution* of *Christ*, and *Practice* of the *Apostles*, It will be unreasonable to doe this any farther, save onely upon a brief *recapitulation*, to refer it to the judgment of any sober *Christian*, Whether first, by *Christ's* founding of the *Institution* of this *Sacrament* in the *Jewish* custome of *baptizing* of *Proselytes*, which appears to have belonged to the *Infant-children* of the *Proselytes*; and secondly, by his being so far from excepting against the age of *children* as a *prejudice*, or hindrance to their coming to him, (*i. e.* to their *Proselytism*) that he affirms them to be the pattern of those, of whom his *Kingdom* is to be made up, and though he be not affirmed in the *Gospel* to *baptize* such (when indeed *Jesus baptized not at all, but his disciples*) yet he *took them into his armes, and laid his hands upon them, and blessed them*, Mar. 10. 16. (which being the ceremony used in the *Church* for those that were fitted for *Baptism*, and distinctly *preparative* to it, they that were by *Christ* afforded that, cannot be thought by *him* less capable of *Baptism* than of that;) And thirdly, by the expres words of the *Apostle*, that *their children are holy*, interpreted by the *context*, so as to infer from the *Apostle's* way of arguing, That it was the custome of those *Apostolick* times to *baptize* the *children* of the *Christian parents*, and so interpreted by the *Christian* writers of the *first* and *purest* ages; And fourthly, by the *Testimonies* of all the *Ancients*, that are found to speak of this matter, without any one pretended to dissent, that this was the *practice* of the *Apostles*: Whether, I say, these four things being put together (the truth of each which hath been before more largely evinced) it be not sufficiently *evident*, That the *baptizing* of *children* is of the *Institution* of *Christ* and *Practice Apostolical*. If it be not, I desire to know what is farther *necessary* to sufficient *conviction* in a matter of this nature, and whether by any more (or equally) competent *arguments*, the contrary may be evinced to be the *Practice* of the *Apostles*, i. e. that they refused to *baptize* the *children* of their *Proselytes*.

Sect. 106. But if it *be*, I shall not need to take notice of the other branches of that *Num.* 25. For first, by the *Testimonies* already produced out of *Justin Martyr*, *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, as well as *Origen*, and then by the expres words of the *Authour* of the *Ecclesiastick Hierarchy*, and of the *Constitutions*, and of St. *Cyprian*, (to which might be added St. *Jerom* and St. *Ambrose*) as well as St. *Augustine*, it is clear, That the *Authority for the Tradition*, *depends not wholly on the Testimony of Origen*, as the one person *from whom St. Augustine had it*. And secondly, there be other *arguments* to joyn (and which are in force by their *conjunction*) with these *Testimonies* for the *Tradition*, so far, that although it were yielded, that *Justin's* and *Irenæus's*, as well as *Origen's affirmation* might be fallible, that *baptism* of *Infants* is by *Tradition* from the *Apostles*; and again, that St. *Augustine* might have it from *Origen*, and be *fallible* also; yet when those other circumstances concur with that, which is affirmed by *Origen*, and no *testimony* or circumstance in the *Institution* be producible against it; and *Augustine*, and the following *Church*, which condemned all *Origen's errours*, doth yet appear to agree with *Origen* in *asserting* this, as *truth*, certainly the aspersing of *Origen* in *other* respects, will not *invalidate*, or weaken his *Testimony* in *this*.

Sect. 107. So again when it follows, that *the necessity of Pædobaptism was not determined in the Church till the eighth age after Christ*, this will be of little importance against us, supposing the meaning of that to be, the defining it absolutely *necessary* to the *salvation* of the *child*. For we do not pretend it to be thus *necessary*, *necessitate medii*, but derive the *necessity* of it from the *Institution* and *Practice* of *Christ*, and his *Apostles*, and charge that onely upon the *parents*, and the *Congregation*, whose guilt it is, if the ordinance be neglected, or despised, but not on the *Infants*, whose want of *understanding* renders them uncapable of contumacy, and *wilfull* sin, though not of being *baptized* or brought to *Christ*.

Sect. 108. And thirdly, it being granted by the *objector*, that *Pædobaptism was by Canon established in the Milevitan African Council*, *Ann. Ch.* 418. yet, as long as it is also confessed, that it was *practised in Africa before*, there will be little concluded against us. For what stood by *Apostolical practice*, and known *custome*, needed not to be prescribed by *Canon*, as that which prevails by force of a *greater*, need not be assisted by a *weaker authority*. And indeed, while the footsteps of so *authentick* a *Tradition* were so lively, and no *adversary*, or *disputer* started up, no *question*, or opposition yet made against a *Common Usage*, 'twere ridiculous for *Councils* to convene, and fortifie it by *Canons*. And so the onely thing reasonably deducible from the lateness of those *Canons*, is, that all that while it was *universally* received without *opposition*: I mean not, that no *Infant* of any *Christian*, was *unbaptized*, through the space of those first *Centuries*, but that the *extending* of the *Institution* to *Infants* was not opposed in the *Church*, till about *Pelagius's* days, whose opinion of *Original* sin (utterly denying the *guilt* of it on *Adam's* posterity) was such, as might consequently produce some change in his *opinion* of *Pædobaptism*. But of that I have formerly spoken *Sect.* 46. As for the saying of *Ludovicus Vives*, *Neminem nisi adultum antiquitus solere baptizari*, it is not of such weight, as that I should here stop to examine the truth, or grounds of that citation, the book being not present by me to do so: I suppose it belongs to the *Infants* of *Heathens*.

Sect. 109. But *Num.* 26. the undertaking is somewhat more considerable, *viz.* that *there is very good evidence from Antiquity, that Infants ought not to be baptized*: Whether this be justly suggested, it will concern

us

us to enquire warily. For it is affirmed to be clear in the sixth *Canon of the Council of Neo-Cæsarea.* The words of that *Canon* are these, Περὶ κυοφορούσης, ὅτι δεῖ φωτίζεσθαι, ὁπότε βούλεται, οὐδὲν γὰρ κοινωνεῖ ἡ τίκτουσα τῇ προαιρέσει διὰ τὸ ἰδίαν εἶναι τὴν προαίρεσιν τὴν ἐν τῇ ὁμολογίᾳ δείκνυσθαι. *A woman with child may be baptized when she pleaſe: for the mother hath nothing to doe with the child, becauſe it is each ones will or reſolution, which is expreſſed or ſignified in the confeſſion* (or *profeſſion*, which is wont to be made in *Baptiſm.*) This certainly is far enough removed from a *clear affirmation* of what was undertaken to be proved by it, *viz. That children ought not to be baptized.* For as for the latter part of the words, which is conceived to do ſo, it is no more than this, that the *confeſſion* or *profeſſion of a woman, that being with child is baptized*, doth onely belong to *her ſelf*, not to the *child*, and conſequently that her *Baptiſm* belongs onely to her *ſelf*, alſo. The words being a proof of what was immediately antecedent to them, that *the parent hath nothing to doe with the child*, οὐδὲν κοινωνεῖ, *hath nothing common with him*, but hath ἰδίαν προαίρεσιν, *a will or choice peculiar to her ſelf*, (*as* ἴδιον is oppoſed to κοινὸν, *peculiar*, or *proper* to *common*) And ſo all that can be concluded from hence, is, that the *child* of ſuch a *parent*, that was *baptized*, when that was in her womb, muſt, when it is *born*, have a *baptiſm* for it ſelf, and the *baptiſm* of the *parent* not be thought to belong to it. And this in *oppoſition* to the conceit of ſome *Jewiſh Rabbins*, (taken up, it ſeems, by ſome *Chriſtians*) who ſay, *Si gravida fiat proſelyta, adeóque lavacro ſuſcipiatur, proli ejus baptiſmo opus non eſt, That if a woman great with child become a proſelyte, and be baptized, her child needs not baptiſm when 'tis born.*

As for the giving *demonſtration of election or choice required in the baptiſmal confeſſion*, of which the *child* is ſuppoſed *incapable*, this place doth no farther *affirm* of it, than it is known to be acknowledged by us, *viz.* that no *baptiſm* ought to be *adminiſtred* but upon condition, and ſuppoſition of a *vow* to be undertaken then, and after to be *performed* on the part of the *baptized*, which, as in thoſe of full age, it muſt be done by themſelves; ſo that in *Infants* it is not ſufficient to be done by *proxies* and *undertakers*, is no-way affirmed, or intimated by that *Canon* which belongs quite to another matter. *Sect.* 110.

And for the known cuſtome of *interrogating Chatechumeni in baptiſm*, and the pretended *egregious prevarication in asking queſtions of them, who are known to be uncapable of giving anſwers*; this is of no farther force than the uſual exceptions againſt *Godfathers*, and that *cuſtome* hath [1] elſewhere been ſufficiently vindicated, and as far as the preſent objection preſſes us, is juſtified abundantly by the *capableneſs* of the *ſureties*, or *proxies* that free the action from all *prevarication*, and the obligation that from thence devolves upon the *child*, aſſoon as he comes to *years of underſtanding*, which will make up and ſupply what other defect ſoever can be imagined in that matter. *Sect.* 111. [1] *Pract. Cath.* VI. *Sect.* 2.

This of the *unreaſonableneſs of ſupplying the childs incapacity by the anſwer of the Godfather, and no ſenſible account to be given of it*] is farther inſiſted on *Num.* 27. And the means to prove this unreaſonable, are theſe, 1. That *the pretence of the Roman cuſtome of ſtipulation performed by Tutors in the name of their pupils, is an abſolute vanity.*] To this I anſwer, That the *Tutor's* being, by reaſonable men, and by the *Roman* Law, allowed to *ſtipulate*, and bargain for his *pupil*, as it is perfectly agreeable to the caſe in hand (the *Infant* exactly *parallel* to the *pupil*, his *real no-will*, to the others *no-will* in *Law*) ſo it is an example which will juſtifie this practice from the cenſure of *unreaſonable*, and *egregious prevarication*, and to that it will be conſequent, not that *God muſt be tyed, and Chriſtian Religion tranſact her myſteries by proportion and compliance with the Roman Laws*, but that it may without *prevarication* (in any degree) or *unreaſonableneſs*, be thus appointed and *tranſacted* by them in this caſe, as in other kinds of *ſtipulation* it hath been without danger of ſuch *Cenſure.* *Sect.* 112.

For as to the caſe of a *notable benefit accrewing to the minor*, wherein *Stipulation* is ſaid by *indulgence* to be *permitted*; Firſt, this is not true in any circumſtance. Secondly, if it were, 'twere as reaſonable in *baptiſm*, as in any other caſe. Firſt, 'tis not true that this was a *permiſſion by indulgence*, for it was a known diſtinct *Law*, the *Tutor* may *ſtipulate* for the *minor* as freely, and in all caſes, wherein the man of full age may *ſtipulate* for himſelf, and not onely *in caſe of notable benefit accrewing to the minor*, but in caſe of *ordinary* and equal bargain. And ſecondly, if it were but on *indulgence*, and *permiſſion* of grace, why ſhould not the *Chriſtian* child be as well, and as kindly treated by *Chriſtian* Religion, as the *minor*, by the Laws of thoſe *heathen Romans?* And be the *benefit accrewing* to the *minor* never ſo notable, yet being ſuppoſed but a *temporal* benefit of this life, ſure the favour of *admiſſion* into the *Church*, to be a *member of Chriſt*, to the *grace* of preſent *pardon*, and right to all the *benefits* of the *Covenant*, as ſoon as they are *capable* of them, may deſerve to be compared with that *notable benefit*, that the *minor* is ſuppoſed to be concern'd in. And though again *God* can, and, I doubt not, will beſtow thoſe *benefits* and advantages on that *child*, whoſe fault it is not, that they are not ſo conſigned to him, this ſtill is a mercy of his, which will no-way juſtifie them, who contemn the uſe of this *Sacrament.* *Sect.* 113.

But it is farther inforced, that *though 'tis true, God might, if he would, have appointed Godfathers to give anſwer in behalf of the children, yet we cannot find any authority or ground that he hath; and if he had, 'tis to be ſuppoſed he would have given them Commiſſion to have tranſacted the ſolemnity with better circumſtances, and given anſwers with more truth, than to ſay in the child's name, I do believe, in preſent, when the Infant is uncapable of believing.* For anſwer to this, it muſt be recounted, what was the *original* practice in this matter. Among the *Jews*, ſaith the [m] *Gemara Babyl.* the *Infants* uſed to be *baptized* על דעת *upon the profeſſion*, or *confeſſion* of the *houſe of judgment*, the *Conſiſtory*; and the *Gloſſe* ſaith, the *Triumviri* are ſet over *Baptiſm*, and are neceſſary to it, ודין נעשין לי אב, *and ſo they become to him a Father:* and [n] *Maimonide*, וצריך לטבול בפני שלשה *he muſt be baptized before the Triumviri.* By this it appears, that among the *Jews*, from whom Chriſt was pleaſed to tranſcribe this ſacred rite of *Baptiſm*, this cuſtome alſo was to be found of the *Congregation*, or *Rulers* thereof, to *anſwer* for the *Infant*, according to that forecited from Saint *Auguſtine*, that the *Church lends them others feet, and heart, and tongue, to come, to believe, to profeſs*, &c. *Sect.* 114. [m] Tit. *Chetub.* c. 1. [n] Tit. *Iſuri Bia.* c. 13.

Among the firſt *Chriſtians* in the *Apoſtles* age, the ſame uſe ſeems to be continued; for the cuſtome then being to *baptize* thoſe of age, onely by propoſing to them the *faith* of *Chriſt*, and reformation *Sect.* 115.

of

of life, and *Baptiſm* in the name of *Jeſus Chriſt* for the *remiſſion of ſins*, *Acts* 2. 38. and whole multitudes, 3000. on a day, receiving the *faith* on theſe terms, and being *baptized*, ver. 41. without any greater formality of queſtion and anſwer; nay the word ἐπερώτημα, 1 *Pet.* 3. 21. noting not an *anſwer*, but a *queſtion* (ſuch as is mentioned *Act.* 2. 37.) on his part that is *baptized*, and ſo a coming to *God* as to the *Oracle*, ſeeking, making addreſs to *him*, deſiring upon *Chriſt*'s terms to be received by him, there is no difficulty to underſtand how *children* being brought by others, that were themſelves *baptized*, were alſo upon their *requeſt*, and upon this general declaration of the ends of *Baptiſm* before the *Congregation*, which were the terms on which the *Infant* was ſuppoſed to *enter* into that *Covenant*. But ſoon after, when the *Church* was formed into ſtanding *Congregations*, and the *vow* of *Baptiſm* was contrived into a ſetled *form*, then, as every *Catechumen* or inſtructed *Proſelyte* anſwered for himſelf, ſo every one that was not able to doe ſo, was by ſome perſons of the *Congregation* (in this particular repreſenting the whole) brought to the βαπτιστήριον, or *font*, and the queſtions being asked, as in the *Baptiſm* of the *adulti*, thoſe that brought them, and ſo helpt them to *legs*, were their *proxies* alſo, and helpt them to *tongues*, and ſo anſwered in the *preſent tenſe*, i. e. in the ſame form, wherein the *adulti* did anſwer, which ſignifies not their *affirmation*, that thoſe *Infants* did then actually *believe* (which is the thing charged of *untruth*) any more than a *Tutour ſtipulating*, as the *proxy* of his *Pupil*, can truely be ſaid to affirm, that the *pupil* makes ſuch a bargain, of which he knows that he knows nothing. All that is underſtood by ſuch ſpeeches of the *Godfathers* is, that this is the manner of *proxies ſtipulating* for others, and that unleſs thoſe others, when they come to full age, think fit to perform in their perſons what was thus *ſtipulated* by their *proxies*, they ſhall reap no benefit of that *Covenant*.

Sect. 116. And this is all that is chargeable on theſe anſwers, far from any degree of *untruth*, if truely underſtood, (for the *Godfather* bearing a *double* perſon, is ſuppoſed to ſay truely in his own, that he doth *believe*, and as the other's *proxy*, he deſires that his *profeſſion* may be in *Law* accepted for the other, ſo far as to make him capable of *Baptiſm*, the ſign of *God's Promiſes*,) no more indeed than moſt *ceremonies*, and forms of *Law* may be ſaid to be, the deſigns of which are ſufficiently known by ſober men, and accordingly the words are to be interpreted, *I believe*, i. e. *This child* ſtands bound by theſe *preſents to believe*, and is not to expect any benefit of this *Covenant*, except, when he comes to years, he do *actually* (and *de præſenti* then) *believe all the articles of the Chriſtian faith*, &c. for which we that do *believe* them all have now in his *behalf*, and to his *benefit*, undertaken it.

Sect. 117. And whereas it is added as the advice of *Tertullian*, that, *Cunctatio baptiſmi utilior eſt, præcipuè circa parvulos, That delaying all baptiſm is more profitable, eſpecially about Infants*; and, *Quid enim neceſſe eſt ſponſores periculo ingeri*, &c. *What need is there that the Godfathers ſhould be put upon dangers?* and then that *Gregory Nazianzen makes mention of ſome, to whom baptiſm was not adminiſtred* διὰ ἀνηβότητα, *by reaſon of infancy, and that the parents of St.* Auſtin, *St.* Hierome *and St* Ambroſe, *although they were Chriſtians, yet did not baptize thoſe their children before they were thirty years of age.* This heap of exceptions will neither *ſingly* any one of them, nor all in *conjunction*, conclude any thing againſt us. Not that of *Tertullian*, which pretends to conclude no more, but that in his opinion it was, in *ſome reſpect*, advantageous to make ſome *ſtay of baptiſm*, and that eſpecially in the caſe of *little ones*, which if it were granted, yet will not that advantage of *delay* conclude the *baptizing* of *Infants* unlawfull, or wholly inconvenient, any more than the *baptizing* thoſe of age, where *delay*, in his *opinion*, might be uſefull alſo. But on the contrary, 'tis a clear *teſtimony* of the *practice* in his time of *baptizing children*, as well as others, and hath been ſo applyed by us, in the former part of this diſcourſe among the *teſtimonies* prohibited in this matter. And ſo likewiſe is the other paſſage for the uſage of *Godfathers*, or *ſponſores* in the *Church* in *Tertullian*'s days. What the utility was, which *Tertullian* had in his view, or how well grounded his advice, I ſhall not need now to enquire, his words being a plain proof of the *uſage* in his time, and therefore not producible againſt us.

Sect. 118. And for *Gregory Nazianzen*, who is acknowledged to be for *haſtning of baptiſm in caſe of neceſſity*, and ſo to acknowledge a *neceſſity* of *giving Infants baptiſm* in ſome caſes (which is more than ſufficient to our *pretenſions*) If in his time there be mention of ſome, who were not *baptized* διὰ ἀνηβότητα (granting that to be tenderneſs of *years*, and ſo *Infancy*, whereas it may be otherwiſe, *ignorance* or want of *inſtruction* in thoſe of *elder years*, νήπιος is ἀνόητος, ἄφρων, ἀφωνέστερος, an *ignorant*, or *weak* perſon of *ſmall underſtanding*, as well as νεογνὸς, νεώτερος, μικρὸς, in *Heſychius*) yet ſure this will conclude nothing againſt us, who are able to make the ſame relations in theſe times, of ſome that have done more than ſo, abſolutely withheld *baptiſm* from their dying children, and yet know that the *doctrine* of the *Church* in this age is contrary to thoſe *ſingular practices*. And that it was ſo in *Gregory Nazianzen*'s time, may be demonſtrated by this doctrine in this matter, Τίς δ' ἂν εἴποις περὶ τῶν νηπίων, καὶ μήτε τῆς ζημίας ἐπαισθανομένων, μήτε τῆς χάριτος; τί καὶ ταῦτα βαπτίσωμεν; Πάνυ γε εἴπερ τις ἐπείροι κίνδυνος, κρεῖττον γὰρ ἀνεπαΐστως ἁγιασθῆναι, ἢ ἀπολιπεῖν ἀσφράγιστα καὶ ἀτέλεστα. Orat. 40. *What wilt thou ſay of children, which neither are ſenſible of the loſs, nor the grace? ſhall we baptize them? Yes, by all means, in caſe of urgent danger. For it is better to be ſanctified*, i. e. *baptized, without ſenſe of it, than to dye unſealed, unbaptized.* And not onely in caſe of *danger*, but *abſolutely*, ſaith he, Νήπιόν ὅτι σοι; μὴ λαβέτω καιρὸν ἡ κακία, ἐκ βρέφους ἁγιασθήτω, ἐξ ὀνύχων παιδευθήτω τῷ πνεύματι. *Haſt thou a young child? let not wickedneſs receive the advantage of time, let it be baptized from an Infant, let it be early conſecrated by, or to the Spirit*, ibid.

Sect. 119. And for the example of the *parents* of thoſe *three Fathers*, it will not be producible againſt us, unleſs it be alſo *aſſented* to and approved by them that urge it, and ſo it be defined *exemplary*, and *imitable* not to *baptize* any before that age of thirty. That *baptiſm* in thoſe *Fathers* times, and before their birth, was afforded *children*, is too well known, to want proving. And St. *Auguſtine*'s doctrine is confeſſed to be extremely contrary to the *Anabaptiſts* pretenſions: And the grounds of deferring the *baptiſm* of ſome in that age, were not ſuch as were allowed by the then preſent *Church*, but effects of an opinion of the *greater* (not of the *leſs*) *neceſſity* of *baptiſm*, and ſo the unfitteſt evidence, that could have been pitched on, to infer the deſired *concluſion*.

For

For the *Clinici*, we know, would not be *baptized*, till their *death-beds*; and the reaſon was, becauſe being to be *baptized* but *once*; and attributing ſo extremely much to that *ceremony*, and hoping ſo little for pardon of ſin from any other inſtrument, they durſt not be *baptized* too early, leſt they ſhould ſin again, and have no *remedy*. And the deferring *baptiſm* till thirty or forty years old, was but a ſpice of this fancy, attributing ſo hugely much to *baptiſm*, and ſo nothing to any thing elſe. But then they that did ſo, were the moſt impatient of any to miſs *baptiſm*, when they thought they were near their *laſt*, and would never ſin ſo far againſt their *hypotheſis*, as to let any *Chriſtian's Infant* dye without that *viand*, and ſo doing what they did upon a ſcore ſo contrary to the *Anabaptiſts*, it were ſtrange if it ſhould be producible in favour of them. *Sect.* 120.

For the 28. *Numb.* which is the proving Pædobaptiſm to be *againſt the perpetual analogy of Chriſt's doctrine*, the firſt offer of a reaſon is, *becauſe Chriſt never gave precept to baptize them, nor ever himſelf nor his Apoſtles (that appears) did baptize any of them.* To this the anſwer is already given, that *Chriſt's baptiſm* being founded in the *Jews* cuſtome of *baptizing* of *Proſelytes*, and the cuſtome among them being known to be this, to *baptize* the *Proſelytes*, and their *children*, the indefinite command of *baptizing* all *Nations*, was all that was needfull to comprehend the *children* alſo of thoſe, that received the *faith* of *Chriſt*, eſpecially when *Chriſt*, by a ſpecial expreſſion of his pleaſure concerning *Infants*, aſſured his Diſciples, that they were capable of ſolemn *benediction*, which by *parity* of *reaſon* will conclude, they were not uncapable of *baptiſm* alſo. *Sect.* 121.

As for *Chriſt's not baptizing any*, that will equally be of force againſt all *baptiſm*, for the Text is plain, *Chriſt baptized not, but his diſciples*, John 4. 2. And for the *Apoſtles*, 1. the *negative* argument will be of as much force for us, that the *Apoſtles (that appears) never rejected any from baptiſm*, (nor probably durſt, after they had been rebuked by their *Maſter*, for ſomewhat of that kind, *Mar.* 10. 14.) as it can juſtly be deemed againſt us, that *they did not baptize any*. The truth is, neither of them is *argumentative*. But then 2. that in the *Apoſtles* times *children* were *baptized*, ſeems plain by that place to the *Corinthians*, and then there will be but little reaſon to doubt, but the *Apoſtles* did *baptize* ſuch, at leaſt (which is all one) that they *confirmed* and approved that *practice*. *Sect.* 122.

The next proof of the propoſal, is from *Chriſt's and the Apoſtles requiring ſuch previous diſpoſitions to baptiſm, of which Infants are not capable*, viz. *faith and repentance, as appears by that one place*, Mar. 16. 16. *He that believes and is baptized, ſhall be ſaved, but he that believeth not, ſhall be damned.* To which I anſwer, Firſt, that in thoſe that are capable of *faith* and *repentance*, both thoſe are thus previouſly required, and in thoſe that, through invincible defects, are *uncapable* at the preſent, they are again required ſo far, that if, when they are *capable*, they have them not, *baptiſm* will ſtand them in little ſtead. And this is all that can be concluded from that place of *Mark*: For ſure that ſentence of *damnation* ſhall not fall on him that *believes* not, unleſs he were capable of *believing*. Nay, ſecondly, it is evident from the words, that *Chriſt* doth not annex *belief* to *baptiſm*, as a *neceſſary* adjunct to it, at that *preſent*, for he ſaith not [*He that is baptized and believeth*] but onely adds *Baptiſm* to *Belief*, [*He that believeth and is baptized*] and ſo belongeth not to *this* matter. *Sect.* 123.

But becauſe in the progreſs of that *Numb.* there is, I ſee, no more concluded from that Text, than that *if children are excuſed from a neceſſity of faith, ſo that the want of that does not regularly damn them, then 'twill be ſottiſh to ſay the ſame incapacity of reaſon and faith ſhall not excuſe from the actual ſuſception of Baptiſm.* I ſhall need reply no farther, being perfectly reconciled to the *concluſion*, as far as concerns the *excuſing* of the *child*, and not having the leaſt fear, that the *child* ſhall ever ſuffer for another's negligence in this matter. But then ſtill the *child* having a capacity of *ſuſception* of *Baptiſm*, i.e. of being *baptized*, though not of *faith* or *repentance*, or neglecting or ſeeking of *baptiſm*; they that deny the *child* that privilege, of which it is *ſuſceptive* or capable, may become *uncapable* of that *excuſe*, when the *innocent Infant* ſtands in no need of it. *Sect.* 124.

As for the queſtion, *Whether Infants have faith*, *Numb.* 29. I ſhall profeſs to be none of thoſe, who are concern'd in it, I freely confeſs to believe *faith* to be ſo *neceſſarily* founded in *underſtanding*, that they that have not *underſtanding*, cannot have *faith*, whether *actual* or *habitual*; and when the *Apoſtle* ſaith, that *faith cometh by hearing*, I ſuppoſe he hath fully ſtated that *queſtion*. For whatſoever can be ſaid of *infuſed habits*, thoſe muſt ſuppoſe the ſubjects *capable* of them, or by being *infuſed*, render them ſo. As the gift of *ſtrange tongues*, when 'tis ſupernaturally *infuſed*, muſt either ſuppoſe the ſubject prediſpoſed with *underſtanding*, and ability of ſpeaking ſome *language*, or muſt make him ſo by that *infuſion*. And beſides, what graces are imaginable to be infuſed into *Infants*, will in reaſon be concluded to be *infuſed* at *Baptiſm*, or as effects and conſequents of that, and ſo will be equally unfit to *qualifie* for *Baptiſm* (which is to be done by *previous* diſpoſitions) as if there were no ſuch *habits* acknowledged. *Sect.* 125.

And ſo the reaſon taken from the *Infant ſent to the Mahumedane Province*] is yet ſtronger, than is pretended. For, unleſs the *Infant*, that is to be *baptized*, be before his *baptiſm* ſo imbued by *divine* overſhadowing, or *infuſion*, that, if in ſtead of being carryed to the *font*, he ſhould be carryed to a *Prieſt* of *Mahomet*, and there *circumciſed*, and inſtructed in the *Turkiſh* principles, he would yet, as he came to years of underſtanding, produce acts of *Chriſtian faith*, there will be little reaſon to affirm, that *Infants* of *Chriſtians* have *habitual faith* previous to their *Baptiſm*. *Sect.* 126.

The ſame inconveniences, I ſuppoſe, will lye againſt *ſeminal faith in Infants*, Firſt, becauſe if that be taken in, as a ſuppletory, to give the *child* capacity of *baptiſm*, it muſt then be ſuppoſed previous to, and not beſtowed in, or after *baptiſm*: And ſecondly, 'tis apparent that the *ſeeds of faith* are ſown in *inſtruction*, or *catechizing* (and ſo, as *faith cometh by hearing*, ſo doth *hearing by the word of God*) and they *grow* not up, till they have been thus *ſown*. *Sect.* 127.

As for the *imputative faith*, I ſuppoſe they that ſpeak of it, mean no more than thus, that the *children* of *Chriſtian Parents*, though they have not *faith actually, habitually, ſeminally*, may yet lawfully be admitted to *Baptiſm*, becauſe their *Parents* being *Chriſtian*, and they likely to be brought up in a *Chriſtian* ſociety, this may ſo far ſtand them in ſtead, that upon preſumption of the care of the *Parents* (who deſire *Baptiſm* for them) that they ſhall be brought up in the *faith of Chriſt*, and upon the preſent *undertaking* of the *Godfathers* (which are by the *Congregation* appointed to repreſent the *child*, and *ſtipulate* in his name) they may (though they are at the preſent uncapable of *faith*, or *Sect.* 128.

new vows) be admitted to *Baptiſm*, and ſo pre-engaged, before any rival *luſt*, or *falſe profeſſion* be able to ſolicite them. And if this be the meaning, then, though it cannot be ſaid, that they have *imputative faith*, for they have not *faith* themſelves, and *other folks faith* will never be imputed to them ſo, that they ſhall be thought to have it, yet it may truly be affirmed, that they are look'd on to this purpoſe as kindly, and are as fit to be hoſpitably received by the *Church*, *i. e.* to be *baptized*, as if they had *faith*, the extreme probability of the *hope* at preſent, that they *will* be competently inſtructed, when they come to years (and that ſecured as well, as humanely it can be) being ſufficient to ſound their *Baptiſm* upon, though it be not certain that they will ever *believe*; As the *profeſſion* made by one of full age is his ſufficient qualification, though the *Church* is not ſure that he is not an *hypocrite* at *that minute*, or that he will not be an *Apoſtate* the *next*, and, when *perſecution* ariſes for the Word, be ſtreightway *ſcandalized*.

Sect. 129. The 30. *Numb.* demands, *If baptiſm be neceſſary to the ſalvation of Infants, upon whom is the Impoſition laid? upon the Parents, or the Children? Not the Children, for they are not capable of a Law; not the Parents, for then God hath put the ſalvation of innocent babes into the power of others.* To this I anſwer, by renouncing the whole *hypotheſis* affixt, by this way of arguing, to the maintainers of *Pædobaptiſm*. For we do not at all pretend it neceſſary to the *ſalvation* of *Infants*, upon the very ground that the Diſputer preſumes it *unneceſſary*, becauſe it being acknowledged by all that it is not the *omiſſion*, but *contempt* of *Baptiſm*, that damns, theſe two are not diſtinguiſhable in *Children*, who can be ſaid no more to *omit*, than to *contemn* it. All the *neceſſity* we pretend to in this matter of *Infants*, is *præcepti*, not *medii*, not that it is a *means*, without which they cannot be ſaved, for then the argument would hold that they might be *damned*, or *not ſaved* by another's default, without their own, but that, firſt, having *foundation* in the *Inſtitution of Chriſt* (as that being founded in the *Jews baptizing* of *Proſelytes*, belonged conſequently to their *young children* alſo) and ſecondly, *authorized* farther by the *Apoſtles practice*, and thirdly, uſed through all ages of the *Church* accordingly; and fourthly, when the perverſneſs of *heretical* men queſtioned and oppoſed it, defined by *Councils*; and fifthly, at length *commanded* by the *Church*. From hence, I ſay, the *neceſſity* reſults, and not from any other principle. And this being underſtandable onely by men of age, is not ſuppoſeable to be given to any others, and ſo the *guilt* in this matter is acknowledged to lie onely on thoſe, *i. e.* either on the *Parents* that *refuſe*, or *neglect* it, *diſlike*, or *ſeek* it not for their *children*, or on the *Miniſters*, who refuſe to *give Baptiſm*, or on the *Diſputers*, that infuſe theſe ſcruples unneceſſarily into mens heads, or on the *factious*, that break the *unity* of the *Church* on ſuch cauſeleſs diſlikes as theſe, and inſtead of returning to the *Church*, exclude all regular obedient Sons thereof from their *communion*.

Sect. 130. The 31. *Numb.* propoſes ſome *inconveniences, which the baptizing of Infants ruſhes men upon:* The foundation of which is laid in this *dilemma*, *Either Baptiſm produces ſpiritual effects, or it produces them not*, &c. To prevent all force of thus arguing, I ſay, that if by *ſpiritual effects* are meant *Grace* and *Glory*, *Baptiſm* of *Infants* produces not ſuch *effects*, and conſequently they are not the nearer to *heaven*, if they are (*i. e.* as an *effect* from a *cauſe*, by their being) *baptized*, nor, if it be *neglected*, the farther off. And conſequently the argument that ſuppoſed *without all peradventure, that all Pædobaptiſts would ſay, that their baptiſm did produce ſpiritual effects*, is preſently at an end. All that we ſay of *Baptiſm* is, that it is a *federal* ceremony of *Chriſt's Inſtitution*, to waſh away *Original guilt*, and to admit us *Proſelytes* unto himſelf by his *Church*, the *conduit* by which *Chriſt* is pleaſed to convey *Grace*, and ſo gives us a ſolemn legal *ſeizure* of the *advantages* and benefits of the *Covenant* (all that at the *preſent* they are, or for the *future* ſhall be capable of) on condition they perform on their part (as ſoon as they are able to perform it) what on their part is *promiſed* in their *names:* wherein if they do not willingly fail, as, in caſe they dye in *infancy*, 'tis certain they do not, there is no queſtion, but the *mercies* conſigned in *Baptiſm*, may by *God's gracious* ſupplies belong unto them. And it being as certain, that when, without any *fault* of theirs, they are *unbaptized*, that defect will never be charged upon them for evil, it muſt be reſolved, that thoſe advantages that are *conſigned* in *Baptiſm*, are not *effects* produced by it, and conſequently that the *inconveniences* or *rocks* imagined in that arguing, have been without that *admonition* very cautiouſly foreſeen, and avoided by us.

Sect. 131. As for the *ſum* of the argument compacted into little, that either *Baptiſm is a mere ceremony, or it implies a duty on our part: if a ceremony onely, how does it ſanctifie? if it implies a duty, how can children receive it, who cannot doe duty at all?* I anſwer, That it is a ſacred *ceremony*, which contains in it a *duty* to be performed on our part, aſſoon as we are *able* to perform it, but requires it not of us, whilſt we are *unable*. And this is a perfect *anſwer* to all that follows in that *Number*, charging us to make *Baptiſm* a *mere outward duty*, a *work of the Law*, &c. which is all unjuſtly imputed to us, who do as verily believe it an *inward duty*, *ſhadowed* by the *outward ceremony*, when 'tis uſed to an *Infant* (and that, the being *baptized into Chriſt's death*, and the *crucifixion of the old man*, &c.) as when 'tis uſed to the grown man; onely with this reſerve, that it is no ſooner nor farther required of either, than they are capable of performing it.

Sect. 132. As for the Syllogiſm, that *whoſoever are baptized into Chriſt, have put on the new man*, Gal. 3. 27. *But to put on the new man is to be formed in righteouſneſs, and holineſs, and truth*, Eph. 4. 24. *therefore they who are not formed new in righteouſneſs*, &c. *they who remaining in the preſent incapacities, cannot walk in newneſs of life*, &c. *they have not been baptized into Chriſt.* The anſwer is obvious, that in the *major Propoſition*, the words of the *Apoſtle* [*have put on Chriſt*] muſt neceſſarily be interpreted not of *actual* putting him on, for 'tis certain that many men that have been *baptized*, have not *actually* done ſo, It is clear in *Simon Magus*, *Acts* 8. 21. and in all that bring not (as *Cyril* ſaith in *Præfat. Cat.* p. 1.) *Ὑγιοῖαν προθυμίαν, a gennine purpoſe* along with them to the *baptiſtery*, and 'tis certain, that the *Apoſtle* could not ſo underſtand it of any of thoſe *Galatians*, to whom he then wrote, whom he acknowledged to be *fooliſh* (*ἀνόητοι, without underſtanding*, and if that be not *as great*, 'tis yet a more *deſperate* incapacity, than being *νήπιοι babes*) and *bewitched*, or ſeduced not to obey the *Goſpel of Chriſt*; but ſo onely, as to note the *obligation* that lay upon them from their *Baptiſm*, and from thence the preſumption of the *Apoſtle*, that they had *undertaken* and *reſolved* it. *As many as were baptized into Chriſt have put on Chriſt*, *i. e.* are moſt ſtrictly

ſtrictly *obliged* thereby, and are preſumed to have *reſolved*, and undertaken to *put on Chriſt*, and the *new man*. This is all that is deducible from thoſe words, (unleſs I farther add, that they have the *prohibens*, the *obſtacle* which kept *Chriſt* from them or them from *Chriſt*, (*i.e. original guilt*) removed) and that is as truly affirmed of the *Infant*, as of the *grown man*, with the ſame reſerve again, when he ſhall be able to perform it, as the ἐπερώτημα ἀγθρώπε, as *Arian* calls it, the *Promiſe of every reaſonable creature*, when he hath firſt leave to become ſuch, the ὅρκος ἐνσεμνύθ, the *oath ineſſentiate* with us, *i.e.* the *obligation* that our *Creation* lays upon every *child* of *Adam*, is actually required of thoſe onely that are of age to perform it, but may be in the mean time preſumed even in the *womb* of the *Mother* to be *undertaken* by us; This by our being deſigned to the uſe of *Reaſon*, as that by our being *Proſelytes* to *Chriſtianity*.

The ſame anſwer ſuffices for that which is brought from Saint *Peter's definition of the ſaving Baptiſm, that 'tis not onely the waſhing with water, but the* ἐπερώτημα *of a good conſcience*. For this is as true of that *Baptiſm* which belongs to *children*, as to any other, onely the *duty* of it is not required, till they come to *years*, and ability to perform it, and then, if they keep not a *good Conſcience*, it will be little available. And if this be of any force againſt *baptizing Infants*, it will have been of the ſame force againſt *circumciſing* them, ſince Saint *Paul*, *Rom.* 2. 28, 29. doth as much *invalidate* the *external* part of *Circumciſion*, as Saint *Peter* here doth that of *Baptiſm*. *Sect.* 133.

It is added in the cloſe of that *Numb.* that *vows made by perſons under others names, ſtipulations made by minors, are not valid, till they by a ſupervening act, after they are of a ſufficient age, do ratifie them.* But this is not exactly true, as it is ſet, and as far as it is true, 'tis not prejudicial to our *Pretenſions*. For firſt, *Stipulations* made by *minors*, or by the *Tutor* in the *minor's* name, are *valid* by *law*, as long as he continues in *minority*, and when he comes out of that, then it is in his power to *reſcind*, or annull the *bargain*, or on the other ſide to *confirm* it, and if he do ſo, it needs not to be by way of *new ſtipulation* (which is a matter of more ſolemnity in *law*) a bare *confirmation* under *hand* and *ſeal* gives it a perpetual unretractable validity. And juſt ſo it is in this caſe; the *Covenant* is entred into at *Baptiſm*, the *ſtipulation* made by the *Godfather* in the name and behalf of the *Infant*, and remains valid to all uſes, ſo long as the *child* remains ſo. Afterward, when he comes to chuſe for himſelf, if he like not the *bargain* that is made for him, he may *reſcind* it, and turn *heathen* again, or he may *ratifie* it, and then by undertaking the *vow* of *Baptiſm* deliberately, and upon judgment, in his own name, he is capable of *Confirmation*. And this is ſo far from proving that which is of the *Anabaptiſts* turn, that it is fully ſatisfactory to all his pretenſions againſt it. For whatſoever *defect* he complains of in *Pædobaptiſm*, or *entring into the Covenant by Proxy*, is ſupplied and repaired by *Confirmation*, which is the renewing the *vow* of *Baptiſm* in his own name, and being ſuperſtructed on *Baptiſm*, is the performing all that, which in the *child* is ſuppoſed wanting to the *conſummation* of that *Sacrament*. *Sect.* 134.

And therefore when it is demanded, *Why the Infants* (I ſuppoſe it ſhould be *children catechiſed*) *may not as well make the vow* de novo, *as* de novo *ratifie that which was made for them* ab antiquo, *when they come to years of choice*; I anſwer, that the reaſon is, firſt, in reſpect of the *matter*, becauſe it is *unneceſſary*, and wholly uſeleſs; *Confirmation* will ſerve the turn as well. And that being granted, a ſecond reaſon will be taken from the *Authority* of the *Church*, and expreſs *Canons* of *Councils*, and, I ſuppoſe, from the *Apoſtolick Inſtitution of Confirmation*. All which are ſure of ſuch weight to any obedient *ſon* of the *Church*, that in a matter ſo perfectly lawfull on that ſide, that the *inſtitution* lies, it is not onely ſafe to comply (and that is enough againſt the *Anabaptiſt*, who pretends it *unlawfull*) but matter of *obedience*, and *Chriſtian duty*, which obliges us to *ſubmit* to thoſe that are ſet over us, at the leaſt not to *ſeparate* from any for no other crime, but of *obedience* to theſe Parents of ours, in ſuch *lawfull* (perfectly *lawfull*) *Commands*. *Sect.* 135.

Numb. 32. proceeds to prove the *Anabaptiſts way the ſurer*, and the onely *medium* is, *that it is moſt proportionable to an act of reaſon and humanity, and it can have no danger. For to ſay that Infants may be damned for want of Baptiſm, is to affirm that of God, which we dare not ſay of any wiſe and good man.* To this I anſwer, that I am abſolutely reſolved, that no *child* ſhall be *damned* for want of *Baptiſm*, and that upon the very reaſon rendred, becauſe *it is not a thing in their power to acquire, they being perſons not yet capable of a law*, and conſequently not *capable* of *tranſgreſſing* it. But this doth not yet conclude it the *ſurer courſe*, nor yet ſo *ſure* as the contrary, becauſe that which *hurts* the *Parents*, or thoſe, whoſe ſoever the duty is to bring the children to *Baptiſm*, cannot be ſaid to be *innocent*. And indeed, the very ſuppoſition, that the *Infant's incapacity* of the *command* ſecures him from receiving hurt by the *omiſſion* of *Baptiſm*, implies, that, if it were *imputable* to him, it would do him *hurt*, and therefore muſt be deemed to do ſo to thoſe, that *being capable* (and now offered matter of conviction by this paper, both from the *inſtitution* of *Chriſt*, and *practice* of the *Apoſtles*, and the *uſage*, and (at length, when it was *needfull*) *commands* of the *Church*, not to deny it to *Infants*) do ſtill with *contumacy*, reject, and vilifie it. And for proportionableneſs to *acts* of *humane Reaſon*, it is certainly moſt ſo, in *providence*, to take the *ſureſt* for all ſides. That in caſe there be any *neceſſity* of it, more than we are *aware* of, in caſe any *bleſſing* of a *preſent* benefit, either from the *Protection* of *Angels*, or from *preparing* and *prediſpoſing* grace to the child, accompanying the *Parents obedience*, or the *benediction* of the *Church*, then by bringing the *child* to *Baptiſm*, we make ſure of it, but make no ſuch *proviſion* by *omitting* it. *Sect.* 136.

Numb. 33. is a *congeries* of charges, every one of great weight, but without offer of proof of any one of them, I ſuppoſe, upon a *preſumption*, that they are proved before in the former arguments, which if it be a due *preſumption*, then by the ſame reaſon I may flatter my ſelf, that they are not to be cauſes of new trouble to us, now that the precedent *reaſons*, which are thought to infer thoſe *odious concluſions*, are each of them anſwered in the premiſſes. *Sect.* 137.

Onely to the laſt branch, that *they that baptize Infants invocate the holy Ghoſt in vain*; the addition of theſe words [*doing as if one ſhould call on him to illuminate a ſtone or a tree*] being reducible to ſome ſhew of a *reaſon*, why it ſhould not be done, My anſwer is, That an *Infant*, that hath the firſt power or faculty of *reaſon* in him, which a *ſtone* or a *tree* hath not, is truly capable of receiving *benefit* by this *Sect.* 138.

prayer, if not while that firſt *power* is not reduced into *act*, yet afterwards, whenſoever it is, and if it may be but one *minute* the earlier *illuminated*, or one *dram* the more *effectually* indued with *preventing* and *inciting grace*, in anſwer to thoſe *prayers* of the *Church*, this ſure will be a *teſtimony* and *evidence*, that the *prayer* is not in *vain*. And if that may not be, it will be hard to affirm, and prove, that any thing elſe may be *advanced*, or wrought by that *means*, and then all other *prayers* (if the *Anabaptiſt* will allow any) ſhall be concluded to be *vain* alſo.

Sect. 139. I have paſſed through all the *ſeveral* heads of *arguments*, that are here propoſed, and conſidered them, as *nicely* as I could, ſo as not to let fall one word that ſeemed to me to have any ſhew of *validity* in it, or in the *conſequence* of it, and muſt conſent to the truth of the *Authour*'s obſervation, that *the Anabaptiſts have been encouraged in their errour more by the accidental advantages given them by the weakneſs of thoſe arguments, that have been brought againſt them, than by any truth of their cauſe or excellency of their wit.* And indeed, though againſt the *arguments* premiſed by this *Authour*, in behalf of *Pædobaptiſm*, the contrary arguments have ſeemed unto many, to have been *ſucceſsfull* and *victorious*, yet againſt the grounds, which have here been briefly laid for this *practice*, in the beginning of this *diſcourſe*, and againſt the *practice*, as 'tis ſtated and maintained by us, it will, I believe, be ſoon diſcerned, that neither any, nor all of them, will be *applyable* with any *advantage* or *ſucceſs*.

Sect. 140. If I had the *ſagacity* to *foreſee*, or had been ſo *diligent*, as to obſerve any other head of *Objection* or *exception* againſt this *practice* of the *Church*, I ſhould now farther enlarge this Paper to conſider, it, but being not ſure, that I have any *reaſon* to do ſo, and having ſhew'd how far *Chriſt*, and his *Apoſtles*, and the *Church* have gone in this buſineſs, and how little excuſe any intelligent perſon can probably have, in rejecting the *uniform* reſult of all theſe, I ſhall joyn fraternally and cordially in the concluſion, and be no *forwarder*, nor no more *peremptory* to *preſcribe* to others, than theſe *Authorities* will juſtifie me to be (certainly not ſo forward as the *Anabaptiſts*, or *Antipædobaptiſts* are to *preſcribe* to us, and to charge on us things of ſome weight (if *Num.* 33. ſay true) *the polluting the bloud of the everlaſting Covenant*, &c.) And *God* forbid, we that deſire to reduce *diſſenters* to the *unity* of the *Church*, and cannot probably have any other deſign or aim in that *endeavour*, but the *eternal good* of others, ſhould ever think of *damning*, *killing*, *or perſecuting any that diſſent in this or any other particular*.

Sect. 141. Our deſire is that of *Ignatius*, τὸς παρεξυσμὸς ἐμβροχαῖς πάυειν, to *allay the ſharp humour, by applying the ſoft Word*, and to cure by *embrocation*, not by *cauſticks* or *exciſion*. And I think it but duty to pray againſt that *treacherous proſperity*, which ſhould be able to infuſe any greater degree of *unkindneſs*, or roughneſs in the minds of *men*, whether *ſons*, or *fathers* of the *Church*, than what I here *avow* to be ſtrict *duty* in every *Chriſtian*.

The Fifth *QUÆRE*.

Of Impoſition of Hands for Ordination.

Sect. 1. TO the next queſtion concerning *Impoſition of Hands for Ordination*, although much may be ſaid, yet I ſuppoſe that which is neceſſary to the *ſatisfaction* of any reaſonable man, may be contrived within a moderate compaſs. Firſt, by examining the words, by which it is expreſſed, and in one of them the *Ceremony*, *Impoſition of Hands*, which is uſed in it, and then proceeding to that of which it is the *ceremony*, the *office*, or *power* conferred by it.

Sect. 2. The words by which Ordination is expreſt in Scripture. καθιςῆσαι, χειροτονεῖν. For the firſt of theſe, there are four words uſed in the *New Teſtament* to expreſs this matter: Firſt, καθιςῆσαι, *Tit.* 1. 5. *to conſtitute*, where *Paul* is ſaid to have left *Titus* in *Crete*, to *conſtitute Elders in each City*. Secondly, χειροτονεῖν, a word that literally ſignifies to *ſtretch out* or *hold up* the *hand*; but being uſed among the *heathens* for *chuſing*, or any ſort of *ſuffrage*, or giving of *ſentence*, which among them in *popular Judicatures*, or *choices*, was wont to be done by that *ceremony* of *ſtretching out*, or *lifting up of hands*, it is in vulgar uſe among *heathen*, and *Jewiſh*, but eſpecially among *Chriſtian* Writers, brought to ſignifie, without any reſpect to *giving of ſuffrages*, (indifferently, whether by *one*, or *more*) *conſtituting* or *ordaining*, which is directly all one (and no more) with καθιςῆσαι before named.

Sect. 3. This is not ſo generally acknowledged by late Writers, but that it may be uſefull to give ſome few *Teſtimonies* of it out of thoſe Writers which were neareſt the times of the *Scripture*. Thus *Philo Judæus* of *Joſeph*, βασιλέως ὕπαρχος ἐχειροτονεῖτο, *He was ordained Governour of all Ægypt under the King*, where it is clear, that without any *other ſuffrages*, he was by *Pharaoh* ſo *conſtituted*, *Gen.* 41. 40. *Pharaoh ſaid unto Joſeph, Thou ſhalt be over my houſe:* and *Pſalm* 105. 21. *He made him Lord of his houſe, and Ruler of all his ſubſtance*; and *Acts* 7. 10. the very word [καθίςησι] is uſed of it, *Pharaoh conſtituted him Governour over Ægypt, and over all his own houſe.* So again of *Moſes*, ἡγεμὼν ἐχειροτονεῖτο, *He was conſtituted their Ruler*, not by any *choice of theirs*, but onely by *God*'s appointment. So of *Aaron*'s *ſons*, ἱερεῖς ἐχειροτόνει, *God inſtituted them Prieſts.* So in *Joſephus*, *Ant.* l. 13. c. 5. *Alexander* ſon of *Antiochus Epiphanes* writes to *Jonathan*, χειροτονῦμέν σε ἀρχιερέα Ἰεδαίων, καὶ φίλον ἡμῶν καλεῖσθαι, *We* (*i. e.* I, in the *regal* ſtyle) *conſtitute thee chief Prieſt of the Jews, and to be called my friend.* So *Lucian* of *Alexander*'s kindneſs to *Hepheſtion*, Θεὸν χειροτονῆσαι τὸν τετελευτηκότα, *that he made him a God when he was dead.* So in *Hierocles ſons* are ſaid to be ζωκόοι καὶ ἱερεῖς ὑπ' αὐτῆς χειροτονημένοι καὶ καθιερωμένοι τῆς φύσεως, *Prieſts choſen and ordained by nature it ſelf* to perform due *offices* to the parent. See *Stobæ.* p. 462. And when the word is uſed of the *Romans*, as oft

oft it is in *Appian*, *Dio*, &c. it muſt neceſſarily be taken in this ſenſe, becauſe that of *Election* by *lifting* up of *hands* was not in uſe among them, but onely among the *ancient Grecians*. For the uſe of it among *Chriſtian* writers, it is moſt evident, that it belongs not to *elections* by the *ſuffrages* of *many*, but to *Ordinations* by *ſingle Apoſtles*; Take one place for many, in the *Author* of the *Conſtitutions*, l. 7. c. 45. Κλήμης μετὰ τὸν Λίνου θάνατον ὑπὸ Πέτρου δι' ἐπιθέσεως χειροτονήθη, τῆς δὲ Ἐφέσου Τιμόθεος ὑπὸ Παύλου, Ἰωάννης δὲ ὑπὸ Ἰωάννου, *Clement after the death of Linus, was ordained Biſhop of Rome by Peter, and Timothy was ordained Biſhop of Epheſus by Paul, and John by John.* Where it is evident, that three *ſingle* perſons, St. *Peter*, St. *Paul*, St. *John*, are *each* of them, in ſeveral *Congregations*, affirmed to *ordain Biſhops*, and *this* word peculiarly choſen to expreſs it. And though there be *queſtion* made of the *Author*, and *authority* of thoſe *Conſtitutions*, yet ſure for the uſe of a word their *Authority* is ſufficient, and might be backt with *many* others, who have never been *queſtioned*. By all which it appears, that the word is ſimply uſed for *conſtituting*, without any conſideration of any *ceremony* of *lifting up*, or *ſtretching out hands*, whereby it was done. And thus it is uſed in the *New Teſtament*, *Acts* 10. 41. where *Chriſt's diſciples* are ſaid to be προκεχειροτονημένοις ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, *deſigned*, or *foreconſtituted by God*, *the witneſſes of his Reſurrection*. So *Acts* 14. 22. of *Paul* and *Barnabas*, χειροτονήσαντες πρεσβυτέρους κατ' ἐκκλησίαν, *conſtituting*, or *creating Elders in every Church*. Where they that have look'd ſo far back to the *original* of the word, as to think it neceſſary to render it *ſuffragiis creare*, *to create by ſuffrages*, are ſure guilty of very impertinent nicety: for to ſay that they *created* them by their *own ſuffrages*, is to ſay no more but that they joyntly did *create* them, and indeed being but two, there could be no place for *ſuffrages*; and to affirm they did it by the *ſuffrages* of others, is not agreeable to the pretended uſe of the word: For where it is uſed of *chuſing* by *ſuffrages* (as when the *people* are ſaid χειροτονεῖν to *ſtretch* out their *hands*, and chuſe) it is certain that their *own*, not *others ſuffrages*, are meant by it.

Sect. 4. Συγκατεψηφίσθη, *Act.* 1. miſtaken.

The like miſtake it is, whereby συγκατεψηφίσθη, *Act.* 1. 28. is (in favour to ſome mens *intereſts*) rendred, *Communibus calculis annumerabatur*, *he was by joynt ſuffrages choſen and numbred with the eleven Apoſtles*, merely by looking on the *original* of the word, and the parts of it taken aſunder, σὺν *with*, and καταψηφίζω, to *number*, or *to chuſe by ſtones* or the like; whereas 'tis clear, Firſt, that *Matthias* being there *choſen* by *lot*, was not *choſen* by *conſent*, or *ſuffrages* of *men*; and ſecondly, that ψηφίζειν ſignifying *originally* two things, 1. giving *ſentence*, or *voice* by *ſtones* (on which the *cuſtome* was in *elections* to inſcribe a *name*, *Rev.* 2. 17.) and 2. to *number* by *ſtones*, as *counters* (whence ψῆφος is expreſſed in *Heſychius* by λόγος, (as that ſignifies *counting*) as well as κρίσις *judgment*) it may moſt probably in that place ſignifie no more than [*was numbred*] and ſo be all one with καταριθμηθεὶς τοῖς σὺν ἡμῖν, *he was numbred with us*, ver. 17. and that explained by ἔλαχε κλῆρον, *he obtained his portion in this miniſtery*, i.e. *office Apoſtolical*: Or if it ſhould poſſibly refer to the notion of *election*, muſt denote *God's choice* of him *ver.* 24. by the diſpoſing of the *lot* to fall upon him, (and not any *ſuffrages* of others, which cannot be appliable to that matter) and in compoſition with σὺν ſignifies no more than was expreſſed *ver.* 22. σὺν ἡμῖν γενέσθω, his *being by the lot joyned with the eleven*, to be an *Apoſtle* or *witneſs* of *Chriſt's Reſurrection*.

Sect. 5.

But this by the way, which yet was ſeaſonable to be added here, becauſe in that place καταψηφίζειν, if it ſhould ſignifie *chuſing*, would be all one in effect with χειροτονεῖν before mentioned, neither of them relating to the *manner* of *chuſing*, but both ſimply denoting to *conſtitute*, or *appoint*.

Sect. 6.

By all which appears the no great *weight* or *ſolidity* of thoſe *Grammatical* contentions, concerning the [a] *identity* or *difference* of χειροτονία and χειροθεσία, the [χεὶρ, *hand*] which is the ſame in both, perſuading ſome for the *identity*, and the *difference* betwixt *extending* and *laying* on, perſuading others that they *differ*: whereas the truth ſeemeth to lye (as moſt commonly it doth) in the midſt between the *contenders*, the *agreement* betwixt them being not from the *common* mention of the *hand*, but upon another ſcore, becauſe χειροτονεῖν ſignifying to *ordain*, and *conſtitute* in general, without referring to any *ceremony* in doing it, may fitly (ſeeing it doth not exclude any *ceremony*) be uſed for the *ordaining* a *Biſhop*, who is *conſtituted* with that *ceremony* of *impoſition* of *hands*. And thus the obſervation of *Zonaras* will ſtand good, Νῦν μὲν χειροτονία καλεῖται ἡ τῆς εὐθειρίστου τῆ ἱερᾷδι λόγου τελειουργία, ᾗ τὸ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἐπίκλησις διὰ τῆς τῶν Ἀρχιερέων τείνεων τῶν χεῖρα ἀλογοῦντα τὸν χειροτονήσαντα. *Now the word is uſed for the conſecration of the Prieſt, and invocation of the Spirit, becauſe the Biſhop ſtretcheth out his hand when he bleſſeth him that is ordained*; (and accordingly *Theophylact* on 2 *Tim.* 1. 6. inſtead of St. *Paul's*, διὰ ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν μου, *by impoſition of my hands*, hath ὅτε σε ἐχειροτόνουν ἐπίσκοπον, *when I ordained thee Biſhop*: And when *Johannes Antiochenus* mentions *Evodius* being made *Biſhop* of *Antioch*, he expreſſes it by, τὴν χειροτονίαν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς ἔλαβεν, *he received Epiſcopal Ordination*, and many the like) and the *difference* between them on *another* account alſo, becauſe χειροθεσία *impoſition of hands*, together with that of *conſtituting*, denotes alſo that particular *ceremony* uſed in *ſome*, but not in *all* deſignations and *conſtitutions*, and ſo muſt needs be of a *narrower* extent, than the other is, which belongs *indefinitely* to all, and doth not refer to that, or any other *ceremony*.

[a] See *Zonaras* and *Balſamon* on the *Apoſtol. Can.* I.

Sect. 7.

The ſhort of it is, χειροτονία ſignifies originally *ſtretching forth the hand*, and though that *ſtretching* out may be *preparative* (as it is in *Jacob*, *Gen.* 48. 14.) to *laying on in benedictions*, yet being of an *heathen*, not *Jewiſh origination*, as in vulgar uſe it is taken for any kind of *appointing*, or *conſtituting*, ſo onely (and in no other reſpect) it is made uſe of in the *Scriptures* of the *New Teſtament*, for the *conſtituting*, or *deſigning* to any *office* in the *Church*, whether by *God*, or by *men*, (*Apoſtles*, that derived power from *God*) or by the *whole Church*, as in the *nominating* one to *travel* with *Paul*, 2 *Cor.* 8. 19. and that is all that is meant by, or can be juſtly *collected* from the Word.

2 Cor. 8. 19.

Sect. 8. Ἀφορίζειν. Exod. 13. 2.

A *third* word there is once uſed *Acts* 13. 2. ἀφορίζειν *to ſeparate*] the *holy Ghoſt ſaid*, *Separate unto me Paul and Barnabas for the work*, the ſame word that is uſed *Exod.* 13. 2. in *conſecrating* to *God* the *firſt-born*, deſigning, ſetting them apart to thoſe uſes, to which *God* hath *called*, or ſhall pleaſe to employ them.

Sect. 9. Χειροθεσία.

The *fourth* and the laſt word is (that which was even now mentioned, and now muſt more largely be ſpoken of) χειροθεσία, *impoſition of hands*; which, how, or by what peculiarity it belongs to this matter, muſt briefly be explained.

To

Sect. 10. Impoſition of hands in the Old Teſtament.

To lift up the *hands* was a *ceremony* in *prayer*, *Exod.* 17. 11. and accordingly to *lay* the *hands* on any (differing no otherwiſe from *lifting up*, than by the *determining* that action to a particular *object*, the *perſon* that was *prayed* for) was generally among the *Jews* a *ceremony* of *benediction*, uſed firſt by the *father* to the *children*, in beſtowing the *bleſſing* upon them (and with that the *ſucceſſion* to ſome part of his eſtate, the *inheritance*) as appears in *Jacob's bleſſing* the *children* of *Joſeph*, *Gen.* 48. 14.

Gen. 48. 14. *he ſtretched out his hand, and laid it upon Ephraim's head, and* ſo his *left hand on Manaſſes*, and ſo he *bleſſed*, &c. *ver.* 15. from thence it was accommodated among them to the *communicating* any part of *power* to others, as *aſſiſtents*, or to the *deriving* of any *ſucceſſive* office from one to another. Thus when *Moſes* had from *heaven* received, and long uſed this *commiſſion*, to be, under *God*, the *ruler* of

Numb. 11. 17. the *people*, and firſt, the *Seventy Elders* were by *God*'s appointment aſſumed to aſſiſt him, *Num.* 11. 17. and part of his *ſpirit* was by *God put upon them*, ver. 25. this, ſaith *Maimonides Sanhedr.* c. 4. was done by *Moſes laying hands upon them*. And at length a little before his departure out of this life, when a *ſucceſſour* was to be provided for him, *God commands* him to take *Joſhua*, and *lay his hands*

Numb. 27. 18. *upon him*, *Num.* 27. 18. and that as a token of his putting his *honour* upon him, *ver.* 20. *i. e.* making him the *ſucceſſor in integrum* of the whole *dignity*, and *authority* which he had enjoyed ſo long, *that*, as the Text ſaith, *all the Congregation of Iſrael may be obedient*, paying him the ſame obſervance, that they had paid to *Moſes*. And accordingly it was done, *Moſes laid his hands upon him, and gave him a charge as the Lord commanded by the hand of Moſes*, ver. 23. *i. e.* by that *ceremony* derived to him the *authority*, which himſelf had had, *conſtituted* him his ſucceſſour in that *Government*.

Deut. 34. 9. And ſo 'tis repeated again, *Deut.* 34. 9. *Joſhua was full of the ſpirit of wiſedom, for Moſes had laid his hands upon him*, and the children of *Iſrael* harkened unto him, *&c.* And ſo for thoſe *ſeventy Elders* (that were, by *God*'s immediate *deſcent* into a *cloud*, *conſtituted* aſſiſtents unto *Moſes*, and conſequently had their *original* immediately from *heaven* alſo) 'tis certain from the *Jewiſh* writings, though the *ſacred Scripture* have no occaſion to mention it, that the *ſucceſſion* of theſe (under the name of the συνέδριον or *Sanhedrin*, or *Council*) was continued through all ages by their *creating* others in the place of thoſe that *dyed*, by this *ceremony* of the סמיכה *impoſition of hands*. To this purpoſe are the clear words of *Maimonides tr. Sanhedr.* c. 4. השבעים וקנים משרה רבינו סמכם ושרתם עליהן שכינה ואותן הזקנים סומכו לאחרים ואחרים לאחרים ונמצאו חסוכין איש מפי איש עד בית דינו של יהושע ועד בית דינו של משה &c. *Moſes our Maſter created the ſeventy Elders by impoſition of hands, and the divine Majeſty reſted on them, and thoſe Elders impoſed hands on others, and others on others. And they were found created, unto the houſe of judgment of Joſhua, and unto the houſe of judgment of Moſes*, i. e. from time to time, aſcending to the *Sanhedrin* in *Joſhua*'s and *Moſes*'s time.

Sect. 11. In the New.

From theſe three uſes of this *ceremony*, Firſt, in *praying* for another; Secondly, in *paternal benediction*; Thirdly, in the *creating* of *ſucceſſours* in power, either in *whole*, or in *part*; Three ſorts of things there are in the *New Teſtament*, to which this *ceremony* of *laying on of hands* is accommodated. That of *Prayer* ſimply taken, was of two ſorts, either for the *curing* of *diſeaſes*, or *pardoning* of *ſins*, and each of theſe was accompanied with this *ceremony*, *Diſeaſes*, the corporal *bands*, *Luke* 13. 16. were cured by *impoſition of hands*, Acts 9. 17. and 28. 8. (and ſo it was foretold, *Mark* 16. 18. *they ſhall lay hands on the ſick, and they ſhall recover*) and ſo *ſins*, the *bands*, and *diſeaſes* of the *ſoul*, they were done away by that *ceremony* alſo, and to this it is (the *abſolution* of *penitents*) that that exhortation of *Paul* to *Timothy* belongs, that he ſhould not *ſuddenly* (or without due examination, and proof of

1 Tim. 5. 22. their *penitence*) *lay hands on any*, 1 Tim. 5. 22. leſt by ſo doing he ſhould be partaker of thoſe *ſins*, for the *mortifying* of which, the *Cenſures* of the *Church* were deſigned. And in that ſenſe, I ſuppoſe, it is to be taken *Heb.* 6. 2. For as the βαπτισμοὶ, *baptiſms* uſed among the *Jews* and *Chriſtians*,

Heb. 6. 2. both by *John* and *Chriſt*, for the admitting of *Proſelytes*, may fitly refer to the *faith* toward *God*, the *qualification* of all, that would thus be *admitted*, *Heb.* 11. 6. ſo the ἐπιθέσεως χειρῶν, *laying on of hands*, may refer to the *repentance from dead works*, and ſo peculiarly denote *abſolution* of the *penitents*.

Sect. 12. From the ſecond, that of paternal benediction, was borrowed, firſt, that of *bleſſing Infants*, with that *ceremony* of *impoſition of hands*, as that differed from *baptiſm*, *Mark* 10. 16. and ſecondly, that

Mar. 10. 16. of *confirming* thoſe of *fuller age*, that had been formerly *baptized*.

Sect. 13. Laſtly, to *creating ſucceſſours* in any *power*, or *communicating* any part of power to others, as to *aſſiſtents*, is anſwerable to that *impoſition of hands* in *Ordination*, ſo often mentioned in the *New Teſtament*, ſometimes in a lower degree, in the *ordaining* of *Deacons*, *Acts* 6. 6. *conſtituted* or *ordained*,

Acts 6. 6. ἐπὶ χρείας ταύτης, for that *particular employment*, and elſewhere in the *higheſt degree*, ſetting *Governours* over particular *Churches*, as generally when by that *laying on of hands*, it is ſaid they *received the holy Ghoſt*, where, as the *holy Ghoſt* contains all the χαρίσματα required to the *Paſtoral function*, and alſo ſignifies *power from on high*, *Luke* 24. 49. the authority and function it ſelf, ſo it being given

Luke 24. 49. by *impoſition of hands*, makes the parallel exact between this of *Chriſtian Ordination*, and that obſerved in *creating ſucceſſours* in the *Jewiſh Sanhedrin*.

Sect. 14. For as in the firſt *creation* of *Moſes*, and after of the *Seventy*, thoſe *functions* were inſtated on him, and them, by *God's ſpeaking* (and appearing by *Angels*) to him, and by his *taking the ſpirit* that was on *Moſes*, and its reſting upon them, *Num.* 11. 25. and agreeably all that by *impoſition of hands* were after *created* to *ſucceed* them, were ſaid to have the *Majeſtatick Preſence*, שכינה *reſt upon them*, and the *Spirit*, *Deut.* 34. 9. (the שכינה *Divine Preſence*, and רוח הקדוש *holy Spirit*, being all one in the *Jewiſh* writings) and this (as it is there ſaid, *becauſe*, &c.) by means of *impoſition of hands*; ſo in the *New Teſtament* the *holy Ghoſt firſt* deſcended viſibly upon the *Apoſtles*, and thereby they were inſtated in that *power*, which *Chriſt* deſigned and promiſed them, and then they by *impoſition of hands*, as they made *Deacons* for *lower* ſervices, to aſſiſt them, ſo they *conſtituted* others their *ſucceſſours*, and the *holy Ghoſt*, i. e. not onely the χαρίσματα, *gifts* and *graces*, to fit them, but eſpecially the *function* it ſelf, *deſcended* on them.

Sect. 15. Acts 8. 17. Of this *ceremony* thus uſed, the ſeveral mentions there are: Firſt, *Acts* 8. 17. where, after *Philip* the *Deacon* had *preached* and *baptized* in *Samaria*, *Peter* and *John* the *Apoſtles* came from *Jeruſalem* to perfect the work, and *laid hands on them* (not on all that were *baptized*, but ſome ſpecial perſons whom

whom they thought meet) and they *received the holy Ghoſt*. So *Acts* 13. 3. *by praying and laying on of hands, Paul and Barnabas were ſeparated to the Apoſtleſhip*. So *Timothy*'s being made a *Biſhop* is expreſſed, 1 *Tim.* 4. 15. by the χάρισμα, *gift*, or *function*, that was given him διὰ προφητείας, *by prophecy (direction* from the *Spirit* of *God)* μετὰ ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν τῆς πρεσβυτερίου, by *the laying on the hands of the Preſbytery*, referring either to ſome *number* of *Apoſtles*, St. *Paul*, (2 *Cor.* 1. 6. *the gift which is in thee by the laying on of my hands*) and *Barnabas*, and ſuch others that were *Apoſtles*, or *apoſtolical* men (in the ſenſe that the *Apoſtles* are called by [b] *Ignatius* πρεσβυτέριον ἐκκλησίας, *the Preſbytery of the Church*) or elſe by ſome *aſſembly* of *Biſhops* joyning with St. *Paul* in this *Ordination*.

Act. 13. 3.

1 Tim. 4. 15.

[b] *Ep. ad Philadelph.*

And thus much may ſuffice for the firſt thing propoſed, the examining the *words*, by which it is expreſt, which will have prepared the way to the ſecond, that of the *office* or *Power* conferred in *Ordination*.

Sect. 16. The power conferred in Ordination.

To which purpoſe it muſt firſt be laid for a *foundation*, that *Chriſt Jeſus*, the *eternal Son of God*, was ſent down in our *humane* fleſh to exerciſe in his own perſon (and ſo to found) an *office* of *Government* upon the earth. Thus was it propheſied of him, *Iſa.* 9. 6. that the *Government ſhould be upon his ſhoulder*; and *Iſa.* 61. 1. *that the Lord God had anointed* (which the *Chaldee Paraphraſe* generally renders by רבא *exalting*) *him*, and (as a *preparative* to that) *that the Spirit of the Lord was upon him, to preach the Goſpel*, &c. and *proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord*. Which *Prophecy* is acknowledged to be fulfilled in *Chriſt*, *Luke* 4. 18. 21. that *Spirit of God*, upon his being *baptized* by *John*, immediately *deſcending* upon him, *Matt.* 3. 16.

Sect. 17. Chriſt's Miſſion and Power.

Iſa. 9. 6.

Iſa. 61. 1.

Luke 4. 18. 21.

Matth. 3. 16.

What this *office* was, is by himſelf ſet down, firſt *negatively*, then *affirmatively*. *Negatively*, that he *was not conſtituted a Judge of Civil Intereſts*, *Luke* 12. 14. and *John* 18. 36. that it was not a *Kingdom of this world*, which he pretended to. And ſo all pretenſion of right from him to interpoſe in, or diſturb *Civil Governments*, or *Judicatures*, or to make any change in the *Principalities* of the world, is utterly diſclaimed in the *foundation*. And they that from *Chriſt incarnate* think to deduce, or plead any ſuch Charter, are upon the *Chriſtian* Principles to be look'd on, as *Impoſtors*, and deſigners againſt the *peace* of the *world*, and the *quiet*, and ſettlement of the ſeveral Kingdoms in it, which *Chriſtian Religion* was deſigned to *ſecure*, not onely by preſcribing continual *Prayers* for *all that are in authority*, but alſo by enacting and enforcing the ſtricteſt *Laws* for *obedience* to the *Supreme Powers* (to be performed by all, without exemption of any, even of *Chriſt* himſelf, when he was here on earth, or the *Apoſtles* and *Governours* of the *Church* afterward) to defend, and perpetuate it.

Sect. 18. His Office ſet down Negatively.

John 18. 36. No Civil Power.

In recompence to which it is foretold in *Scripture*, that *Kings* and *Queens* ſhould be the *nurſing fathers* and *mothers of the Church*, which is a very diſtant Title from that of *Subjects*, or *Pupils*, or *Children* of it. And when it is foretold of *Chriſt*, that he ſhould have on his *veſture, and on his thigh a name written, King of kings, and Lord of lords*, *Rev.* 19. 16. that ſure is but a *Prophetical* expreſſion, to ſignifie that the *Kings* of the *earth* ſhould generally *receive the faith*, not that any *Secular Dominion* ſhould be ſet up over them by *Chriſt*, who had ſo profeſſedly *diſclaimed* it. Thus far is *Chriſtian Religion* from laying any grounds of *undermining*, or ſhaking the *Political* order, or cutting aſunder any of thoſe *ſinews*, whereby it was formerly compacted.

Sect. 19.

Rev. 19. 16.

And, as *negatively*, ſo alſo *affirmatively* is his office ſet down, Firſt, in general, that he came to *call ſinners to repentance*, to *ſave that which was loſt*, *to bring the ſpirit*, and *ſouls* of men into a regular complyance with the *Laws* of *God*, to *rule*, and *reign* in *mens hearts by faith*; and then in particular, firſt, to *preach*, and *reveal* the Will of God: Secondly, to gather *Proſelytes*, and admit them by *baptiſm* into his *Church*, the ſociety of thoſe which profeſs the *faith* of *Chriſt*: Thirdly, to *confirm*, and farther *build* up, and inſtruct thoſe that are thus admitted: Fourthly, to remove thoſe from the *privileges* of that *ſociety*, who walk unworthy of them, by that means moſt probably to reduce them, as *withdrawing* of *mercies* is the moſt profitable *diſcipline* for thoſe that ſurfeit of them: Fifthly, to receive theſe, upon teſtification of their *repentance*, into the *embraces* of his *arms*, the *communion* of the *Church* again. And *laſtly*, to *communicate* this power to others in what *meaſure* he thought expedient.

Sect. 20 Affirmatively. The parts of Spiritual power.

In all theſe reſpects he is ſaid to be *ſent into the world*, *Joh.* 17, 18. ſent by his *Father* Joh. 20, 21. (as *Governours* are ſaid to be ſent, πεμπόμενοι δι' αὐτοῦ, 1 *Pet.* 2. 14. ſent by the *Supreme Ruler* with *Commiſſion* to that purpoſe) to have *power on earth to forgive ſins*, *Mat.* 9. 6. to have all *power delivered* to him in *heaven and in earth*, *Mat.* 28. 18. and particularly to be the *teacher*, and *Lord* of his *Church*, or *diſciples*, *Joh.* 13. 13. *Our High Prieſt and Apoſtle*, *Heb.* 3. 1. the *great ſhepherd of the ſheep*, *Heb.* 13. 20. and ſo the onely *Paſtour*, and *Biſhop of our ſouls*, 1 *Pet.* 2. 25.

Sect. 21.

John 17. 18.

John 20. 21.

1 Pet. 2. 14.

Matth. 9. 6.

Matth. 28. 18.

John 13. 13.

Heb. 3. 1.

Heb. 13. 20.

1 Pet. 2. 25.

What *Chriſt* had thus received from his *Father* by his *Miſſion*, or *Commiſſion*, he exerciſed in his own *perſon*, as long as he remained on the *earth*, *preached* the *Goſpel*, inſtituted *Rites*, called, and entertained *diſciples*, by them *received*, and *baptized Proſelytes*, or *believers*, commanded them, and uſed their *Miniſtery*, their *voluntary*, not *conſtrained* obedience, deſigned ſome to certain *offices*, and onely for a *time*, (the *Seventy*, as *harbingers* in one journey of his) to aſſiſt, or be uſefull to him, others he inveſted with a *weightier*, and more laſting *authority*, left them his *ſucceſſours* on earth, ſent them, as he was *ſent* by his *Father*, gave them the ſame *Commiſſion*, which he had *received*, to be executed in the ſame manner by them and each of them, after his departure, as *Joſhua ſucceeded Moſes* in his *office* and *power*. All which is, in every branch of it, clear from the expreſs words of *Scripture*.

Sect. 22. Chriſt's perſonal exerciſe of his office on earth.

That they had this *Commiſſion* from him, were in his life time called *Apoſtles*, that title denoting *Proxies*, or *Procuratours*, which act in the name, and ſtead of him, whoſe *Proxies* they are, according to the known rule of the *Jews*, *Apoſtolus cujuſque eſt ut quiſque*, *Every ones Apoſtle is as himſelf*, to which our *Saviour* ſeems to refer, *Matth.* 10. 40. *He that receiveth you receiveth me, and he that receiveth me receiveth him that ſent me*, making himſelf his *Father's Apoſtle*, or *Proxy*, and the *twelve*, his. But at his departing from the World, then he ſolemnly inſtated his power on them, ſealed their *Commiſſion* to them, *Joh.* 17. 18. and 20. 21. as it had been ſealed to him by his *Father*.

Sect. 23. The Apoſtles Chriſt's ſucceſſours.

Matth. 10. 40.

John 17. 18. 20. 21.

This alſo is very diſtinctly and particularly ſet down in holy Writ, through the ſeveral branches of this power. As the *Father gave judgment unto the Son*, John 5. 22. ſo the *Son* gave *judgment* to the *Apoſtles*, *Matth.* 19. 28. *Luke* 22. 30. 1 *Cor.* 6. 3. 2 *Cor.* 10. 6. As the *Father gave the Son power on earth*

Sect. 24.

John 5. 22.

Matth. 19. 28.

Luke 22. 30.

1 Cor. 6. 3.

to 2 Cor. 10. 6.

Matth. 10. 6. John 20. 23. Iſa. 22. 22. Rev. 3. 7. Matth. 16. 19. Matth. 19. 28. Luke 22. 30. Matth. 21. 42. Eph. 2. 20. Joh. 5. 24. 17. 18. John 20. 21. Rev. 19. 10. Acts 1. 22.

to remit ſins, *Mat.* 10. 6. ſo the *Son gave the Apoſtles power to remit ſins on earth* alſo, *John* 20. 23. As the *Father gave the Son the keys of the houſe of David*, *Iſa.* 22. 22. *Rev.* 3. 7. ſo the *Son gave the keys to the Apoſtles*, *Mat.* 16. 19. As the *Father gave the Son to ſit on his Throne*, ſo the *Son gave the Apoſtles alſo to ſit on twelve Thrones*, &c. *Mat.* 19. 28. *Luke* 22. 30. As the *Father gave the Son to be the foundation* or corner *ſtone* of his *Church*, *Mat.* 21. 42. ſo the *Son gave the Apoſtles to be foundations upon the foundation*, *Eph.* 2. 20. and laſtly, as the *Father ſent the Son*, *Joh.* 5. 24. and 17. 18. ſo the *Son ſent the Apoſtles*, *Joh.* 20. 21. And hence it is that the *Angel* ſent from heaven to St. *John*, who was one of this number, calls himſelf the *fellow-ſervant* of him, and of *thoſe that have the teſtimony of Jeſus*, *Rev.* 19. 10. *i. e.* or the *Apoſtles*, adding this reaſon of it, becauſe ἡ μαρτυρία Ἰησοῦ, the *teſtification of the Reſurrection of Chriſt* (and the *Chriſtian faith*) the *Apoſtolical office*, *Act.* 1. 22. was the *Spirit of prophecy*, i. e. a *ſucceeding* of *Chriſt*, in his great *Prophetick office*, the moſt honourable employment of that kind, to which any mortal man could be deſigned by *God*, and ſo fit to be compared with the *Angels* employment at that time, in bringing the news, that the *Emperours* would receive the *faith* of *Chriſt*, v. 6.

Sect. 25. Acts 1. 25. [c] Diſſert. III. c. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. Matth. 19. 28.

This power (wherein the *Apoſtles*, not all of them together, but *Peter*, *Matth.* 16. 19. and each other of them ſingle, in his κλῆρος, or ἴδιος τόπος, *Province*, or *proper place*, Act. 1. 25. (as hath [c] elſewhere been largely ſhewn) ſucceeded *Chriſt*) being thus, not in part, but intirely conferred on *each* of them, a *ſeveral Throne* for every *one*, *Mat.* 19. 28. and being of ſo viſible uſe, not onely for the firſt *planting*, but *propagating*, and conſervation of the *Church*, it cannot be imagined, that it ſhould be *temporary*, and determine in the *perſons* of thoſe *twelve*. The neceſſity of *order*, of *rules*, both for the ſupply of thoſe things, which ſhould be found *wanting* for the well-being, and preſervation of each *Church*, *Tit.* 1. 5. and alſo for the ſecuring of the *flock* from the λύκοι βαρεῖς, Acts 20. 29. the *wolves*, the *hereticks*, which it was foreſeen would ſo early infeſt them, and the *plantation*, and *propagation* of the *Chriſtian faith*, without any aſſiſtence of the *Rulers* among the *Jews*, and the *Emperours* and *Princes* among other parts of the *heathen* world, nay, when it was ſo oppoſed and perſecuted by them, is a competent collection of Reaſons to aſſure us, That that *power* which *Chriſt* gave the *Apoſtles*, which were but ſhort-lived, and ſhould, many of them, be put to death by thoſe *Perſecutors*, was deſigned to endure longer than their time. But *Reaſon* is not a *commodious medium* to infer, or conclude a matter of *fact*, and therefore that muſt of *neceſſity* be done either 1. by *affirmation*, and *Promiſes* of *Chriſt* touching this matter, or if thoſe be not ſo *clear*, as to convince *gainſayers*, then 2. by ſupplying *that* want of *light* from the *Hiſtories* and relations of thoſe times, by which it will as clearly appear, as any thing in *ſtory* can, that the office of *power* in the *Church* beſtowed by *Christ* on the *Apoſtles*, was not to *determine* in their *perſons*, but to continue in their *ſucceſſours* to future ages.

Their office not temporary.

Sect. 26. The proofs of that, 1. Chriſt's affirmation, John 17. 18. 20.

For the former of theſe we may diſcern ſomewhat perhaps from that paſſage in *Chriſt's Prayer* to his *Father*, *John* 17. where having ſpoken of his *Apoſtles*, whom he had *ſent*, as his *Father ſent him into the world*, ver. 18 *i. e.* given them (in *deſignation*) *Commiſſions* for the *Governing* of his *Church*; and then to his *Prayer for them*, ver. 17. (that *God* would *ſanctifie* them ἐν ἀληθείᾳ, *in*, or *for his truth*, i. e. *conſecrate* them for the *preaching* of the *Goſpel*, as St. *Chryſoſtome* expounds it) adding farther, *ver.* 19. that *for their ſakes he ſanctifies himſelf*, i. e. *offers* up himſelf a *Sacrifice*, for the *conſecrating* of them, that they alſo may be *ſanctified for the truth*, i. e. *conſecrated*, and *ſet apart* for this *function*, and after his *example venture* their *lives* in their *preaching* of *God*'s will, as he hath done: at length he concludes, οὐ περὶ τούτων δὲ ἐρωτῶ μόνον, *But I pray not for theſe alone*, ver. 20. which being in all *reaſon* to be *interpreted* of the *ſame matter*, concerning which he had *pray'd* for the *Apoſtles* before, it follows that this *Prayer* of his, for the *conſecrating* of *officers* in his *Church*, is not confined to his *Apoſtles* alone, which then attended him, ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ τῶν πιστευόντων, *&c.* but the ſame *Prayer* he offers up for thoſe *alſo*, *that ſhall believe through their word*, i. e. for others, that by theſe *Apoſtles* preaching ſhould be brought to the *Faith*, and, as the event demonſtrates, *ordained* by them to be *Biſhops* and *Deacons* in ſeveral *Churches*. This, if we have not miſtaken the meaning of it, is an expreſs *affirmation* of *Chriſt*'s in this matter.

Sect. 27. 2. His Promiſe. Matth. 28. 20.

And we ſhall have leſs reaſon to *ſuſpect*, that we have *miſtaken*, if we conſider *Chriſt's Promiſe* to his *Apoſtles* at his parting from them, *Mat.* 28. 20. *And behold I am with you all the days*, ἕως τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος, *untill the end of the world*. 'Tis certain that this preſence of *Chriſt* with them, refers to his *authority* derived, and *aſſiſtence* made over to them, in order to the diſcharge of their *office* of *gathering diſciples*, *baptizing and teaching*, ver. 19. and as certain, that the *Apoſtles* ſhould not *perſonally* live to execute that *office*, *till the period* there named, the *end of the world*, and then it is not imaginable how *Chriſt's preſence* ſhould be *continued* with them *till the end of the World*, unleſs they be conſidered *in complexo*, in *conjunction* with their *poſterity*, or *ſucceſſours* in that *office* (as the *Promiſes* made to *Abraham*, are performed to his *poſterity*, though not to his *perſon*) to whom therefore this promiſed *aſſiſtence* belongs πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας, *all the days*, i. e. for the *whole* term of this *new age*. And this is the more *demonſtrative*, becauſe this was ſaid by *Chriſt* after his *Reſurrection*, immediately before his *aſcending* to *heaven*, which being the beginning of the μέλλων αἰών, *the laſt age of the World*, the *Kingdom of Chriſt*, when all *power was given to him* ver. 18. it neceſſarily follows, that what was to be *continued* till the συντέλεια *conſummation*, or *concluſion of that age*, ſhould laſt till *the end of the World*, in the *largeſt* ſenſe, that thoſe words can ſignifie.

Sect. 28. And the like, Rev. 2. 26.

This, I ſuppoſe, is alſo meant by the *Promiſe* of *Chriſt*, *Rev.* 2. to thoſe of the *Church* of *Thyatira*, which ſhould *overcome and keep*, ver. 26. i. e. *adhere conſtantly* to the *faith*, in ſpight of all *temptations*, that he will *give* them *power over the Nations*, *as he received of his Father* ver. 27. where in the very ſame manner, that *Joh.* 20, 21. *power* is inſtated on the *Apoſtles*, [*as my Father ſendeth me, ſo ſend I you*,] (*ſending*, and *giving power*, being *ſent*, and *receiving power*, being phraſes of the ſame importance) the like *power* is by *Chriſt* promiſed to be inſtated on theſe faithfull *Confeſſours* afterward, and that belonging to the *planting* and *propagating* the *faith* among the *Gentiles*, bringing them to *repentance* (which is the *breaking them to ſhivers* there) and *ruling them with a rod of Iron*, i. e. the *Sceptre of Chriſt's Spiritual Kingdom*, his *Goſpel*, and *Power* and *Paſtoral Authority* committed to them. If this, being

(by

(by the *Prophetick* ſtyle, wherein it is *veiled*) ſomewhat *obſcure*, bring not that *evidence* with it, which is expected, I deſire it may be paſt over, as a *conjecture* which pretends onely to be conſiderable, by the *accordance* and *conſent* with other greater *evidences*, which are now to follow.

Sect. 29. 3. The hiſtories of thoſe times. Acts 1. 20, 22, 23.

To proceed then to the next *Topick* of *probation* (the *Hiſtories* of thoſe *Times*, which are moſt competent to clear the *fact*) A firſt evidence of this ſort, is the aſſumption of *Matthias* into the place of *Judas* the *traditor* and *deſertor*, *Acts* 1. who loſt his office, and ſoon after, his life. Wherein we ſee Saint *Peter*, upon the *Prophetical Prediction* of *Judas*'s fate, and the laſt branch of that [*his Biſhoprick let another take*] v. 20. concludes with a [δεῖ οὖν] a *neceſſity*, that one of thoſe that *had continued with them from the beginning*, and ſo was qualified for it, ſhould [γενέσθαι μάρτυρα τῆς ἀναστάσεως σὺν ἡμῖν] ver. 22. *become with them a witneſs of the Reſurrection*, and by the form of their prayer for *God's* direction, and revelation of his Will, which he had pitch'd on, it is evident, that *taking* his *Biſhoprick*, ver. 20. is all one with *taking* the *lot*, or *portion* of that *Miniſtery* and *Apoſtleſhip*, ver. 25. and conſequently, that as ἐπισκοπὴ *Biſhoprick*, denoted an *office*, ſo that was all one with Ἀποστολὴ the *office* of *Apoſtles*, and that ſtill a διακονία, a *miniſtration*, a *miniſterial office* for the *benefit* and good of others. And there is one paſſage more obſervable in the end of that 25. *v.* that he that thus ſucceeded *Judas* (and ſo by *analogy* of reaſon, every other of the *twelve*) had his ἴδιον τόπον, *peculiar* place or *Province*, to which he was deſigned, and ſent to preach the *Goſpel*, not the whole *College* of *Apoſtles* together to *all* and *every* place, but *every* one of them *ſingle* endued with that *power*, that he might alone, without *aſſeſſors*, diſcharge his *office*, and ſo was obliged πορεύθηναι εἰς τὸν ἴδιον τόπον *to go to his own place*, which words being divided by a *comma*, from [ἐξ ἧς παρέβη Ἰούδας, *from which Judas by tranſgreſſion fell*] which therefore are to be read as in a *parentheſis*) are yet by ſome conceived to belong to *Judas*'s fate after death, his, *going to that place of puniſhment*, appointed for him. But ſure that is a miſtake.

The aſſumption of *Matthias* to the Apoſtolacy.

Sect. 30. The ſeven Deacons.

Soon after this 'tis apparent, *Act.* 6. that the *Apoſtles*, to make their burthen more ſupportable did by *impoſition* of *hands create ſeven Deacons* in *Jeruſalem*; which although it be not an example of their *conſtituting ſucceſſors* to their *whole office*, and therefore is not here mentioned in the ſame rank as the former was, yet it is an evidence, that they were able to *communicate* to others any part of that power committed to them by Chriſt. And that is a ſufficient proof, that the *Apoſtles power* was not *temporary*, and determined to their *perſons*. And then ſecondly, why they might not, in *whole* as well as in *part*, communicate it to others, who might ſucceed to it (after their departure from any place, or *finally* out of the *world*) as well as *aſſiſt* them, being preſent, by undergoing in their ſtead ſome part of it, there is no imaginable reaſon to be rendred; but, on the *contrary*, the *example* of *Moſes*, who firſt aſſumed the *Seventy* to aſſiſt him (and at that time *God* gave them of his *Spirit*, and ſo part of his *power*) and after *conſtituted Joſhua* to *ſucceed* him, will be directly applicable to this matter.

Sect. 31. *Saul* and *Barnabas*. Acts 13. 2.

Thirdly, it is apparent, that after, and beſide the inſtating of this office on the *twelve*, it was the will and appointment of *God*, that *Saul* and *Barnabas* ſhould be aſſumed to it, *Acts* 13. 2. and that immediately after *James* the *Apoſtle*'s death, *c.* 12. 2. in the ſame manner as *Ephraim* and *Manaſſes* ſupplyed the place of *Joſeph*, when he dyed. By which teſtimony from heaven appears lifewiſe, that that *office* was not determined to the perſons of the *twelve Apoſtles*, or thoſe of whom the *holy Ghoſt* deſcended, *Act.* 2. but was to be *communicated* to others alſo.

Sect. 32. *James* the *Juſt* Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*.

Fourthly, by comparing ſome paſſages of *Scripture* with the plain aſſertions of *ancient* Writers, and *Fathers* of the *Church*, it may be concluded, that *James* the *Juſt*, that had the title of *Brother of the Lord*, was conſtituted *Biſhop* of *Jeruſalem* (being none of thoſe twelve *Apoſtles*) by *Chriſt* himſelf, ſay [d] ſome, at his *appearing* to him after the *Reſurrection*, but (as 'tis more generally reſolved on) by the *Apoſtles*, which having received their power from Chriſt, *Euſebius*'s phraſe is, that he had it παρὰ αὐτοῦ Σωτῆρος καὶ τῶν Ἀποστόλων, from *our Saviour himſelf and his Apoſtles*, from him *mediately* and from them *immediately*. This is manifeſt by *Ignatius*, who was his contemporary, in his *Epiſtle* to the *Trallenſes*, mentioning *Stephen* the *Deacon*, λειτουργοῦντα Ἰακώβῳ, *waiting on James* peculiarly. And ſo in *Ep. ad Hieron.* λειτουργὸς ὡς Στέφανος ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις Ἰακώβῳ, *Thou art employed as a Deacon, as Stephen was to James.* And ſo ſaith [e] *Hegeſippus*, and [f] *Clemens Alexandrinus*, [g] *Athanaſius*, [h] *Epiphanius*, [i] *Gregory Nyſſene*, [k] *St. Hierome*, and divers others agreeing in this, that *Peter*, *and James*, *and John*, *choſe* and *conſtituted James the Biſhop of Jeruſalem*, and that in the xix. year of *Tiberius*, *i.e.* the next year after the *death* of *Chriſt*, ſaith *Euſebius* in his *Chronicle*, p. 43.

[d] *Theophyl. in* 1 *Cor.* 15. 7.
[e] Υπομνημ. 6. *ap. Euſeb. l.* 2. *c.* κγ'.
[f] Ὑποτυπ. *l.* ς'.
[g] *In Synopſ.*
[h] *Hær.* 78.
[i] *de Reſur. Or.* 2.
[k] *In Catal. & in Gal.* 1.

Sect. 33. Called an Apoſtle, Gal. 1. 19. Act. 14. 6. 22.

Hence it is that this *James*, though none of the *twelve*, is called an *Apoſtle*, *Gal.* 1. 19. and perhaps *Act.* 15. 6. and 22. and in the inſcription of his *Epiſtle*, (though in the beginning of it he call himſelf the *ſervant of the Lord*) he is intituled the *Apoſtle James*; and accordingly [l] *St. Hierome* calls him the *thirteenth Apoſtle*, which farther yields him a *priority* before *Paul and Barnabas*, (as being after him admitted to that *dignity*) to whom he gives the *right hand of fellowſhip*, *Gal.* 2 9. and being at *Jeruſalem*, his *Epiſcopal* See, is there named before *Peter* and *John*, two *principal Apoſtles*, who with *James* the other ſon of *Zebedee*, would not, ſaith [m] *Clemens*, ἐπιποθῆσαι δόξης, *contend for the glory or dignity*, ἀλλὰ Ἰάκωβον τὸν Δίκαιον ἐπίσκοπον τῶν Ἱεροσολύμων ἑλέσθαι, *choſe James the Juſt Biſhop of Jeruſalem.* Whatſoever there is of ſeeming difficulty in this matter, hath been cleared in [n] other Papers. And by this again appears, that that *office* of *preeminence* and *authority* in the *Church*, was not given to the *perſons* of the *twelve*, ſo as to be *determined* in them, but ſo as to be from them *communicated* to others alſo.

[l] *Com. in Iſa.*
[m] Ὑποτυπ. *l.* ς'.
[n] *Diſſert.* IV. *c.* 3.

Sect. 34. *Timothy.* 2 Tim. 1. 6. 1 Tim. 4. 14. *Titus.* Tit. 1. 5.

Fifthly, of St. *Paul* 'tis not onely ſaid by himſelf expreſly, that he had *laid hands on Timothy*, and that thereby the *gift of God*, fitting him for the *Epiſcopal function*, was *given him*, 2 *Tim.* 1. 6. and 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. but farther, that he was by him left at *Epheſus* to exerciſe this authority, παραγγεῖλαι τισὶ, *to command ſome*, (which includes *power*) *to teach no other doctrine*, i. e. to ſuppreſs *heretick*s; 1 *Tim.* 1. 3. and the ſame is as clear of *Titus*, who is by him *left in Crete*, with power of *regulating things that were not yet ordered* in that *Iſland*, *and to ordain Elders in every Church*, *Tit.* 1. 5. which being two branches of *Epiſcopal Power*, it is by all the *ancients* generally affirmed, that he

was instituted the [o] *Metropolitan*, or chief *Bishop* of that *Island*, as [p] *Timothy* of *Ephesus*, the *chief Metropolis* of *Asia*, and accordingly these two are styled *Apostles* also (as receiving the same power, or *Commission*, that *Christ* had given to the *twelve*, and to St. *Paul*) So that [q] *Anonymus* in *Pharius* mentions the martyrdom of *Timothy* the *Apostle*, and *Theodoret*, Ἀπιστῶν Ἀπόστολος ὁ Τιμόθεος, *Timothy the Apostle of the Asiaticks*, and Κρὴς ἦν Ἀπόστολος ὁ Τίτος, *Titus the Apostle of the Cretians*. And the same is observable of *Mark*, *Luke*, *Thaddeus*, *Epaphroditus*, *Clemens*, and *Ignatius*, and others, as is [r] elsewhere shewn.

[o] τοιούτων ὁποῖοι νῦν οἱ μητροπολῖται καὶ χειροτονίαν ἐντεῦθεν Chrysost. *Hom.* 1. *in* Tit. Theophyl. *Arg. Epist.*

[p] Τιμόθεος ὁ τῆς μεγάλης Παύλου καὶ χειροτονητοῦ τῶν Ἐφεσίων μητροπόλεως ἐπίσκοπος, καὶ ἀνδρονίζηλος. Anon. *in* Phot. *Num.* 254. [q] *Ibid.* [r] *Dissert.* IV. c. 3.

Sect. 35. Elders ordained by *Paul* and *Barnabas*. Act. 14. 2.

Sixthly, of St. *Paul* it is farther plain, that in *Lystra* and *Iconium*, and *Antioch*, and in those parts, *he* and *Barnabas* χειροτονῆσαν αὐτοῖς πρεσβυτέρους κατ' ἐκκλησίαν, *ordained them Elders Church by Church*, *Act.* 14. 2. *i. e.* a *Bishop*, or *Governour* in every *Church*; which is again the *communicating* that *power* to others, which they held by *Commission* from *Christ*.

Sect. 36. *De Synod.* l. 1. c. 14. Mr. *Selden*'s notion of it.

Of these acts of St. *Paul*, 2 *Tim.* 1. 6. *Tit.* 1. 5. and *Act.* 14. 23. it will not be amiss to consider a while what is observed by Mr. *Selden*, and recommended as *most worthy to be observed by all that are lovers of truth*, *viz.* This of St. *Paul's creating of Presbyters*, *was according to the Jewish custome of creating of Elders*; that *Paul*, forsooth, *was brought up at the feet of Gamaliel*, *as his disciple*, Act. 22. 3. *and there instructed more exactly in the Jewish Law*; *that Gamaliel was the Nephew of Hillel*, *and Prince of the Sanhedrin at that time*; *that he*, *as an Elder among the Jews*, *might create his Scholars to the same dignity*, *as he pleased*, *and therefore that it is not to be doubted*, *but that Gamaliel created Paul to the dignity of a Jewish Elder while he was his disciple*, i. e. *before he was a Christian*; *and that a while after Paul becoming Christian and an Apostle*, *thought it lawfull in Asia*, *Crete*, *and elsewhere*, *as well as within Judaea*, *to create Elders*, *for the preaching of the Gospel*, *accounting himself and the other Apostles free from that new Law of having the licence of the Prince of the Sanhedrin*, *and so that that custome prevailed in creating the Christian Elders*, *that every one that was duly created himself*, *might also duly create his own disciples*; and to conclude, *Hinc de Paulo & Barnabâ dicitur* χειροτονήσαντες αὐτοῖς πρεσβυτέρους κατ' ἐκκλησίαν, *Hence*, saith, he, *it is said of Paul and Barnabas*, *Having ordained them Elders through the Churches*. And *Hinc Paulus ad Titum*, &c. *Hence Paul to Titus*, *that was before created to the dignity of Eldership*, *I left thee at Crete*, &c, *that thou mayst constitute Elders through the Cities*.

Sect. 37. An examination of it.

Having set down his observation, or interpretation of this *Gentleman*, and so his account of St. *Paul's* power to *ordain Elders* in the *Church*, I shall instead of the *many* unproved affirmations contained in it, take notice onely of these few *inconveniences* which necessarily follow on it: First, that according to these *premisses*, St. *Paul's power* of *ordaining Elders* in the *Church* of *Christ*, was no other *power*, but that which *Saul* the *Persecutor* of *Christians* had, when he was that *Persecutor*: Secondly, that he received it from *Gamaliel* the *Jew*, and not from *Christ*, the *Head* and *Founder* of the *Christian Church*: Thirdly, that he that would not own to have *received* any part of his *Apostolical Power* from St, *Peter* or any other *man* in the *World*, *Gal.* 1. 1. onely that he might owe it all to the *Commission* received from *Heaven*, should now be constrained to acknowledge the receipt of it from his old *Master* in the *Jewish Religion*: Fourthly, that *Barnabas* which appears equally with *Paul* in *ordaining* of *Elders*, Act. 14. should not in this *interpretation* be taken notice of at all, nor *consideration* be had, whether what is said of *Paul*, were in any degree appliable to *him*.

Gal. 1. 1.

Sect. 38.

These, I think, are inconveniences enough, to which this doctrine is lyable upon the *Christian score*; and yet there are many other discernable upon the bare *Jewish* account. For first, for the *Prince* of the *Sanhedrin* at *Jerusalem* to *create*, and *constitute* an *Elder*, must, I suppose, signifie to take him into the *Sanhedrin* at *Jerusalem*. And surely no man imagines that *Paul* before his *Conversion* was thus *created*, it being said of him expresly, *Act.* 7. 58. at St. *Stephen's martyrdom*, that he was νεανίου, a *young man*, at *whose feet the witnesses laid their raiment*, when they went to *stone* him: where the word νεανίας, if it be onely a note of his *age*, or if it be all one with νεώτερος in other places, must signifie either a *young man*, or a *person* of *mean* quality, or perhaps an *inferior officer*, such as *Act.* 5. 6. *carried out* the dead to *burial*, and in any of these notions will be far enough distant from one of the *Elders* or *members* of the *Sanhedrin*. And that farther appears by what was said of him, just before his *Conversion*, *Act.* 9. 2. that he *came to the High Priest*, *and desired letters from him to the Synagogues at Damascus*, *that if he found any Christians there*, *he might bring them bound to Jerusalem*. This makes it probable, that he was some *inferior officer*, or *Serjeant*, but evident that he was neither *Elder* in the *Sanhedrin*, nor *member* of any *Consistory* in another City, and so sure it is more than *to be doubted*, whether *Gamaliel* had *created* him to this *dignity*, it is most apparent that he had not. All that is imaginable in this matter is, that *Gamaliel* being a *Doctor* of the *Law*, might create this his disciple to that dignity of *Doctor of the Law*. And if that had been so, certainly he that held it *usefull* to put into his *apology* that he had been *brought up at Gamaliel's feet*, would have thought fit, for the *inhancing* those pretentions, to have added, that he was once made a *Doctor* by the *Prince* of the *Sanhedrin*. But besides that there is as little *appearance*, or (for the *former* reasons) *probability* of *truth* in that, as in the *former*, It is evident that this, if it were granted, were *impertinent* and unapplyable to this matter: For that would not denominate him a πρεσβύτερος or *Elder*, but rather a γραμματεύς, which we render *Scribe*, such were they that had been taught γράμματα, the *Books* and *Writings* of the *Law*, and themselves after become *teachers* in their בתי חמדרש *houses of Information*, or *Instruction*, and sometimes *chosen* into the *Sanhedrin*; for that consisted of three sorts of men of several denominations, *Chief Priests*, *Elders*, *and Scribes*, (see *Mat.* 26. 3.) the *Doctors* of the *Law* were the γραμματεῖς, *Scribes*, not πρεσβύτεροι *Elders*, and if all of them together in *Council* be sometimes styled πρεσβυτέριον, or *Eldership*, that is but a denomination of the whole from one special part of that *Council*, and no way concludes (against expres testimonies of *Scripture* and *Jewish* Writers) that the *Sanhedrin*, was all made up of *Elders* at that time. Nay, it is said of *Gamaliel* expresly, that he was νομοδιδάσκαλος, a *Doctor* of the *Law*, and one of the *Sanhedrin*, *Act.* 5. 34. who as a *Doctor* might have *disciples* to *instruct* in the *Law*, *sitting at his feet*, but cannot from thence be concluded to be the *Prince* of the *Sanhedrin* at

Act. 7. 58.

Act. 5. 6.

Act. 9. 2.

that

that time (as is by Mr. *S.* pretended) but on the contrary, by being called τὸν ἐν συνεδρίῳ φαρισαῖον *a certain Phariſee in the Sanhedrin*, it may well be conjectured that he was not, but an ordinary member of it, though of *great reputation* at that time. And ſo ſtill though he might make his *Diſciple* a *Doctor* of the *Law* (of which there were other uſes, beſides being of the *Sanhedrin*) yet an *Elder* he could not, nor conſequently could *Saul* beſtow that *dignity* upon any other *Jew*, much leſs upon *them* abroad in the *diſperſions*, leaſt of all upon any *Gentile Chriſtians* (as 'tis more than probable, ever ſince his *departing to the Gentiles*, chap. 13. 46. ſome of thoſe *Elders* chap. 14. 23. were, and of thoſe in *Crete*, *Tit.* 1. there can be no place of doubting) upon that ſcore of having been a *Scholar* of *Gamaliel*'s. Many other things there are in this notion, utterly unreconcileable with the *Jewiſh cuſtoms*, if it were here ſeaſonable to *diſcover* them.

That the learned *Grotius* was favourable to this notion, is pretended by Mr. *S.* ſetting down to this purpoſe theſe words of his, on *Act.* 11. 30. (*Totum regimen Eccleſiarum Chriſti conformatum fuit ad Synagogarum exemplar*, *The whole Government of the Churches of Chriſt*, *was conformed to the pattern of the Synagogues*) and referring the Reader to his *Notes* on *Act.* 13. 1. 20. 7. 18. 8. But this is no way to be deduced from that learned man's words; for 'tis certainly one thing to affirm the *Government* of the *Church* to be formed *after the Jewiſh pattern*, (which it is acknowledged that it was, *Chriſt accommodating*, and lightly changing the *Jewiſh cuſtoms* into *Chriſtian Inſtitutions*) another to deduce the power of *making Elders in the Church*, which certainly had the *original* from *Chriſt*, who came down from heaven to plant, or gather a *Church* of *Gentiles*, as well as *Jews*) from the *authority* of the *Jewiſh Sanhedrin*, which as it was uſed for the putting of *Chriſt*, and ſome of his *diſciples*, even, of *Paul* himſelf, to death, ſo it was never uſed to *propagate Chriſtianity*, nor could be imagined to *communicate* a *power* to men of, and in other *nations*, particularly in *Crete*, which were not ſo much as *Proſelytes* of the *Jews*, had nothing to doe with them. *Sect.* 39.

The other *affirmations* of *Grotius* referred to, will yield as little aid, being all to the ſame purpoſe, that the *Cuſtoms* in the *Jewiſh Synagogue* were imitated, and *accommodated* by *Chriſt* to the *Chriſtian* uſes, not that *Paul*, an *Apoſtle*, or *Commiſſioner* of *Jeſus Chriſt*, indued from heaven with that power, which he *communicated* (as he ſaw fit, and as the *Spirit* directed him) to others, neither *had*, nor *communicated* any *power*, but what he had from *Gamaliel* his *Jewiſh Maſter*; That *Paul* was *indued* with this *power* from *heaven*, when he was *called* to his *Apoſtleſhip*, that he and *Barnabas* together were actually *ſeparated* to that work by the *impoſition* of the *hands* not of *Gamaliel*, the *unconverted Jew*, but of the *Chriſtian Prophets* and *Doctours*, or *Biſhops*, *whoſe* names are *recorded Act.* 13. 1, 2, 3. was ſure the acknowledged opinion of that *excellent* man, *Hugo Grotius*, and never any other *original* aſſigned by him, or any *Chriſtian* to this *power* of making *Elders*, I ſhall not need to ſay any more of it. *Sect.* 40.

Seventhly then, It farther appears, that as *Timothy* and *Titus* were thus *ordained* by St. *Paul*, ſo they had thereby alſo *power* to ordain *others*, through all *Churches* in thoſe *Regions* where they were placed, and accordingly did actually *ordain* them. And ſo the *power*, which was given the *Apoſtles*, was ſure no *temporary* power, but as from them derived to others, ſo from thoſe others farther *communicated*, and all this by expreſs Teſtimonies of *Scripture*. For that St. *Paul* ſhould leave *Titus* in *Crete* on purpoſe to *ordain Elders* there, and preſcribe *Timothy*, as well as him, what ſort of men, and how *qualified*, ſhould be *conſtituted Biſhops* (and *Deacons*) in the *Churches*, and they ſhould make no uſe of that *power*, is not imaginable, nor could be controverted, though there were no other *book* in the world, but the *New Teſtament*, whereas the teſtimony of the following *Church*-writers is clear, that in *Crete* the one, (and in *Aſia* the other) had the *ordaining* firſt, and then the *judging* of ſo many *Biſhops* (by name an *hundred*) in that *Iſland*, and that (as there, ſo every where elſe) the *Biſhops* in their ſeveral *Churches* were the *ſucceſſours* of the *Apoſtles*, and therefore many of them called *Apoſtles* alſo. *Sect.* 41. *Timothy* and *Titus* had power to ordain others.

This we have ſeen already in *James* the *Biſhop* of *Jeruſalem*, called ſo in the Scriptures themſelves. And the like we find of divers others; Of *Thaddæus* (not he that was one of the *twelve*, *Judas*, or *Lebbæus*, but) he that was, ten years after *Chriſt*'s *Reſurrection*, ſent by St. *Thomas* to the *King* of *Edeſſa*, we have, out of the *Records* of that *Nation*, [Ἀπόστολος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, *the Apoſtle of Jeſus*] the *Apoſtle Thaddæus*, and ſimply *the Apoſtle*. See *Euſebius Hiſt.* l. 1. c. *ult.* *Sect.* 42. Biſhops ſucceſſours of the Apoſtles, and called Apoſtles. *Thaddæus.*

So *Luke*, that is thought to be the perſon that was ordained St. *Paul's-fellow-traveller*, 2 *Cor.* 8. 19. and he were not (as there are ſome *reaſons* to believe it was *Silas*) muſt in all reaſon be placed there among the Ἀπόστολοι ἐκκλησίας, *Apoſtles of the Church*, v. 23. is by *Epiphanius* diſtinctly ſtyled an *Apoſtle*. *Her.* 51. and in ἀγκυρωτ. *Sect.* 43. *Luke.*

So *Mark*, he that wrote the *Goſpel*, and is called by St. *Peter* his ſon, as *converted* by him, and of whom *Papias* truely affirms, ὅτι ἤκουσε τοῦ Κυρίου, ὅτι παρηκολούθησεν αὐτῷ, *he neither heard nor followed Chriſt*, yet being, eleven years after *Chriſt*'s aſſumption, ſent into *Ægypt* to preach the *Goſpel*, and there affirmed by St. *Hierome*, out of the *Records* of thoſe firſt times, to have ordained *Anianus Patriarch of Alexandria*, and by the writer of his life in *Photius*, to have done the like in *Pentapolis*, is by *Euſebius* l. 2. c. κδ'. and by *Epiphanius Her.* 51. called Ἀπόστολος, *Apoſtle*. *Sect.* 44. *Mark.*

So *Timothy*, that by Prophecy (i. e. *revelation* of the *Spirit*, ſay the [f] *Scholiaſts*) was ordained *Biſhop* of *Epheſus*, is by the *Anonymus* in *Photius*, *Num.* 254. called Τιμόθεος Ἀπόστολος, *Timothy the Apoſtle*, and by [t] *Theodoret*, Ἀναγῶν Ἀπόστολος, *the Apoſtle of the aſiaticks*, and ſo by *Theophanes*, he with others, is ἅγιος Ἀπόστολος; *an holy Apoſtle*. *Sect.* 45. *Timothy.*

[f] *Oecumen. in* 1 *Tim.* 3.

[t] *In* 1 *Tim.* 3. 1.

And ſo of *Titus* Κρητῶν Ἀπόστολος ὁ Τίτος, *Titus* the *Apoſtle* of the *Cretians*, in *Theodoret*. *Sect.* 46. *Titus.*

So *Epaphroditus* the *Biſhop* of *Philippi*, is acknowledged by *Theodoret*, to be therefore called *their Apoſtle*, *Phil.* 2. 25. Ἐπαφρόδιτον Ἀπόστολον αὐτῶν σαφῶς καλέσας, &c. St. *Paul* manifeſtly called *Epaphroditus* their *Apoſtle*, having, ſaith he, the appellation of their *Biſhop*. *Sect.* 47 *Epaphroditus.*

So *Clemens* mentioned *Phil.* 4. 3. as a *fellow-labourer* of St. *Paul*'s, and firſt a *Deacon* to St. *Peter*, (ſaith *Ignatius ad Trallenſes*) afterward *Biſhop of Rome*, is called by *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Strom.* 4. ὁ Ἀπόστολος Κλήμης, *the Apoſtle Clemens*, and by [v] St. *Hierome*, *Vir Apoſtolicus*, an *Apoſtolical perſon*, and ſo by [x] *Ruffinus* adding, *Imo pene Apoſtolus*, *yea and almoſt an Apoſtle*. *Sect.* 48. *Clemens.*

[v] *In Iſa.* 52.

[x] *de adulterat. lib. Origenis.*

Sect. 49. *Ignatius.* So *Ignatius*, that is ſaid by [r] St. *Chryſoſtome* to have *converſed familiarly with the Apoſtles*, and by them made *Biſhop of Antioch*, *the hands*, ſaith he, *of the bleſſed Apoſtles touching his ſacred head*, is by him called both *Apoſtle and Biſhop*.

Sect. 50. And accordingly 'tis the general affirmation of *Theodoret*, τοὺς νῦν καλουμένους ἐπισκόπους, Ἀποστόλους ὠνόμαζον, *Thoſe that were* (in his time, ſaith he) *called Biſhops, they called Apoſtles*, τῷ δὲ χρόνῳ μειοῦσθαι, &c. *but in proceſs of time they left the name of Apoſtles to thoſe that were truely ſo*, ſent immediately by Chriſt, and impoſed the *name of Biſhops* on thoſe others, that had been *anciently* called *Apoſtles*.

Sect. 51. So *Rabanus Maurus* on 1 Tim. 4. 14. *Epiſcopi provincias integras regebant Apoſtolorum nomine nuncupati, The Biſhops ruled whole Privinces, being called Apoſtles.*

Sect. 52. So when *Irenæus* l. 1. c. 9. and from him *Epiphanius* l. 1. *Her.* 14. and 34. ſaith of the *heretick Marcus's* followers, that they were ſo puffed up, that they contemned the *Apoſtles* themſelves in reſpect of them, it muſt be ſure underſtood of the *Biſhops* of thoſe times, who thereby appear to be ſtyled *Apoſtles*.

Sect. 53. The ſeven Churches of *Aſia.* *Eighthly*, It is manifeſt by the *Epiſtle* of *Chriſt* to the *ſeven Churches* of the *Proconſular Aſia*, delivered by viſion to St. *John*, that there were, at the date of the *Epiſtle*, *Rulers*, or *Governours* of each of thoſe *Churches*, to whom, under the title of *Angels*, the care of thoſe *Churches* was committed. That theſe were any of the *twelve Apoſtles*, or others *conſtituted* from *heaven* immediately, neither is, nor can be pretended by any; it remains therefore that it muſt be a derived, *communicated power*, whether *mediately* or *immediately* from one, or more of the *Apoſtles*, that firſt preached the *Goſpel* there, which was thus veſted in thoſe *Angels*, in reſpect of which not onely that honourable title of *Angels* is beſtowed upon each of them by *Chriſt* himſelf, the ſame that on the [x] *high Prieſt* among the *Jews*, *Mal.* 2. 7. but they are alſo reſembled to ſo many *Stars held* by *Chriſt* in his *right hand*, Rev. 1. 16. and 2. 1. which is an infallible evidence, that this *dignity*, and power of theirs was approved and confirmed by *Chriſt*.

[r] Ἀρχιερέα τοῦτον ἀεὶ προσαγορεύουσι, καὶ νομίζουσιν αὐτοῖς ἄγγελον γενέσθαι τῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ προσταγμάτων, *They call him the chief Prieſt, and think him to be an Angel or Meſſenger of God's, to bring his commands to them.* Diodor. Sicul. *ap.* Phot. *de Judæis.*

Sect. 54. Teſtimonies out of Antiquity. Council of *Chalcedon.* *Polycrates.* And to ſo clear a *teſtimony* of *Scripture*, we may farther add the words of the *Council* of *Chalcedon*, *Act.* 2. concerning the *Church* of *Epheſus*, that from *Timothy* to that time, there had been *twenty ſeven Biſhops* there, to which it is conſequent, that either *Timothy*, or ſome follower of his, was this very *Angel* that *Chriſt* wrote to, *chap.* 2. 1. And ſo *Polycrates*, that was not long after St. *John's* time, affirms himſelf to be the *eighth Biſhop of that City. Epiſt. ad* Victor. *apud* Euſeb. *Hiſt. Eccl.* l. 5. c. 24.

Sect. 55. St. *Irenæus.* [a] *l.* 3. c. 3. [b] *Tertullian. de Præſcr.* c. 32. [c] *Ibid.* And ſo when [a] *Irenæus* affirms of *Smyrna*, another of thoſe *ſeven Churches*, that *Polycarp* a *diſciple* of the *Apoſtles*, was by them *conſtituted Biſhop* of that *City*; and when [b] *Tertullian* ſaith of him, that he was ſo *conſtituted by* St. *John*, as *Clemens* was at *Rome* ordained by St. *Peter*, 'tis clear that the *Apoſtles power* was not *determined* in themſelves: And of this [c] *Tertullian's* teſtimony is moſt diſtinct, and *univerſal*, that, as in *Smyrna*, and *Rome*, *perinde utique & cæteræ Eccleſiæ exhibent, quos ab Apoſtolis in Epiſcopatum conſtitutos, Apoſtolici ſeminis traduces habent*; *The reſt of the Churches in like manner exhibit thoſe, which being by the Apoſtles, conſtituted Biſhops, were their ſucceſſours*, ſpiritually begotten by them; and again, *Ordo Epiſcoporum ad originem recenſus in Johannem ſtabit auctorem, The order of Biſhops being recounted to the beginning, devolves to John the Apoſtle, the firſt authour of it*, ſpeaking of theſe *Churches* of *Aſia*, *Johannis alumnæ*, which were taken care of, and *fed* by St. *John*.

Adv. Marcion. l. 4. c. 5.

Sect. 56. *Clemens Romanus.* [d] *Ep. ad Cor.* To which in the latitude (and not onely as it concerns thoſe *Churches*) 'twere eaſie to add many more. That of [d] *Clemens Romanus*, mentioned by St. *Paul*, is moſt clear, ἐξεπέμφθη ὁ Χριστὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ οἱ Ἀπόστολοι ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, οἱ οὖν ἐξήλθοσαν εὐαγγελιζόμενοι, κατὰ χώρας ἓν καὶ πόλεις κηρύσσοντες καθίστανον τὰς ἀπαρχὰς αὐτῶν, δοκιμάσαντες τῷ πνεύματι, εἰς ἐπισκόπους καὶ διακόνους τῶν μελλόντων πιστεύειν, *Chriſt was ſent by God, and the Apoſtles by Chriſt, and they went preaching the Goſpel*, and doing ſo, *they conſtituted their firſt-fruits into Biſhops and Deacons of them that ſhould after believe.* So [e] *St. Irenæus, Succeſſiones Epiſcoporum quibus Apoſtolicam, quæ in unoquoque loco eſt, Eccleſiam tradiderunt, The ſucceſſions of Biſhops, to whom they delivered the Apoſtolick Church, which is in every place.* And, *habemus enumerare eos, qui ab Apoſtolis inſtituti ſunt Epiſcopi in Eccleſiis, We can reckon them that were by the Apoſtles inſtituted Biſhops in the Churches*, and of *Rome*, that *the bleſſed Apoſtles committed to Linus the Miniſtery of that Church.* And again ſpeaking of Biſhops, *qui cum ſucceſſione Epiſcopatus chariſma veritatis certum acceperunt, Who with the ſucceſſion of Epiſcopacy received the certain grace of truth.*

[e] *St. Irenæus Cont. Her.* l. 4. c. 63. *Ibid.* l. 3. c. 3. *Ibid.*

Sect. 57. St. *Cyprian. Ep.* 27. So St. *Cyprian* ſpeaking of the *Keys* given to St. *Peter*, and ſo to the Biſhops of the *Church*, *Inde per temporum & ſucceſſionum vices, Epiſcoporum ordinatio, & Eccleſiæ ratio decurrit, ut Eccleſia ſuper Epiſcopos conſtituatur, & omnis actus Eccleſiæ per eoſdem gubernetur*, Thence by viciſſitudes of times and ſucceſſions, *the ordination of the Biſhops, and the account of the Church doth run, that the Church may be conſtituted upon Biſhops, and every act thereof be governed by them.*

Sect. 58. *Tertullian. de Præſcr.* c. 36. And *Tertullian* again, *Percurre Eccleſias Apoſtolicas*, &c. *Run through the Apoſtolick Churches, and there as yet the Chairs of the Apoſtles preſide in their places, thus have you Corinth, Epheſus, Philippi, Rome.*

Sect. 59. St. *Athanaſius. Ep. ad. Dracont.* So St. *Athanaſius*, among thoſe things, ἃ ὁ Κύριος διὰ τῶν Ἀποστόλων πεποίηκε, *which the Lord formed by the Apoſtles*, names the *office* of the *Biſhop*, and therefore adds, *that he that deſpiſeth this function*, καταφρονεῖ τοῦ διατάξαντος Σωτῆρος, *deſpiſes Chriſt which ordained it.*

Sect. 60. St. *Baſil.* So S. *Baſil* the *Great*, calls *Epiſcopacy* ἀξίωμα τῶν Ἀποστόλων, and ἀποστολικὸν, the *prefecture*, or *precedency* which the *Apoſtles* had from *God*.

Sect. 61. St. *Ambroſ. de Dignit. Sacerd.* c. 5, 6. So St. *Ambroſe*, *Claves illas in beato Petro cunctis ſuſcepimus ſacerdotes, We all received thoſe Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven in the perſon of St. Peter.*

Sect. 62. St. *Auguſtine. Epiſt.* 44. So St. *Auguſtine*, *Radix Chriſtianæ ſocietatis per ſedes Apoſtolorum & ſucceſſiones Epiſcoporum certâ per orbem propagatione diffunditur, The root of Chriſtian ſociety is diffuſed by a certain propagation through the world, by the ſeats of the Apoſtles, and the ſucceſſions of Biſhops.*

Sect. 63. St. *Jerome in Pſal.* 45. And St. *Hierome*, *Quia Apoſtoli à mundo receſſerunt, habes pro illis Epiſcopos filios, Seeing the Apoſtles are departed from the earth, you have the Biſhops, their ſons, inſtead of them.*

And

And *Photius*, *Epist.* 34. ἡ Ἀποστολικὴ καὶ θεία ἀξία, ἣν παρὰ διαδοχῆς ὁ ἱεραρχικὸς ἐκεῖνος ἐκληρώσατο χορός, *The Apostolical and Divine dignity, which the Pontifical race inherits by succession.* Sect. 64. *Photius.*

And *Theophylact*, ἴσην ἔσχον τιμὴν καὶ ἀξίαν οἱ παρὰ Πέτρου χειροτονηθέντες ἐπίσκοποι, *They that in like manner with St. Peter were vouchsafed the grace of being Bishops, have the power to bind and loose, as he had.* Sect. 65. *Theophylact. in Mat.* 18.

And *Oecumenius*, Ἀνάλογον ἔσχεν ἡ χειροτονία τοὺς ἐπισκόπους, &c. *The Bishops were by the Ordination of the Spirit, as succeeding the Apostles, which were so ordained.* Sect. 66. *Oecumenius.*

To all which it will not be amiss to add one *Testimony* of many, out of the *Chronography* of *Johannes Malela Antiochenus*, (a *Manuscript* in the *Oxford Publick Library*) which pretends to a much greater *Antiquity* than his own, That *at the beginning of the Reign of Claudius Cæsar, some ten years after Christ's ascension*, Πέτρου μετὰ τὴν ἄνοδον τὸν Ἀποστόλων τὸν πρωτοθρόνου τῆς Θεουπόλεως τῆς Ἀντιοχείας — ἐχειροτόνησεν, *Evodius next after St. Peter* (viz. on the *Judaical* part, as *Ignatius* after St. *Paul* on the *Gentile* part) *was ordained Bishop of Antioch*, μεγάλης πόλεως τῆς Συρίας, *the great City*, i. e. *Metropolis* of *Syria*. Adding that in his time it was, that the *name of Christians*, *Act.* 11. 26. *began*, *Evodius preaching to them, and imposing that name upon them, who were before called Nazarenes and Galileans.* And this passage is by *Suidas* transcribed from this Authour. Sect. 67.

Thus hath this *Controversie* been sufficiently cleared by some remains in the *Scriptures*, to which, as they are interpreted by us, to the deducing our conclusion from them, the *concordant Testimonies* of all *Antiquity* have most readily afforded their *suffrages*. Sect. 68.

And then, as to the settling the *Monarchy* of the *Jews*, the way set down in *Scripture* is this, that *God* by a *Prophet* sent immediately from him, designed first the person of *Saul*, and after of *David*, and after, the *succession* or *line* of *David*, (by *Solomon*, and *Rehoboam*) came down from *father* to *son*, through all the *Kings* of *Judah*, without any new *revelations*, or *mission* of *Prophets*, to *anoint* and *constitute* a new *King*, when the former was deceased: or (rather) As, when *God* had first called *Moses*, and by *Miracles* sealed him a *Commission* from heaven to be ruler over the *Jews*, and after taken of the *Spirit* that was upon him, and put it upon the *Elders* to be his *assistents*, For the *succession* to either of those *offices*, there was no more used, or thought needfull, but that *Moses* should *lay his hands* on *Joshua*, and *give him a charge*, and *put some of his honour upon him*, &c. *Num.* 27. 18, 19, 20, 21. and that the *Seventy*, which were thus created to their office, should by *imposition* of *hands* admit others to the same dignity; So for the settling *Governours* in the *Church*, *God* first sent down his *Son Jesus Christ* to be personally the founder, and *Head* of it, sent down his *Spirit* to *demonstrate*, and *constitute* him so, and after his departure, this *power* being before his death instated on the *Apostles*, the *holy Ghost* again *descended* on those *Apostles*, and some the like prodigies from *heaven* were used to wards others, for their first settling them in their *dignities*. But when that was done, the whole business of a *succession* was provided for, by a more easie and familliar course, that those that were thus sent by the *Apostles*, through *Imposition* of their *hands* (as they had been by *Christ*, through the descent of his *Spirit*, hovering over, and resting on them, and as *Christ* by his *Father*, with the like solemnity) should, after the same manner, *communicate* it to others, fitly *qualified* for it. Sect. 69. The manner of succession.

Which that it was actually done in the several *Churches*, as it cannot be expected to be recorded in the *New Testament*, which can speak no farther than to those times of which it writes, so to some mentions of it, which are found there, infinite *suffrages* are added from the following Writers, by whom it far more evidently appears, that this *Power* of the *Church* did not end in the *Apostles* persons, but continued to their *successours*, the *Bishops* in their several branches, than by the *Old Testament*, and other *Jewish writings* now extant, it appears, either that it was *God's Will* that the *son* should succeed the *father* in the *Kingdom* (of which yet there is no doubt, when it was not countermanded by a *Prophet* sent from *God*) or that in the *Sanhedrin* new men were received into the places of the deceased, of which there is yet no doubt made by any. Sect. 70.

Having cleared the whole matter thus far, there will now be no need to declare what *Powers* they are, which are thus conveyed to the *Bishops*, or other *Officers* in the *Church*, it being already manifest, that the power of *planting*, *governing* and *continuing* of the *Churches*, being first vested in *Christ*, was from him derived to the *Apostles*, and from the *Apostles* to the *Bishops*, and so that the powers of *Preaching*, *Baptizing*, *Teaching*, *Confirming*, *Consecrating* the *Sacrament* of the *Eucharist*, *binding* and *loosing*, *blessing* in *Marriage*, *visiting* and *praying* over the *sick*, and at last, *constituting* others like themselves, either in whole by *communicating intirely* their whole power to them, or in part, by giving them some limited *Powers* for some certain Offices, were thus *communicated*. Sect. 71. Commission required.

Of which all that will be necessary to be added, is onely this, which *natural* reason dictates to every one, that no man ought to assume to himself any *Office* in any *Society*, but he that is designed to it by him that hath the *supreme Power* in it, nor consequently in the *Church*, but he that is called, as was *Aaron*, i. e. hath received *Mission*, or *Commission* from *God*, which being not now pretended by any to be received *immediately* from *heaven*, there is but one way imaginable for any man to *claim* it, viz. by *receiving* it from them, who immediately have received it from *heaven*. And therefore St. *Cyprian* speaking of the *Hereticks* and *Impostures* of his time, *de Unit. Eccl.* p. 23. chuses to give this, as a principal part of their *Character*, *Hi sunt qui se ultrò apud temerarios convenas sine divina dispositione præficiunt, qui se Præpositos sine ulla Ordinationis lege constituunt, qui nemine Episcopatum dante Episcopi sibi nomen assumunt, sedentes in Pestilentia Cathedra*, &c. *These are they that of their own accord, without God's appointment, set themselves up among their temerarious assemblers, who constitute themselves Rulers without any Law of Ordination, who assume the name of Bishops, when no man gives them the power, and so sit in the Chair of Pestilence* (instead of the *Episcopal Chair*) &c. Sect. 72.

And then the whole matter is devolved to a short issue, that every one that thus *runs*, is obliged to shew his *Commission*, by which he may appear to be *sent*. And that being once produced, to whatsoever acts that *extends*, to those he will be allowed to be sufficiently *authorized*, but to nothing else. Sect. 73.

And whosoever will not stand to this award, must not onely cast off the *Church* of *Christ* from being his *Mother*, confess *Christ* so far from being a favourer, that he is a professed *enemy* to his Sect. 74.

pretences,

pretences, but withall muſt acknowledge himſelf to have given a *precedent* for all the unreaſonable *claims*, and *violences*, and *oppreſſions* in the world, which muſt all commence *regular*, and *juſt*, when it ſhall once be allowed, that any power belongs to any, which cannot juſtifie (and doth not ſo much as *plead*) the *derivation* from above.

Sect. 75. To deduce this general concluſion concerning *Eccleſiaſtical Power*, to the particular branches of the *Miniſterial* function, hath been of late undertaken by my *worthy friend* Dr. *Jeremy Taylor*, which hath therefore ſuperſeded that part of the task, to which I were otherwiſe obliged now to proceed.

Sect. 76. The Office of Teaching. Inſtead whereof, it will onely be ſeaſonable to admoniſh this one thing, That the office of *publick teaching*, which is of all others now adays, moſt frequently invaded by thoſe, who are not *ſent*, is ſo far from being a *light* and *unconſiderable*, that it is indeed, next that of *Ordination*, (which is the *communicating* of the *whole power*) the moſt *Apoſtolical* part of the *Miniſterial* function, and that which cannot with any ſafety to the *Church* of *Chriſt*, be permitted to lye in common to all *invaders*, as being the proper *inſtrument* of diſſeminating *true* or *falſe* doctrine, and giving *confidence* to all the *practices*, that are conſequent to either, and upon the *concord*, or diſagreement of the *teachers*, it is viſible, that either *unity* or *diviſions* in the *Church* are directly, and immediately built.

Sect. 77. From whence it is neceſſarily conſequent, that the whole *well-being* of the *Chriſtian Church*, which conſiſts in *unity*, as the *well-being* of a *body* in the *health* of it, nay the very *being* it ſelf, which conſiſts in the *truth* of the *Doctrine*, and *obedience* to the *Inſtitutions* of *Chriſt*, depends in an eminent manner, upon the due qualifications of thoſe which are [f] inſtructed with the *Office* of *teaching* in the *Church*. And if it be not in the *Power* of the *Governours* of any *National Church*, to deſign the perſons that ſhall be intruſted with that *Office*, to *reſtrain* thoſe, whom they ſhall judge unmeet for that truſt, and to preſcribe forms of *wholeſome doctrine*, within which all ſhall be obliged to contain themſelves, It will not be poſſible to preſerve either *truth* or *peace* in any *Nation*, nor conſequently *Chriſtianity* it ſelf, which is made up of theſe two, and may as poſſibly be transformed into the direct contrary (whether *Judaiſm*, or *Mahomedaniſm*, or *Idol-worſhip*, or *Atheiſm*) as we ſee it is from *truth* in any particular point to the contrary *errour*, by the advantage of this one *inſtrument* of *Conveyance*, when he that goes out to *ſow*, carries nothing but *cockle* and *darnel* in his *ſack* with him.

[f] Intruſted.

Sect. 78. Teacher, the title of the Biſhop in Scripture. 1 Cor. 12. 28. Eph. 4. 11. 1 Tim. 5. 17. And therefore it is obſervable, that among the ſeveral *Titles* of the *Biſhops* in the *Scripture*, that of διδάσκαλος, *Teacher*, is a principal one, 1 *Cor.* 12. 28. *Eph.* 4. 11. the office of *labouring*, ἐν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ *in the doctrine*, 1 *Tim.* 5. 17. belonging to the προεστὼς *the Prefect* there, As in *Juſtin Martyr*, *Apol.* 2. after the *Anagnoſtes*, or *Reader*, had *read* the *portion* of *Scripture* out of the *Apoſtles* or *Prophets*, προεστὼς τῷ τοιούτων μιμήσεως, *the Prefect*, i. e. *the Biſhop makes the Exhortation*, in like manner as *Act.* 13. we ſee practiſed by St. *Paul* the *Apoſtle*, where after the *reading* of the *Law*, follows the λόγος παρακλήσεως πρὸς τὸν λαὸν, *the word of Exhortation to the people*, which it ſeems was not the *Reader's*, but the *Doctour's office*.

Sect. 79. Can. 12. Can. 57. And although the *Office* of *Teaching* in the *Church* have been permitted to others beſides *Biſhops*, yet ſure to none, but thoſe, to whom the *Biſhops* have thought fit to *communicate* it, by *impoſition* of *hands*, and ſpecial *licence*, the force of the *Ancyran* and *Laodicean Council*, χρεὼν τὸ ἐπιτραπῆναι τὸν τοῦ ἐπισκόπου μετὰ γραμμάτων μηδὲν πράττειν ἐν ἑκάστῃ παροικίᾳ, *That none ſhould doe any thing in every Province, without being permitted by the Biſhop with his Letters*, extending to this, that no man ſhould undertake the office of *teaching the people*, but he that had his *mandate*, were thus *licentiate* to doe it.

Sect. 80. Having thus briefly ſet down the *poſitive* doctrine, and deduced it out of the clear ſtory of *Scripture*, and the *firſt times*, which demonſtrate the *ſucceſſion* of *Officers* in the *Church*, to be no *temporary Inſtitution* confined to that ſeaſon of the *planting* of the *Goſpel*, I ſhould be willing now to conſider all that hath by any *adverſary* been with any ſhew of *reaſon* pretended to the contrary: but being not ſo well verſed in the *Modern Pamphlets*, as would qualifie me to attempt the doing of that *exactly*, the moſt probable way I can think of, is to conſult the *Socinian* Writers, who being certainly the firſt, that from the beginning of *Chriſtianity* have in this *Controverſie* appeared againſt us (and the men to whom the late *Divinity* of theſe *evil times* oweth ſo extremely much, that I cannot doubt, but their weapons have been made uſe of on this *Theme* alſo) and having in other their *invaſions* of the *Catholick Chriſtian Doctrines* and *Inſtitutions*, written the moſt *ſubtilly* of any, may therefore be preſumed not to have betrayed this part of their *cauſe*, through any *perſonal* defects of theirs, but improved it to the *higheſt*, of which the matter hath been found *capable*.

The *Socinians* objections.

Sect. 81. *Volkelius's* arguments, propoſed. And to this end I ſhall give a ſhort view of what *Volkelius*, their great *Maſter*, hath ſaid in this matter, l. 6. c. 12. *de Miſſ. Eccl. Doct.* where under the name of the *Pontificii*, he ſets himſelf againſt thoſe, who *being not content with the ancient cuſtome of chuſing Doctours and Paſtours, do now require ſome ſingular Miſſion of them, and demand a continual uninterrupted, and that perſonal ſucceſſion of Paſtours.* From hence there ariſe two branches of the diſcourſe, 1. of the *Miſſion*, 2. of the *Succeſſion of Paſtours*.

Againſt Miſſion. On the firſt head, he hath three things to ſay, Firſt, that *the place of Jeremy*, c. 23. 21. *I have not ſent them, and yet they ran*] can *prove nothing againſt his pretenſions, becauſe there they that are found fault with, took upon them to be Prophets, and aſſumed a Miſſion, gloried that they had a Province aſſigned them by God, of revealing ſome new things to his people, and conſequently required credit to be yielded them, as Embaſſadours of God's: But the modern Paſtours of the Church, profeſs they are no Prophets, brag not of any ſuch Embaſſy, undertake not to reveal any new thing, but onely inculcate that, which they find in the writings of the Apoſtles, and acknowledge they may err in underſtanding and explicating them, and require men to examine what they ſay, and believe them no farther, than they ſhall be found to agree with Scripture.*

Sect. 82. The ſecond thing (which is but conſequent to this) is, that *thoſe words*, Rom. 10. 15. *How ſhall they preach except they be ſent?*] *can yield as little aid to our pretenſions, for that is ſpoken of thoſe who were firſt to deliver the Chriſtian faith, and ſo a new thing, to mankind, and to confirm it ſo, as all were obliged to acquieſce in their doctrine, which they could not have done, if they had not been ſent as Embaſſadours on this errand: Whereas the modern Paſtours make not themſelves the firſt Preachers of the faith, aſſume no ſuch authority to themſelves,*

themſelves, but contenting themſelves with that Ordination of the Church, which the Apoſtles introduced, think they have done well, if they can but aſſiſt Chriſtians in the knowledge and practice of Chriſtian doctrine; which Ordination though it be laudable, and to be retained in the Church, whilſt it continues proſperous, yet if in time of perſecution the Church be diſſipated, and on any occaſion, that Ordination cannot be had, nothing hinders but that they which are able to inſtruct others to eternal life, may, without Ordination, propound the Chriſtian doctrine to men. And then his third thing is the proof of this laſt aſſertion from the *example of thoſe, Act.* 8. 4. *who being after the death of Stephen diſperſed, were not ordained by any, and yet the preached doctrine of Chriſt, and the hand of the Lord was with them, ſaith St. Luke.* And this is all he ſaith on the firſt Head.

Of the ſecond, *concerning the ſucceſſion of Paſtours*, His firſt obſervation is, that *the Apoſtles in creating Paſtours looked not themſelves after any ſucceſſion, nor deſired that it ſhould be looked after in others, but thought it enough if they were ſo qualified as was required,* 1 *Tim.* 3. *Tit.* 1. *where deſcribing their office very largely, they yet give no precept, or ſyllable concerning ſucceſſion; which ſhews, that this is but a figment of thoſe that would advance the authority of the Church, and more eaſily obtrude their doctrines upon others. But,* ſaith he, *this ſtrategem hath not ſucceeded, as they deſired, with wiſe men, who do deny the neceſſity of that ſucceſſion of Paſtours, and onely aſſert the doctrinal, not perſonal ſucceſſion, and therefore unleſs the aſſertours of that neceſſity* (under the name of *Pontificii* again) *can prove that their Biſhops ſucceed the Apoſtles in purity of doctrine, they doe nothing, though they never ſo oft inculcate the ſucceſſion of the perſons. For the doctrinal ſucceſſion is not ſo conjoyned with the perſonal, that one cannot ſubſiſt without the other, nothing hindring but that the doctrine may be changed, where the perſonal ſucceſſion continues: Which appears by their own confeſſion, who acknowledge Biſhops of Apoſtolical Sees to have proved many of them heretical. From whence* he concludes, that *the perſonal ſucceſſion without the doctrinal, doth no more conſtitute a true Paſtour, than the carnal ſucceſſion from Abraham's loyns, makes the Jews the true people of God; and therefore they are not to be counted the ſucceſſours of the Apoſtles, who are not begotten by them either after a carnal or a ſpiritual manner, though they can brag of ſitting in their ſeats. And as they that are not born of Abraham's ſeed, yet imitating his faith, are the true ſons of Abraham, ſo they that follow the Apoſtles doctrine are true Doctors, though they do not perſonally ſucceed in their places.* Sect. 84. Againſt ſucceſſion. c. 13. De ſucceſſ. Paſtorum.

This is all that is ſaid by him on this matter, and is far from any cloſe *arguing*, or preſſing our pretenſions with any *inconvenience*, or abſurdity. Sect. 84. Anſwer to thoſe againſt Miſſion.

For firſt, as to the two places of *Scripture* from *Jer.* 23. and *Rom.* 10. which he ſaith are not pertinent to our purpoſe, this diſcourſe, which hath not choſen to make uſe of them, is no way preſſed, or diſparaged by them: Onely it may deſerve to be conſidered, whether when the fault is ſo great to pretend *Miſſion* from *God*, for thoſe *Meſſages* or *Prophecies* which are not delivered by him, it be not a dangerous thing for any man to undertake to interpret *Scripture publickly* (which is the *New Teſtament* notion of *Propheſying*) who is ſo far from having any *Commiſſion* from *God* for ſo doing, that he is not *authorized* by the *Governours* of the *Church*, wherein he lives, or by any that have any ſo much as pretence of *authority*, to juſtifie him, but onely by his own *preſumption* in aſſuming an *Office* (for ſuch that of the *Doctor* is acknowledged to be) without any *Call* or *Commiſſion* for it, from any but himſelf. Sect. 85. Jer. 23.

And for the ſecond place, *Rom.* 10. *How ſhall they preach, except they be ſent?*] though I acknowledge the *circumſtances* of the place to determine it to another notion, than is ordinarily thought on (*viz.* that as the *Jews* could not *believe*, unleſs the *Goſpel* were preached to them, ſo 'twas not imaginable that it ſhould be *preached*, or they *believe*, if the *Apoſtles* did not look upon them, as their *Province*, to which they were *ſent*, if they forſook them, and departed to the *Gentiles*) yet *Volkelius*'s anſwer ſuppoſing a *Miſſion* neceſſary to the *firſt preaching* of the *Goſpel*, becauſe that was a *new thing to mankind*, muſt acknowledge the ſame *neceſſity* of *Miſſion* to *authorize* any to *preach* to the *Indians*, where the *Goſpel* hath not been preached yet; and that being granted, there will be little reaſon to doubt, but that *Catechizing* and *Preaching* in a *Chriſtian Commonwealth*, being the onely *publick* way to *plant Chriſtian Religion* in any (which certainly is not *born* with men here, any more than at *Japan*) that *Miſſion* will be as neceſſary to this *Office* of *Preaching* here, as to the *preaching* to *Indians* it would be; The danger being as great in *miſ-teaching* of the *baptized* ignorant *Engliſhman*, as in *miſ-preaching* to the *heathen Indian*, and the care that is due from the *Church* to her own members, being as great, as that wherein thoſe that are without are concerned, and no way to prevent that *danger*, or to expreſs that *care*, but by maintaining of *Order* in a *Church*, and not leaving the *Pulpit* to the ignorant, or *permitting* them, whoſe boldneſs qualifies them for nothing but *errours* and *impieties*, to infuſe into others all that *poyſon*, which their *humour* is apt to breed in *themſelves*. Sect. 86. Rom. 10. 15.

But then thirdly, the whole ground of his anſwer, *viz.* that *difference betwixt the Preachers there meant, and the Paſtours of the preſent Church*] is very infirm, and impertinent to this matter. For, granting the *preſent Paſtours* not to *aſſume* to be the firſt *Preachers* of the *faith*, &c. why ſhould that render this *Miſſion* or *Ordination unneceſſary? Titus* was *ordained Biſhop* of *Crete* by St. *Paul*, and *Timothy* of *Epheſus*, and that by the *impoſition* of *hands*, yet neither of them to be the firſt *Preachers* of the *faith*, but ἐπιδιορθοῦν τὰ λειπόμενα, to *ſet right things that were left unregulated*, *Tit.* 1. 5. and to *charge ſome that they teach no other doctrine*. Both which ſuppoſe *eſtabliſhed Churches*, and not the *new planting* of the *faith*. And both theſe were to *ordain Elders*, or *Biſhops*, i. e. *Paſtours*, one in *every City*. And ſo thoſe again, that were to reſide in *Chriſtian* Cities, and not to *Preach* to *Infidels*, had yet need of *Ordination*, and *Miſſion*, to fit and qualifie them for that (which is now the acknowledged office of the *Paſtour*) as much as *Paul* or *Barnabas* had to preach to the *Gentiles*, that had not heard of *Chriſt*. Sect. 87. Tit. 1. 5.

But then fourthly, this *Authour* having ſaid of the *modern Paſtours*, that they content themſelves with that *Ordination* of the *Church*, which the *Apoſtles introduced*, hath made all farther *anſwer* of ours unneceſſary: For it being manifeſt by what hath been ſaid, that the *Apoſtles* introduced the *Ordination* for which we contend, if that be had by all that undertake the *office* of *teaching* in the *Church*, I ſhall have nothing to charge, or except againſt them: And becauſe he acknowledgeth that *Ordination laudable*, and ſuch as is to be *retained* in the *Church*, whilſt it continues *proſperous*, and onely pleads for the *inſtructing* others to *eternal* life without *Ordination*, in caſe that cannot be had, through *perſecution*, &c. therefore I ſuppoſe the whole *queſtion*, as it is by him argued, devolves to this, *What is lawfull*, Sect. 88.

or

Act. 8. 4. or *fit to be done in caſe of that neceſſity:* And to that belongs his proof produced from *Act.* 8. 4. when, ſaith he, *they that were diſperſed after the death of Stephen went out and preached without Ordination.*

Sect. 89. Case of neceſſity. But to this iſſue of the whole matter, the *anſwer* is obvious, Firſt, that whatſoever excuſe from *neceſſity* can be pretended for them that are *perſecuted*, this cannot with any reaſon be produced for the *perſecutours*, when they that have caſt out the *Governours*, and *ſettled Miniſtery* of any particular *Church*, ſhall aſſume and invade their *Offices*, and ſo being guilty of *introducing* the *neceſſity* (or being themſelves the onely *Fates*, that have impoſed theſe *indiſſoluble Laws*) cannot be excuſed by that *pretended Neceſſity.*

Sect. 90. But then for the *perſecuted*, who alone can be ſuppoſed to make this *claim* to the *excuſe of neceſſity*, I anſwer, Secondly, that when any *perſecution* lyes on any *particular Church*, nothing hinders any *perſecuted* ſon of that *Church* to ſeek *Ordination*, or *Miſſion* from the *fathers* of it, unleſs all of them be ſwept away by the ſuppoſed *perſecution*, and their *light* be quite *put out in Iſrael.* And if that *blaſt* that extinguiſhes all, ſhould be ſo ſudden and violent, that it cannot be *prevented*, or *reſiſted*, the old *Iſraelitiſh* way of calling to the *next of kin* to *raiſe up ſeed* to the *deceaſed brother*, is a good hint of advice and direction in this, *viz.* to borrow light from ſome *neighbour's Candle*, *Ordination*, or *Miſſion* from ſome other *Church*, which cannot without great *unchriſtian charity* think fit to deny that duty of *Mercy*, when it is begg'd of them.

Sect. 91. And if yet, upon this *morally impoſſible ſuppoſition*, *Ordination* ſhould be no way *compaſſable*, then thirdly, I ſhall not doubt to yield as much as is pretended, that in caſe of *unblameable neceſſity*, they which have received the *Faith*, and are *able* to *inſtruct* others to *eternal life*, may without *Ordination propound* the *Chriſtian doctrine* to men, and to an *Orphan brother* or *ſiſter*, any *brother* ſupply the place of the *Charity*, though not uſurp the *Authority* of a *Father.*

Sect. 92. Act. 8. 4. But then fourthly, to the Argument drawn from *Act.* 8. 4. I anſwer, that thoſe that are there ſaid to have *gone every where preaching the Word*, do not any way appear to have done it without *Miſſion* or *Ordination.* For firſt, the [*all they that were ſcattered abroad*] v. 1. cannot be ſuppoſed to be [*the whole number of Chriſtians* (called *the multitude of diſciples*, c. 6. 2.) *that were at Jeruſalem, except the Apoſtles*] for if ſo, there would then have been little for the *Apoſtles* to doe that were left *behind.* 'Tis much more reaſonable to refer the [πάντες *all*] to the [Ἐκκλησία *Church*] (which is the *immediate antecedent*, and may denote the *Governours* and *Officers* of the *Church*, all *Eccleſiaſtical perſons*, the *Apoſtles*, the *Biſhop* of the *Church*, and his *ſeven Deacons*, and thoſe ſure were the men, on whom the *perſecution* fell, witneſs *Stephen*, c. 6. 9. and conſequently thoſe will be ſuppoſed to be *diſperſed* by it) or elſe to the *ſeven Deacons* peculiarly, who had been *conſtituted*, c. 6. and from that place to this, the ſtory of *Stephen's* diſpute, and *Sermon*, and *ſtoning*, ſet down as it were in a *Parentheſis*, and then *c.* 8. 1. upon the great *Perſecution* that was againſt the *Church* πάντες διεσπάρησαν, *they were all diſperſed*; Of the ſeven, *Stephen* ſlain, and all the reſt *diſperſed*, and agreeably it follows immediately, *ver.* 5. *Philip* (one of theſe *ſeven ordained Deacons*) *went down and preached Chriſt* to the *Samaritans*, and, having *converted*, *baptized* them, but, being but a *Deacon*, could not *lay hands* on them, or *ordain Elders* among them, the *Apoſtles* from *Jeruſalem* were ſent to doe that: And then this paſſage of *ſtory* will be as far as any in *Scripture*, from inferring the *uſefulneſs* of *Miſſion* or *Ordination*, being a clear *Teſtimony* for the *neceſſity* of it.

Sect. 93. To this it might be farther added, that although they are *all* ſaid to be *diſperſed*, *except the Apoſtles*, yet it is not ſaid that *all* the *Apoſtles remained* behind, and indeed we find not in this, or any other *ſtory*, that above three or four of the *Apoſtles* did any time *continue* there, and then, beſide the ſix *Deacons*, there might be eight or nine *Apoſtles* contained in that number of the [πάντες, *all*] And as that makes it more reaſonable to conclude [*the Church*] in the notion of *Eccleſiaſtical perſons*, and not [*the multitude of diſciples*] to be the *antecedent* to [πάντες, *all*] ſo it makes it leſs *neceſſay* to conclude, that they that *Preached* the *Word every where*, did it without *Ordination.*

Sect. 94. However if theſe were not the [πάντες, the *all*] but *others* beſide theſe contained in that number, *c.* 11. 19. yet of them theſe two things muſt be obſerved, Firſt, that they were, in a *remarkable* manner, *filled all with the holy Ghoſt*, c. 4. 31. which was certainly done to fit them for ſome *extraordinary* work, ſuch as there follows, the *ſpeaking of the word of God with boldneſs.* And for this they were as fully *qualified* by the *deſcent* of the *holy Ghoſt* upon them, and the *effects* thereof *ſpeaking* with *tongues*, or *Propheſying*, or *gifts* of *healing*, as any are by *impoſition* of the *Apoſtles hands* pretended to be. And yet ſecondly, all that we find *aſſumed* by them, is *divulging* the *Goſpel*, whereſoever they came, *c.* 8. 4. and 11. 19. And that *liberty* where the *Goſpel* is not yet known, we ſhall not *deny* to any. And this is all that is neceſſary to be ſaid to his Objections on the *firſt* branch of the *Queſtion.*

Sect. 95. Anſwer to thoſe againſt ſucceſſion. As for the ſecond, his *exceptions* againſt the *neceſſity* of an uninterrupted *ſucceſſion*, and the *frivolouſneſs* of the *arguments* will render a ſufficient reaſon of the deſigned *brevity* of theſe returns to them. For firſt, the *arguments* from the *Apoſtles not looking after ſucceſſion*, nor *deſiring that others ſhould look after it*, nor *giving any mandate concerning it*, are all *Negative Arguments*, *a teſtimonio* and therefore conclude nothing.

Sect. 96. But then ſecondly, the *Apoſtles ordaining* of *others*, which is mentioned, being it ſelf the *taking care* for *ſucceſſion*, and ſo their ſetting down the *qualifications* of thoſe that were to be *ordained*, and eſpecially the *leaving Titus* diſtinctly to this *end*, that he might *ordain in every City*, are ſo many clear *demonſtrations* of this *truth*, that the *Apoſtles took care* of *ſucceſſion.*

Sect. 97. The Teſtimony of *Clemens Romanus* for ſucceſſion. And it falls out, that we have (*ex abundanti*, much more than is needfull to the juſtifying of our pretenſions) a moſt eminent *Teſtimony* of *Clement*, St. *Paul's fellow-labourer* (mentioned by him with ſo much *honour*, in his *Epiſtle* to the *Corinthians*, Οἱ Ἀπόστολοι ἡμῶν, &c. *Our Apoſtles knew by our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, that there would be contention about the name* (i. e. *Dignity*, or *Authority*) *of Epiſcopacy; for which cauſe therefore having perfect foreknowledge, they conſtituted Biſhops, (and Deacons) and after gave a* ‖ *ſeries or catalogue*, or *ſucceſſion, that when they dyed other approved perſons might ſucceed* (διαδέξωνται) *to that office.* So far it is from *truth*, that the *Apoſtles* took no *care* for *ſucceſſion*,

‖ ἐπινομὴ. See *Diſſert.* V. c. 7. *Sect.* 2.

ſucceſſion, and ſo far that from concluding that this pretended *ſucceſſion* is but a *commentum*, or *ſtrategem* to *advance* the *deſigns* of *ambitious* men, or *Seducers*.

Sect. 98. But for that which he next adds, that *this ſtrategem hath not ſucceeded with wiſe men, who deny that neceſſity of ſucceſſion*, &c. It is far from concluding any thing, but that the Writer was willing to perſuade men, that he and his fellow-*Sectaries* were *wiſe men*, for, beſides that the *unſucceſsfulneſs* of it doth not prove it a *lye* (for *truth* hath not always had the *Monopoly* of *ſucceſſes*) it would be hard for him to ſhew any *one* man in the world, before *Socinus*, and his *followers*, that have avowedly oppoſed the *Miſſion*, and *ſucceſſion* of *Apoſtolical officers*. And then to make ſuch a leap over almoſt 1600 years, from the *Apoſtles* time to them, to pitch upon a thin *ſociety* of *wiſe men*, and then, without any *Teſtimony*, but their own of themſelves, to *preſume* their *own wiſedom*, and, by drawing an *argument* from it, *prejudge* all other men, is a *practice* ſo far from *concluding* in any *mood*, or *figure*, that it is indeed a proving the ſame by the ſame. *Volkelius* and ſome few of his Compeers oppoſe *ſucceſſion*, and their argument to juſtifie their doing ſo, is *becauſe they* have thought fit to *oppoſe* it.

Sect. 99. As for the *diſtinction* betwixt *doctrinal* and *perſonal ſucceſſion*, as I acknowledge it a *reaſonable diſtinction*, ſo I cannot but proclaim that moſt unreaſonable, which from thence he immediately infers, that therefore, *unleſs the aſſertours of the neceſſity of ſucceſſion, can prove that their Biſhops ſucceed the Apoſtles in purity of doctrine, they doe nothing*. For certainly they which doe not *all*, may yet doe *ſomething*, and he that ſaid, *half was more than all*, was not ſo groſly out, as he that made it *equal* with *nothing*. It may, and is doubtleſs *true*, that the now preſent *Biſhop* of *Rome ſucceeds* the firſt *Biſhops* of that *See*, and he that *aſſerts* that, aſſerts *one* truth, and I, in aſſerting (if I can alſo juſtifie) it, have done all that is neceſſary in the point in hand, (becauſe the *preſent Queſtion* engages me to no farther undertaking) though to him that would infer that the *Church* of *Rome* hath no errours in it *now*, it is a moſt feeble *medium* for his turn. And in order to that concluſion 'tis true, that he that doth not prove a *doctrinal* as well as *perſonal ſucceſſion*, *doeth nothing in effect*, *nothing* of *force* or *validity* toward his *end*, *viz.* of proving that there are no *errours* in the *Church* of *Rome*.

Sect. 100. And for the ſmall inconſiderable improvement which he makes to his argument by the *reſemblance* of the *carnal* and *ſpiritual* ſeed of *Abraham*, that *the perſonal ſucceſſion without the doctrinal, doth no more conſtitute a true Paſtour, than the carnal ſucceſſion from Abraham's loyns, makes the Jews the true people of God*; this is founded in the old trivial *æquivocation* of the word [*true.*] For as the *true Paſtour* ſignifies him that is truly called to that office, it is apparent, that the *perſonal ſucceſſion* alone infers that, there being no doubt with any, but that he may be this day a *true Biſhop*, which is to morrow an *Heretick*, fit to be *degraded*, and indeed he were not capable of being *depoſed*, were he not *truly* poſſeſt of that *honour*. And this is the onely notion of a true *Paſtour* that our preſent pretenſions are concerned in; For that the *ſucceſſion* to St. *Peter's Chair*, doth conclude the *infallibility* of the *Pope's Decrees*, or the [*verity*] in the other notion, *i.e. veracity* of all that ſo *ſucceed*, is no part either of our *faith*, or preſent *Intereſts*, who know that the *Jews* are *Jews*, even when they have *crucified Chriſt*, and as truly ſo now, ſince their *ſins* have made that name the *vileſt Proverb* of *Reproach*, as they were, when it denoted moſt *magnificently* the peculiar *People of God*. And though by *Chriſt*'s taking down the *partition*, and *God*'s making his Promiſes not to *Abraham*'s progeny, but the *children* and *followers* of his *faith*; it comes oft to paſs, that he is a *ſpiritual*, which is not a *carnal ſon* of *Abraham*, yet can it not, by that incompetent *ſimilitude*, be concluded, that he that follows the *Apoſtles doctrine*, is a *true Paſtour*, though he *ſucceed* not *perſonally* in any of their *places*: For if ſo, it would preſently be concluded, that every *orthodox female Chriſtian*, which by being ſo, is ſuppoſed to *follow the Apoſtles doctrines*, were a *true Paſtour* alſo. The old rule is true, that *ſimilitudes* are not *argumentative*, and that the thing which they are moſt apt to *infer*, is, that he is to ſeek for *arguments*, that thinks fit to make uſe of them.

Sect. 101. I ſhall need ſay no more to theſe objections, but that they are the beſt, that a ſort of very *ſubtile diſputers* have been able to produce, and, that the *matter* yielded them no better, is not to be imputed to them, that are not ordinarily obſerved to be ill *managers*. As it is, I have no reaſon to complain of the injury, that I have by this means come more ſpeedily to my *harbour*.

Sect. 102. Where having put in, I ſoon find my ſelf called out again by our own *Country-man*, Mr. *Hobbes* in his *Leviathan* (c. 42. *Of a Chriſtian Commonwealth*) Where in the midſt of a *Rapſody* of as ſtrange Divinity, as ſince the days of the *Gnoſticks*, and their ſeveral *Progenies*, the Sun ever ſaw (a new *Trinity*, not of *perſons*, but *perſonators*, a *new Heaven*, and *Hell*, both upon this *Earth* of ours, the *Heaven* conſiſting of *ſingle perſons*, that are *eternal* in their own *perſons*, the *Hell* of *married men*, that by the *advantage* of getting *children*, are, though their *perſons* annihilated, *eternized* in their *ſucceſſive Poſterity*, and a whole ſcheme of *Phænomena*, bearing *ſutable* proportion with theſe *Principles*) I find a Section *Of Ordination of Teachers*, and am unwilling to reſiſt the *Temptation* of annexing here a brief view of it. Mr. *Hobbes*'s objections.

Sect. 103. It begins thus, *As the Apoſtles, Matthias, Paul and Barnabas, were not made by our Saviour himſelf, but were elected by the Church*, i. e. *by the aſſembly of Chriſtians, namely Matthias by the Church of Jeruſalem, and Paul and Barnabas by the Church of Antioch: So were alſo the Preſbyters and Paſtours in other Churches elected by the Churches of thoſe Cities: For proof whereof let us conſider*, &c. The whole doctrine of that *Section* being contained in theſe words, and all that follows being but attempts to *prove* this, It will not be amiſs to conſider them more particularly, and obſerve how many *miſadventures* will be ſoon diſcernible in them. The firſt is the confounding of *Election* and *Ordination*, which are by him ſuppoſed to be *one*, but are indeed *two* diſtant things. That by him they are made *one*, already appears, by comparing the *title* with the *ſubject matter* of the *Section*. The title is *Ordination of Teachers*, but the *ſubject matter Election*; and to that the ſubſequent proofs belong alſo, that from *Act.* 14. from *Tit.* 1. from the *practice* of the *Election* of the *Biſhops* of *Rome*, put it out of queſtion. Election and Ordination.

Sect. 104. Now that *Election* and *Ordination* are ſeveral things, is ſufficiently known to every man that meaſures the nature of words, either by *Uſage* or *Dictionaries*; onely for the convincing of this *Gentleman*, or others, who think not themſelves obliged to the obſervation of ſuch *vulgar* Laws, I ſhall propoſe Differ.

theſe evidences. In the ſtory of the *creation* of the *Deacons* of *Jeruſalem*, *Act.* 6. there are two things diſtinctly ſet down, one propoſed to the *multitude* of *diſciples* to be done by them, another reſerved to the *Apoſtles*; that which the ἀδελφοὶ or μαθηταὶ, *brethren* or *diſciples*, were to doe, was ἐπισκέψασθε ἄνδρας, *to look out men*, *ver.* 3. but that with theſe *three bounds*, 1. to take *ſeven*, neither more, nor fewer; 2. thoſe, men generally known, and *reputed* of, μαρτυρουμένους; 3. in ſuch eſtimation, for *fulneſs* of the *Spirit*, of *Faith*, of *Wiſedom*, or *diſcretion* for *managery* of affairs. According to which rules *preſcribed* them by the *Apoſtles*, they proceed, *ver.* 5. καὶ ἐξελέξαντο Στέφανον, &c. *and they choſe Stephen*, &c. Here (*looking out*, and *chuſing*, either one preparative to the other, or two words ſignifying the ſame thing) *Election* of the perſons was by the *Apoſtles* permitted to the *multitude* of the *brethren*; but ſtill the καθιστῶμεν, *conſtituting*, or *ordaining*, verſe 3. is reſerved to the *Apoſtles*. In order to which it follows, *ver.* 6 that as they which choſe the perſons, ἔστησαν ἐνώπιον, *ſet them before the Apoſtles*: So the *Apoſtles*, and not they, *prayed and laid their hands upon them.* Where *conſtituting* and *impoſition of hands* being directly the thing which is by all men underſtood by *Ordination*, is appropriated to the *Apoſtles*, though the *Election* of the perſons within the forementioned limits, is by them allowed or permitted to the *multitude* of the *diſciples*.

Sect. 105. The ſame may appear in that higher matter, the advancing of *Matthias* to the *apoſtolacy*, if (as St. *Luke muſt*, ſo) this *Gentleman may* be believed againſt *himſelf*. That the *Election* of *Matthias*
Acts 1. 26. was not by *ſuffrages* of men, but by *lot*, Acts 1. 26. and that as an ἀνάδειξις *demonſtration*, ὃν ἐξελέξω, *whom God* (not whom the *Congregation*) *had choſe*, ver. 25. appears moſt evidently by St. *Luke*. But for the *Ordination* of this *Apoſtle*, that, ſaith this *Gentleman*, p. 288. lin. 10. was the *act* of the *Congregation*, which though it be far from all *truth* (all that was done in it being done by the *Apoſtles* onely, *in the midſt*, i. e. *in the preſence* of all the *diſciples*) yet I ſhall not now *reſiſt* it, but take him at his word, and from thence conclude, that the *Election* being by St. *Luke* attributed to *God*, and the *Ordination* by himſelf to the *Congregation*, *Election* and *Ordination* muſt be two ſeverals, and not the ſame *act*

Sect. 106. The ſame may appear again in his own inſtance of *Paul* and *Barnabas*, Act. 13. 2. *The holy Ghoſt*
Acts 13. 2. *ſaid*, *Separate me Paul and Barnabas for the work whereunto I have called them.* There again it is
Acts 9. 15. apparent, that *God* from heaven had choſen *Saul* (that σκεῦος ἐκλογῆς, Acts 9. 15. *Veſſel of Election*, to *bear his name*) and *Barnabas*, to that office of *apoſtolacy*, and given appointment to *Simeon*, and *Lucius*, and *Manaen*, the *Biſhops* of *Syria*, to *ſeparate*, i. e. (as we have ſhewed) to *ordain* them, or *ſend* them forth to the *work*. And accordingly they did, *ver.* 3. *having prayed*, *and faſted*, *and laid hands on them*, *they diſmiſſed them*, or gave them their ſolemn *Miſſion* or *Commiſſion*. Where 'tis again clear, that the *Election* of the *perſons* was the act of *God*, from the *holy Ghoſt*, but the *impoſition of hands*, *Separation*, *Miſſion*, *Ordination*, was the work of men there named, and commanded to doe it. So when *Timothy* was made *Biſhop* by the *Laying on of the hands of the Preſbytery*, as his *Ordination* muſt be imputed to thoſe *Biſhops* or *Elders* that *laid hands* on him: So there is
1 Tim. 4. 14. alſo mention of διὰ προφητείας, 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. of *Prophecy*, or *revelation* of *God*'s Will, by which that *grace* was *given* him. *i. e.* by which he was *elected* to that *dignity*; and ſo St. *Chryſoſtome*, and *Theophylact* affirm of that place, τὸ τῆς διδασκαλίας καὶ ἱερωσύνης ἀξίωμα μέγα ὄν, τῆς τῶ Θεῶ δεῖται ψήφου ὥστε τὸν ἄξιον λέγεσθαι— ὅπω ὁ Τιμόθεος ἠρέθη ἐπὶ τῶ ἱερατεύειν, *The dignity of Teaching and Prieſthood* (i. e. *Epiſcopacy*) *being great*, *ſtands in need of God's ſuffrage for the admitting of a worthy perſon*, *and ſo* (*as of old by Prophecy Prieſts were made*, *ſo*) *was Timothy choſen to the Prieſthood.*

Sect. 107. And as of *Timothy*, ſo of all other the *Biſhops* of *Aſia*, when St. *Paul* ſaith of them, *Acts* 20.28.
Acts 20. 28. that the *holy Ghoſt* ἔθετο ἐπισκόπους *had ſet them overſeers*, I ſuppoſe that is to be underſtood of their
Apud Euſeb. Hiſt. l. 3. *c.* xx. *election* or *nomination* to thoſe dignities. For ſo I am ſure *Clemens Alexandrinus*, ſpeaking of St. *John*, that he was intreated to go to the *neighbouring Cities*, adds, that he went accordingly, ὅπου δὴ καθίστας καθίζων, &c. τῶν ὑπὸ τῶ πνεύματος σημαινομένων, *and conſtituted Biſhops*, &c. *of thoſe that were ſignified by the Spirit*, where the *Spirit's ſignification* notes the *election* or *nomination* of the *perſons*, which was from *God immediately*, but the *conſtituting* them was the *ordination* of St. *John*.

Sect. 108. And ſo in that Teſtimony of *Clemens Romanus* formerly produced, Ἀπόστολοι κατέστησαν —— δοκιμάσαντες τῶ πνεύματι, τοὺς ἐπισκόπους, *the Apoſtles conſtituted Biſhops*, *trying or approving them by the Spirit*: where ſtill the tryal or *approbation*, being all one with the *election* of the perſons, was an act of the *holy Spirit*, revealed to them, but the *conſtitution* or *ordination*, their own act, to which they were formerly authorized by *Chriſt*.

Sect. 109. And ſo in his other inſtance of the *Biſhops* of *Rome*, from the beginning till this time, as in all other *practice* over the *Chriſtian* world, *Election* and *Ordination* are diſtinguiſhed, not onely in reſpect of the *acts*, one ſubſequent to the other, but very frequently in reſpect of the *Electors* and *Ordainers*, the whole *College* of *Cardinals*, that are preſent, being the perſons, to whom the *election* of the *Pope* now belongs, but onely the *Biſhop Cardinals* laying on their hands in the *ordination*.

Sect. 110. And ſo it is known in this *Kingdom*, that the *Conge d' eleir*, the *Commiſſion* to *chuſe* a *Biſhop* was by the *King* ſent to the *Dean* and *Chapter* in the *Cathedral*, as to the *ſtanding Synod* of that *Dioceſe*, but the *ordination* was to be done by thoſe that were *Biſhops* before him.

Sect. 111. This I ſhould not thus largely have inſiſted on, were it not the ἄπιον ψεῦδος, the *procreative miſtake*, or ignorance, that produced thoſe other, that I am now to proceed to.

Sect. 112. A ſecond great miſtake is, that he affirms of *Matthias*, *Paul* and *Barnabas*, that they were *elected*
Election of *Matthias*. by the *Church*: where firſt, it hath already appeared by plain *Texts* of *Scripture*, that every one of theſe three was *elected* by *God* himſelf. Of *Matthias* 'tis clear by the manner of it, by *lottery*, the
Acts 1. 24. *diſpoſition* of which is of the *Lord*, ſaith *Solomon*, and by the ἐξελέξω, *Act.* 1. 24. *thou* (i. e. *God*) *haſt choſen*. And of the other two, εἶπε τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, *the holy Ghoſt ſaid*, i. e. commanded to *ſeparate them* (by name) *to the work*, ὁ προσκέκλημαι αὐτούς, *to which I*, (i. e. the *holy Ghoſt*) *have called them*. And it is not imaginable how this *Gentleman* ſhould *view*, (as 'tis clear he did) and not diſcern the *importance* of ſuch plain *places*.

And

And ſecondly, when by the *Church* he expreſſes himſelf to mean the *Aſſembly* of *Chriſtians*, the *Church* of *Jeruſalem* and of *Antioch*, It is by that rendred much more unreconcileable to all appearance of truth: For till *Church* was ſo explained, it was poſſible he might have meant the *Apoſtles*, or *Governours* of the *Church*, who had ſomewhat to doe in this matter; whereas the *Aſſembly* of *Chriſtians* were (as far as can be diſcerned by the Text) utterly unconcerned in both of them. *Sect.* 113.

Of the chuſing of *Matthias* there were two parts, the *naming* of two, and the caſting *lots* between them two; the former of theſe was no *act* of the *Church*, much leſs the latter. *Sect.* 114.

The two were not *named* by the *Church*, but by the *Eleven*, for in *the midſt of them* (under the title of ἀδελφοὶ ἀπλοῦν, *Peter's brethren*, or fellow-diſciples, and thoſe ſet down by *name*, verſe 13.) St. *Peter ſtood up*, ver. 15. and ſpeaking of *Judas*, ſaith, *he was numbred with us*, ver. 17. *i. e.* with *himſelf*, and them, to whom he ſpake, the *College* of *Diſciples*, or *Apoſtles* peculiarly, not the *whole number* of *believers*, or the *Church* of *Jeruſalem*; and ſo again, *ver.* 21. the *men that conſorted with us*, are thoſe that *followed Chriſt* together with the *twelve*, and *verſe* 22. *a witneſs of the reſurrection* σὺν ἡμῖν *with us*, muſt needs refer to the *eleven* peculiarly, for they onely, not the whole *Church*, were to be thoſe *witneſſes*: Upon which it follows, ἔστησαν δύο, ver. 13. *and they appointed* or *pitched* on *two*, where the [*they*] muſt needs be *they*, *to*, and *of* whom he ſpake all this while, and ſo the *eleven*, and not the *hundred* and *twenty*, which are never mentioned but once, and then 'tis in a *parentheſis*, ver. 15. *Sect.* 115.

And if the *eleven* were they that *nominated* the *two*, then it muſt needs follow, that it was they alſo that gave in the κλήρους αὐτῶν, *the lots of them*, one *lot* with the name of *Barſabas*, the other of *Matthias* upon it, for ſo the ἔδωκαν, *they gave*, verſe 26. muſt connect with the ἔστησαν, *they appointed*, and *conclude* the ſame perſons to have done both. And indeed there could be no uſe of the *Congregation* for that, to throw in, and take out the *lots*, That muſt be the work of ſome *two* perſons at the moſt, and ſo no work of an *Aſſembly*. *Sect.* 116.

And ſo likewiſe at the *conſtituting* of *Saul* and *Barnabas*, the Text is expreſs, that they were *Doctours* and *Prophets* that *prayed*, and *laid hands on them*, and ſo the *Ordination* was no more the act of the *Aſſembly*, than the *Election* appeared to be. *Sect.* 117. The Election of *Paul* and *Barnabas*.

It was hardly poſſible to have contrived a greater number of improbable affirmations into ſo ſmall a compaſs: And then if that which follows with the [*ſo*] be *ſo* indeed, If the *Paſtours* and *Preſbyters* in *other Cities*, were *elected* by the *Churches* in *thoſe Cities*, *ſo*, *as Matthias and Paul*, *and Barnabas*, *were*, if *one* be no *truer* than the *other*, the whole matter is ſoon come to a fair iſſue. *Sect.* 118.

But however it hath proved with his firſt *affirmation*, which was without offer of proof impoſed upon us, The *practice* of the *other Cities* he undertakes to make *proof* of. *Sect.* 119.

And his *proofs* are two, one taken from *Acts* 14. 23. the other from *Tit.* 1. 5. In the firſt, *Paul* and *Barnabas ordained Elders in every Church*; in the ſecond, *Titus conſtituted Elders in every City*: Moſt certainly true. But what is to be inferred from hence? *Ergo*, The *Preſbyters and Paſtours of other Cities were elected by the Churches of thoſe Cities*. *Sect.* 120.

A *Concluſion* very *remote* from theſe *premiſſes*: For, firſt, there is not one word of *Election* in either place, but of *conſtituting* and *ordination*, which is quite another thing; and ſecondly, there is nothing in either place attributed to the *Churches* of thoſe *Cities*, but onely to *Paul* and *Barnabas* in the one, to *Titus* in the other. Thus beyond all meaſure improſperous are this *Gentleman*'s undertakings on this ſubject. *Sect.* 121.

The former of theſe he ingenuouſly confeſſes may at *firſt ſight be taken for an argument againſt him*, that they themſelves (*Paul and Barnabas*) *choſe*, and gave them their *authority*: And ſo ſure 'twill do at the *tenth*, and *twentieth* review of it. *Sect.* 122.

But, ſaith he, *if we conſider the original Text of it*, *it will be manifeſt*, *that they were authorized and choſen by the Aſſembly of the Chriſtians of each City*: *For the words there are*, χειροτονήσαντες αὐτοῖς πρεσβυτέρους κατ' ἐκκλησίαν, *When they had ordained them Elders by the holding up of hands in every Congregation*: What is the importance of χειροτονεῖν, we are not now to be taught, having in the beginning of this diſcourſe ſet it down at large, that though the *original* of it refer to the *ceremony* of *holding up of hands*, yet it ſignifies ſimply to *ordain* and *conſtitute*, without any reſpect to that *ceremony*; and when it doth refer to it, it always denotes their *hands*, and *ſuffrages*, of whom it is ſpoken, and cannot be imagined ſo much as to intimate the *ſuffrages* of other men. And then, firſt, it would be as unreaſonable to infer from the *original* of the word, that that *ceremony* was there uſed, as *Act.* 1. to reſolve that they uſed *Counters* in reckoning or *numbering Matthias* with the *eleven Apoſtles*, becauſe the word συγκατεψηφίσθη there, is derived from ψῆφος a *Counter*, which was uſual in *numbring*. *Sect.* 123. Acts 14. 23.

And ſecondly, if it were granted, that the word muſt here import (according to the *original* of it) to *ordain* by *holding up of hands*, there is not from thence the leaſt advantage gained toward the deſired concluſion. For it was diſtinctly *Paul* and *Barnabas* which did thus χειροτονεῖν *ordain* by thus *holding up the hands*, and not the *aſſembly* of all the *Chriſtians*. And if no part of this were ſo, yet *thirdly*, what he ſaith of their being *authorized and choſen by the Aſſembly of Chriſtians*, is another heap of *Confuſions*: For whatſoever *chuſing* can be imagined of the *Aſſembly*, that muſt (as the *chuſing* of the *Deacons*, Acts 6.) be by *authority* from the *Apoſtles*, who again after that, were to give unto them that were ſo *choſen*, all the *authority* that they were to have; And ſo the *choice*, whatſoever it were, *preceded*, and the *authority* followed after; And again, the *choice* onely was ſuppoſeable to be from the *Aſſembly*, the *authority* being totally derived from the *Apoſtles*: both which are *confounded* and *tranſpoſed* by this *Gentleman*. *Sect.* 124.

But, ſaith he, *the manner of chuſing Magiſtrates and Officers in all thoſe Cities*, *was by plurality of ſuffrages*, *and to ordain an officer in any of the Cities*, *was no more but to bring the people together*, *to elect him by plurality of Votes*. *It was therefore the Aſſembly that elected their own Elders*, *the Apoſtles were onely Preſidents of the Aſſembly*, *to call them together for ſuch election*, and *to pronounce them elected*, *and to give them the benediction*, *which now is called conſecration*. This is again very far from prevailing any thing toward the deſired concluſion. For firſt, whatſoever be ſuppoſed of the *manner* *Sect.* 125.

of *electing Officers and Magiſtrates in thoſe heathen Cities*, 'tis ſure enough that was not the buſineſs then in hand; *Paul* and *Barnabas* came not thither for the *election* of an ἄρχων or φυλάρχης (as of a *Mayor*, or *Sheriffs*, or *Aldermen*) in that City. Theſe *itinerant Apoſtles*, that were not of their *Corporations*, were not certainly the *Preſidents* of their *Courts* or *Common Councils*, to *aſſemble*, or bring them together for thoſe *elections*. This is as remote a *conjecture*, as that formerly mentioned of *Paul's ordaining Elders* by the power which he had *received* from his *Maſter Gamaliel*; The truth is viſibly in the midſt between them, what they did was to *conſtitute Biſhops* in each City, over the *Chriſtians*, and therein they acted neither as *Jews*, nor *Gentiles*, but as *Apoſtles* of *Chriſt*, from whom they had their *authority* to *preach*, to *receive* believers, to *order* them in the *ſervice* of *God*, and ſo leaving them, to *conſtitute* thoſe which ſhould doe it in their *abſence*. All which hath nothing of their *heathen Cuſtoms* in it, nay the *Apoſtles* (ſaith [h] *Clement*, a writer of thoſe times) *conſtituted* their *firſt-fruits Biſhops* of thoſe who *ſhould believe*, μελλόντων πιστεύειν, who therefore not yet *believing*, are not imaginable to be the *Electours* of their *Biſhops*.

[h] *In Sp. ad Cor.*

Sect. 126. *Secondly*, what reaſon can be rendred why to *ordain* ſhould be no more, but to bring the people together to *elect*? It was even now to *hold up hands*, and *ordain* by doing ſo, That differs much from the bare *aſſembling of the people*: So no grounds are there yet produced for the inferring the *Concluſion* [*It was therefore the Aſſembly that elected.*]

Sect. 127. And yet *thirdly*, If again all this were granted to him, he hath ſo ordered the matter, that it would be nothing available to him: For 'tis by him ſtill acknowledged, that the *Apoſtles gave the benediction, which now is called conſecration*. And if they did ſo, that is all we mean by *ordination*, when by that word we render χειροτονήσαντες, and ſo all that we contend for in this buſineſs: For of *ordination* it hath formerly been ſhewed at large, that it was the *communicating* that power to others, which had by *Chriſt* been given to the *Apoſtles*; To them it was conveyed by the viſible deſcent of the *holy Ghoſt* upon them, from them to others, onely by *prayer*, and *benediction*, and *impoſition of hands*, the *ceremony* of conveying power to *ſucceſſours*. And all this we now adays call *Conſecration*, the *ſeparating* men, *i. e.* the *conſecrating*, ſetting them apart to *holy offices* and *dignities* in the *Church*, and if this, all this while, be allowed the *Apoſtles* peculiarly, and not the *aſſembly* of *Chriſtians*, then is all granted that is by any man pretended to, on this head of *Ordination* of *Teachers*.

Sect. 128. For to *conclude* this matter, though both here and in the place to *Titus*, there is no one word of *election*, or *choice* to this *office*, but onely of *ordination*, giving them *Commiſſion* who were *choſen*, yet it is willingly allowed, that the *election* of *Church officers* doth not always belong to the ſame perſons, who are to *ordain*. The *practice* is ſufficiently known in this broken *Church* of ours, The *Parochial Miniſter* is *choſen*, and *nominated* by the *Patron*, who is ſometimes the *whole Congregation*, ſometimes one *principal* perſon in it, the Lord of the *Manor*, the *King*, the *Biſhop*, &c. And he (ſave when it is the *Biſhop* himſelf that hath the right of *Patronage*) preſents him to the *Biſhop*, and as he, upon *approbation* of the perſon, inſtitutes him to the *Cure* of *Souls*, ſo he *ordains* him by *impoſition of hands*, to the office of a *Deacon* and *Preſbyter*.

Sect. 129. And ſo likewiſe for the *ordination* or *conſecration* of a *Biſhop*, as was formerly ſaid, The *King nominated*, the *Dean* and *Chapter* did *chuſe*, (and if they found *juſt* cauſe to return an οὐκ ἔστιν ἄξιος, *he is unworthy*, in ſtead of *ſignifying* their *choice*, no doubt they ſhould be heard) but the *Council* of *Biſhops ordained* him. And ſo ſtill the *election* differing clearly from the *ordination*, and the *election* being not the thing contended for, but onely the *ordination* or *conſecration*, that being yielded to belong to the *Biſhops* or *Elders* peculiarly, and not to the *aſſembly* of *Chriſtians*, the whole Controverſie is yielded us, in the eager'ſt part of the *Contention*.

Sect. 130. Which being done, I ſhall not need to contend any farther, or make any anſwers to the ſubſequent parts of that Section; Otherwiſe it were eaſie to ſhew that Προεστὼς or *Antiſtes*, the ordinary title of *Biſhops* in *Juſtin Martyr*, and ſome of the Ancients, was ſomewhat more than a bare *Preſident* of an *Aſſembly*, as that extends but to *numbring of Votes*, *declaring who is choſen*, *and giving a ſingle vote*] the name being a name of *rule*, and *dignity*, and *power*, and not onely of *Preſidency*, but *Prefecture*, and all one with ἐπίσκοπος *Biſhop* (who had the *rule* of the whole *Church*, and not onely the principal place, or πρωτοκαθεδρία in the *Council*) as may appear (among many others) by three ancient Records.

Προεστὼς.

Sect. 131. *Euſeb. Hiſt. lib. c.* κγ'. *Epiphan. Har.* 72. The one of *Dionyſius Biſhop of Corinth*, in his *Epiſtle* to the *Athenians*, where having made mention of *Publius*, προεστῶτος αὐτῶν, *the Prefect*, or *Preſident of them*, he preſently mentions *Quadratus* μετὰ τὸν μαρτυρήσαντα Πόπλιον καταστάντος ἐπισκόπου αὐτῶν, that *after the martyrdom of Publius was conſtituted their Biſhop*. The other, of *Marcellus Biſhop of Ancyra*, in his *Epiſtle* to *Julius Biſhop of Rome*, where ſpeaking of himſelf, and other *Biſhops* of the *Churches* infeſted by the *Hereticks*, Σιμωνὰ, ſaith he, καὶ τῶν τῆς Θεοῦ Ἐκκλησιῶν, καὶ ἡμῶν τῶν προεστώτων αὐτῶν τετολμήκασι, *they have attempted ſhrewd things againſt the Churches of God, and us the Preſidents*, i. e. *Biſhops of them*. The third, of the *Council* of *Epheſus*, Act. 18. where οἱ τῶν ἁγίων ἐκκλησιῶν κατὰ τὴν Κύπρον προεστῶτες, *the Preſidents of the Churches of Cyprus*, are the ſame that in the beginning of the *Canon* are ἐπίσκοποι τῆς Κυπρίων ἐπαρχίας, *the Biſhops of the Province of the Cypriots*. And in a word, their very title of προεστῶτες τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν, *Preſidents*, or *Prefects of Churches*, and not of *Synods* or *Councils*, is a determination of this buſineſs, and concludes them to have had the *rule* of the *Church*, and not onely the firſt place, or *Preſidency*, or *Prolocutorſhip* in the *Council*; And therefore *Præſidentes* is oft the title of *Biſhops* in *Tertullian*, who yet is known to have aſſerted the *Supreme authority* and *Power* in the *Churches* to belong to them.

Sect. 132. Tit. 1. 5. I now proceed to the ſecond place, that to *Titus*, c. 1. 5. to examine what advantage he can draw from thence to his pretenſions. His words are theſe, *Becauſe all the Churches had their Preſbyters ordained in the ſame manner, where the word is conſtitute* (as *Tit.* 1. 5.) ἵνα καταστήσῃς κατὰ πόλιν πρεσβυτέρους, *for this cauſe have I left thee in Crete, that thou ſhouldſt ordain Elders in every City, we are to underſtand the ſame thing, namely, that he ſhould call the faithfull together, and ordain them Preſbyters by plurality of ſuffrages*. That in this place to *Titus* there is no ſyllable of mention either of *aſſembling* the *faithfull*, or of *ſuffrages* in the *ordination* of *Elders*, is apparent to any that ſhall reade the words, and the contrary

contrary is not by this *Gentleman* pretended; Onely by way of *analogy* with that former place, where he seems to have concluded an intimation of *suffrages* by *holding up of hands*, he concludes it must be so *here* also, though it be not so much as intimated.

Sect. 133. Where first, it were sure more reasonable to interpret St. *Luke*'s obscurer word by St. *Paul*'s plainer (and from thence to conclude, that as *Paul* at *Iconium*, so *Titus* at *Crete*, was the person that *ordained Elders*, and not the *whole Church*) than to interpret St. *Paul*'s plainer by the obscurer of St. *Luke*, and conclude as he concludes: But then secondly, it hath sufficiently been demonstrated, that no such advantage can be drawn from the word χειροτονῶν in that *Text* where it is used. And then sure it can have no influence on this other, where it is not used, but another of a more undoubted *signification*. The short is, χειροτονέω signifies indifferently *to ordain*, or *design* to any *office* (without looking back to the *Gentile* Customs from whence it was taken) and being sometimes used of *God* personally, *Acts* 10. 41. is no way limited to *popular elections*, unless when it is applyed to the *Church*, or *assembly* of many (as 2 *Cor.* 8. 19. it is) and therefore when the Text is clear, that (not the *Church*, but) *Paul* and *Barnabas* did *ordain*, what a complication of *unreasonables* will it be, *First*, from a bare possible *Grammatical* connotation of one word, to conclude the direct *contrary* to the whole verse, *viz.* that they did not *ordain*, who, saith St. *Luke*, did, but the *Church* by *plurality* of voices; and then secondly, from this one practice thus strangely concluded to interpret all other plain affirmations of *Scripture* to a sense quite contrary to the *words*, and infer that *Titus* did not *ordain*, when St. *Paul* saith expressly he *did*, but onely the *assembly* of *Christians called together* by him.

Sect. 134. *But*, saith he, *it had been a strange thing, if in a Town where men perhaps had never seen any Magistrate otherwise chosen, than by an Assembly, those of the Town becoming Christians, should so much as have thought of any other way of election of their Teachers and Guides, i. e. of their Presbyters, otherwise called Bishops, than this of plurality of suffrages.* I shall not need dispute whether every *Town* in *Crete*, as also *Iconium*, *Lystra* and *Antioch*, chose all their *Magistrates* by *plurality* of *suffrages*. 'Tis sure enough that in this matter there is no place for such *arguings*: For first, to his mention of a *Town*, &c. 'tis evident, that *believers* were at first but *few* in every *Town* or *City* (they were not *whole Corporations* at once *converted* (nor consequently could they *act* in such *capacities*) but, (as *Clemens Romanus* saith) they that were by the *Apostles* constituted *Bishops* and *Deacons* in several *Cities* and *Regions*, were constituted over those that *should after believe*, there were oft so few at the present. And then as fast as any did come in to the *faith*, they readily *submitted* themselves to those *by* and *under* whom they did *come* in, and were not at all troubled with the *consultation* or *deliberation*, about the *way* of *electing* their *Teachers* and *Guides*, i.e. their *Bishops*, as is here by this *Gentleman* supposed.

Sect. 135. Secondly, it must be remembred, that whersoever the *Gospel* was preached, it came *originally* from *Jerusalem*, and then, as *Agrippa* in *Philo* saith of that City, that it was, Μητρόπολις ὐ μιᾶς χώρας Ἰουδαίας, ἀλλὰ ϗ τῶν πλείστων, *The Metropolis not onely of Judaea one region, but of many others*, διὰ τὰς ἀποικίας ἃς ἔπεμψεν εἰς τὰς ὁμόρους Αἴγυπτον, Φοινίκην, Συρίας τὴν τε ἄλλην ϗ τὴν Κοίλην προσαρρεδομένας, &c. *because of the Colonies which that sent out to Ægypt, Phenice, and both the Syria's, nay to Pamphilia, Cilicia, and a great part of Asia, as far as Bythinia and Pontus*, &c. So in reason the *Church* in *Lystra*, and *Iconium*, and *Antioch*, where *Paul* and *Barnabas* ordained *Elders*, Act. 14. were to follow the *patterns* at *Jerusalem*. And there we know it was not by the *suffrages* of the *people* that an *Elder* was assumed into the *Sanhedrin*, but the *Prince* or *head* of the *Sanhedrin* received him in by *imposition of hands*, and so in the *creation* of *Scribes* and *Doctors* of the *Law*: And for the *Church of Christians* there, we have already shewed that *James* the *Just*, the *first Bishop* of that *Church*, was by the *Apostles*, not by the *Assembly*, advanced to that *Prefecture*. And agreeably in *other Churches*, it will be much more reasonable (if such considerations may prevail) to deduce the circumstances of *ordaining Elders*, from the *customs* familiar to them that preached the faith unto them, than from the *former usages* of them to whom it was preached, who were not to *dispute*, but to *believe*, and receive the *Institutions*, as well as *doctrines* which were brought them.

Sect. 136. But then thirdly, the matter is yet farther beyond all controversie; For sure the *heathen* (as formerly the *Jewish*) *Cities*, to whom the *Gospel* was to be preached by *Christ*'s command, were not to *chuse* their guides, or *Teachers*, *Christ* was not *chosen*, by those to whom he preached (*Ye have not chosen me*, saith he) he came from *heaven* on that errand of his *Father*'s, and happy they, whom he was thus pleased to *chuse*, to *call*, and *preach* to. And when his *Apostles*, after his example, *go* and *preach* to all *Nations*, and *actually gather disciples*, they *chuse* their *Auditours*, and not their *Auditours* them: And they that give up their names to the obedience of the *Gospel*, one branch of that *obedience* obliges them to *those who are placed over them by God*, not onely their *civil Parents* and *Magistrates*, but *Pastours*, whom the *holy Ghost*, either mediately, or immediately, hath *set over them*.

Sect. 137. And so sure there is no place of disputing left, whether they whom the *holy Ghost* made their *overseers*, Acts 20. 28. had the *plurality* of the *suffrages* of the *people* or no: For, besides that if it were so, never any *Apostle* or *Pastour* should be received by the *faithfull* in any City, till a *major* part of the City, by having *received* the *faith*, were made capable of *receiving* him, (which, we know, was not the way, when there was, in comparison, so *little faith* on the *earth*, to the far wider fields of *infidelity*) It will also follow, against those expres words of *Scripture*, that not the *holy Ghost*, but *they* have *placed* the ἐπισκόπους *overseers* over them. And then I should gladly be advertised of the reason, why, when St. *Paul* wrote so many *Epistles* to whole *Churches*, he never gave directions for the *qualifying*, and *chusing*, and *ordaining* of *Church-officers* in any of them, but *reserved* that *seasonably* for the buliness of those *Epistles*, which were directed to the single persons of *Bishops*, *Timothy* and *Titus*, and that with a ταῦτά σοι γράφω, *these things I write to thee*, 1 *Tim.* 3. 14. immedjately annexed to the discourse on that matter: It being perfectly vain to instruct him in the due *qualifications* of those that were admitted to those *offices*, to which he had no power to *chuse* or *ordain* any.

Sect. 138. Besides these, many other evidences there are premised in this *discourse*, which must not in any reason be here repeated, which render the conclusion of this *Section* most visibly void of all appearance of truth, that there *never was any chusing of Bishops*, (*before the Emperours found it necessary to regulate*

gulate them, &c. *i. e.* at leaſt till *Conſtantine's* time) *but by the aſſemblies of Chriſtians in every ſeveral Town.*

Sect. 139. As for the *continual practice even to this day*, in the *election of the Biſhops of Rome*, by which he thinks his aſſertion *confirm'd*, It is directly and viſibly contrary: for *at this day*, 'tis known, that the *Cardinals*, that are *preſent*, do *elect* the *Pope*, and the *Biſhops* among them *conſecrate* or *ordain* him, and ſo whatſoever is meant by *Election*, whether *choice* of the *perſon*, or *conveying* the *office* to him, 'tis certain it is not done by the *aſſembly* of the *Chriſtians*, meaning, as before he expreſſes himſelf to do, the *whole Congregation*.

Sect. 140. And for the *argument* added to back this *Teſtimony*, That *if the Biſhop of any place had the right of chuſing another to the Paſtoral office, in any City, at ſuch time as he went from thence, much more had he the right to appoint his ſucceſſour in that place in which he dyed.* 'Tis not imaginable what this *argument* can conclude in favour of the diſputer, For firſt, if the *Biſhop* cannot *chuſe* his own *ſucceſſour*, either removing or dying, yet it follows not (but is far removed from all truth) that the *Aſſembly* chuſes him; If we ſpeak of *Election* ſtrictly taken. and differing from *Ordination*, the *Principal* of the *Clergy*, *College* of *Cardinals* at *Rome*, the *Chapter* of the *Cathedral Church* in other places, may and are known to doe it: And yet a notable teſtimony of that matter we have already mentioned out of *Clemens Romanus*, that the *Apoſtles* that *conſtituted Biſhops in every City, did in their life-times make a catalogue of perſons, that ſhould ſucceed in every See.*

Sect. 141. But if we ſpeak, as this *Gentleman* doth, more *looſely*, and make *Election* and *Ordination* all one, then the *Metropolitan*, as *Titus* in all *Crete*, and not any *inferiour Biſhop* in his own *Church*, or elſe the *Council* of *Biſhops*, and not any one *Biſhop*, or, as the ancient *Canons* require, three *Biſhops* at the leaſt; may and do *ordain* the *ſucceſſour*, and ſo, though not the *removing* or *dying Biſhop*, yet not the *whole Church*, or *aſſembly* of *Chriſtians* neither.

Sect. 142. That ordinarily the *removing* or *dying Biſhop* cannot ordain his own *ſucceſſour*, is true upon theſe other accounts, and not upon that *one*, which is *pretended*, Firſt, that the *election* of the *Biſhop* doth belong to other hands as is premiſed; Secondly, that *one ſingle Biſhop* is by the *Canons* made incompetent for the *conſecration* of a *Biſhop*, There are to be three at leaſt, See *Can. Apoſt.* 1. and 2. and *Synod. Nicen.* c. 4. And thirdly, that the *Canons* again command that no *Biſhop* ſhall be *ordained ſine titulo*, without a *Church* (to which he is *elected*) *vacant* to receive him; which therefore cannot be pretended, as long as the *Biſhop* lives. All which reaſons being of force againſt any man's *ordaining* his *ſucceſſour*, are far from hindring him from being one of the *three Biſhops*, that may *ordain* any to a *vacant Church*. And of that ſure this *Gentleman* is ſufficiently ſatisfied, that although the *Biſhop* cannot *ordain* his own *ſucceſſour*, yet he can with other *Biſhops ordain* another's *ſucceſſour*. And therefore it is apparent, that this was but an artifice to amuſe his *Reader*, himſelf acknowledging the *concluſion*, which he would ſeem to invalidate or confute by it.

Sect. 143. Having now diſpatched all that this *Gentleman* hath ſaid of the *Ordination* of *Teachers*, I am again permitted to retire, and conclude this Treatiſe.

The Sixth *QUÆRE.*

Of the obſervation of Chriſtmas-day, and other Feſtivals of the Church.

Sect. 1. IN diſcourſing of the *annual celebration* of the *feaſt* of *Chriſt's Nativity*, it will, to any that were not contentious, be thought ſufficient, to put him in mind of St. *Paul's* argument, the *cuſtomary* practice of the *Church*; And that in this particular *Church* of *England* it is of ſo *ancient uſage*, that we have no other beginning aſſigned to it, than the ſame which our *ſtories* give of the *plantation* of the *Goſpel* among us.

The practice of this Church.

Sect. 2. That it is thus *ancient*, is evidently ſuppoſed and implyed by one *objection* which ſome men have to the obſervation of it, the retaining of ſome *heathen* uſages in it, of which ſort, if there be any continued by the *ruder multitude*, as they are no part of the *office* of that *feaſt*, and conſequently not imputable to the *doctrine* of our *Church* in this matter, ſo are they as undeniable teſtimonies of the *Antiquity*, and uninterrupted *continuance* of this practice, even from the time of our firſt *converſion* from *heatheniſm*. For otherwiſe in caſe of a *latter date* or *diſcontinuance*, it is not imaginable how any *heathen uſage* ſhould be found to have been (and ſtill to remain) adherent to it.

Sect. 3. Of the *plantation* of *Chriſtianity* among us of this *Iſland*, it is acknowledged that there was a *double date*, the one appertaining to the *Saxons* or *Engliſh*, the other to the far more *ancient Britains*.

The plantation of Chriſtianity here.

For that of the *Britains*, it was, if *Hiſtory* and *Monuments* may be believed, either *Apoſtolical*, or very near the *Apoſtles* times. And this will appear leſs improbable, if we take notice of what is ſaid by St. *Paul*, 2 *Tim.* 4. 10. that *Creſcens* was *gone* (ſent by St. *Paul*) into *Galatia*, *Titus* to *Dalmatia*: Where *Galatia* being an equivocal word, and belonging to *Gallia* or *France*, (1 *Mac.* 8. 2. where it is joyned with *Spain*; and ſo in *Joſephus*, *Ant.* l. 12. c. 17. where the *Romans* are ſaid to have ſubdued Γαλατίαν and Ἰβηρίαν, *France* and *Spain*) as well as to a part of *Aſia*, anciently inhabited by the *Gauls*, *Epiphanius* affirms diſtinctly (in the *Hereſie* of the Ἀλογοι) that *Gallia* or *France* was the place there ſpoken of: And ſo the *French* have it by ancient *Tradition*, and ſo the nearneſs of *France* to *Italy* and *Rome*, where St. *Paul* was at the writing of that *Epiſtle*, makes it moſt probable, eſpecially when it is conſidered that *Dalmatia*, which is there named with it, is ſituate over againſt *Italy* And then what is ſo early affirmed in *Scripture* of the communicating the *Goſpel* to *France*, which is ſo near to us, removes all improbability from thoſe *Hiſtories*, which record the *plantation* of the *Goſpel* in theſe *Iſlands* in the *Apoſtles* times, which I the rather obſerve, becauſe *Joſeph* of *Arimathea*, who is reſolved

Sect. 4. Among the Britains.

solved by Mr. *Camden* out of *Ecclesiastick Writers* (who, saith he, had it *ex antiquæ fidei authoribus*, out of as *ancient* and *credible authours*, as we have any) to have planted *Christianity* here, is said by them to have come hither *ex Gallia*, *out of France*. That this was in *Tiberius's reign*, is the affirmation of *Gildas*; And as it is clear by *Tertullian*, that the *British Islands* were long before his time converted to *Christianity*; and by *Origen* on *Ezek. Hom.* 4. *Britanniam in unius Dei consentire religionem*, that *Britany had received the Religion of the one God*, i. e. *Christianity*; so it is in our *stories* affirmed, and by the Records of other Nations acknowledged, that *Lucius* the *King* of *Britain* (about the year of *Christ* 180.) was the first *king* of the *whole world* which received the *Christian faith*; and by the *Epistle* of *Eleutherius Bishop* of *Rome* to him (if *that be authentick*) it doth not onely appear that he was acknowledged by him to be *Vicarius Dei in regno suo*, the *Vicar of God in his own Kingdom*, i. e. far from any *subordination*, or *subjection* to him, that wrote it, but that *before* that writing of his, and not from that present *Bishop* of *Rome*, the *Kingdom* of *Britain* had (as the words of the *Epistle* are) [a] *received by God's mercy the law and faith of Christ*, *the New and Old Testament*, out of which he advises him by the *advice* of his *Realm* to take a *Law*, and by the same to *rule*.

[a] *Suscepistis enim nuper miseratione divinâ in regno Britanniæ legem & fidem Christi, habetis penes vos in regno utramque paginam, ex illis per consilium regni vestri sume legem, & per illam Dei potentiâ vestrum rege Britanniæ regnum.*

Sect. 5. And although by *Diocletian's persecution* the *Christian faith* and *discipline* is said to have been sorely shaken here, yet it was not so far extinguished, but that within ten years after three of our *Bishops*, *Eborius* of *York*, *Restitutus* of *London*, and *Adelphus Colonia Londinensium*, were present and subscribed to the *Council* of *Arles*, eleven years before the first *Council* of *Nice*: See *Concil. Gallic. per Sirmund. tom.* 1. p. 9. and Sir *Henry Spelman* in his *Anglican Councils*, p. 23.

Sect. 6. This is sufficiently acknowledged, but yet may receive some light from one observation, The *celebration* of *Easter* by the ancient *British* and *Scotish Christians*, was contrary to the custome of the *Western Church*, saith *Bede*; That this practice of theirs was taken up by themselves upon any *novel fancy*, may not be imagined, nor indeed is it so charged upon them. 'Tis certainly derived to them by their *Antecessours*, who in all probability took it from the first *planters* of *Christianity* among them: And then those must be some such as in the very *Apostolical* times kept their *Easter* (as in the *East* the first *Christians* did) after the *Jewish manner*. And so though this be an *evidence* that neither *Peter*, nor *Paul*, nor *Crescens*, nor any of those that usually accompanied either of those *two Apostles*, the *founders* of the *Church* of *Rome*, did bring the *Christian faith* to this *Island*, but rather *Joseph* of *Arimathea*, or *Simon Zelotes*, as others affirm, yet in respect of the *antiquity* of the *Plantation*, there was some colour for the affirmation of [b] *Simeon Metaphrastes*, that St. *Peter* ἐπεμείνας ἐν Βρεττανία ἡμέρας τινὰς, καὶ πολλοὺς τῷ λόγῳ φωτίσας τῆς χάριτος, ἐκκλησίαν τε συστησάμενος, ἐπισκόπους τε καὶ πρεσβυτέρους καὶ διακόνους χειροτονήσας, ἐκ Βρεττανίας ἦλθε πρὸς Νέρωνα, *stayed in Britain some time*, *converted many*, *and constituted Churches*, *and ordained Bishops in the* 12th. *year of Nero's reign*. And he cites it out of *Eusebius*, that he spent 23. years in *Rome* and *Britain*, and the *Western Cities*. But the authority of that Writer is not great.

[b] *de Pet. & Paul. ad diem* 29 *Junii.*

Sect. 7. And (as for the *feast* of *Easter*, of which there can be no question, so) for the observation of this *feast* of the *Nativity* among those first *British Christians* (though our *Records* of those times are but very thin and dark, yet) one evidence we have of moment in this matter, referred to in a [c] former *discourse*, but now fit to be set down more fully. *Christmas-day* is frequently called in our *old* Monuments, Mydpinter-dæg, *Midwinter-day*, and Mydpintnæt mæsse *Midwinter-masse*: From whence, I suppose, it may reasonably be concluded, that when that name was first applyed to that day, the day whereon *Christmas* fell, was in the *Calendar* either coincident with, or not far removed from the *Winter Solstice*. Now supposing with the *Western Church*, that our *Saviour* was born on the 25. of *December* (as shall anon be farther proved, and doth in some measure appear, by remembring, that the day which from those times we still continue to call *Midsummer-day*, is on the 24. of *June*, and so directly half a year from the 25. of *December*) it will follow by *calculation* (with which I shall not trouble and tire the Reader) that it must be soon after our *Saviour's* time, that this day was capable of that appellation, and consequently that the day was here celebrated so early. Now (we know) by reason of the *procession* of the *Æquinoxes* and *Solstices*, the *Solstitial* or *Midwinter-day*, when the *Sun* enters *Capricorn*, is a fortnight distant from our *Christmas*-day, and so the *Summer Solstice* is proportionably distant from *Midsummer*-day, as we still call it. And therefore the beginning of the *celebration* of this *day* in this *Nation*, must be fastned at, or near that time when this 25. of *December* fell on the *Winter Solstice*, i. e. a fortnight sooner than the *Julian Calendar* hath placed it, which being considered, will argue the *celebration* very ancient, and bordering upon *Christ's* time. And partly upon this account it was that *Pope Gregory* the XIII. undertook the *reformation* of the *Calendar*, to reduce the *Æquinoxes* (upon which the *celebration* of *Easter* depends) and so consequently the *Solstices*, to the seats they obtained at the time of the *Nicene Council*, But he went no higher; If he had, this might have been more evident.

[c] *Prael. Cat.* p. 87. Midwinter-day.

Sect. 8. The British Church independent from *Rome*. This being thus far clear, will set these farther characters upon this, or any other *Christian solemnity*, *Easter*, *Pentecost*, &c. which is of *original* or *immemorial* usage in this Nation; First, that the *antiquity* of it doth no way argue that it hath any thing of the corruptions of the *Roman See* adhering to it, but evidently the contrary: For it is manifest by the *stories* that *Augustine* the *Monk* was very far from being the first planter of *Christianity* in this Nation, that he found *British Bishops* here at his coming, from whose *Predecessours* and founders, and not from his *Ordo Romanus*, this *Church* of ours is obliged, with acknowledgment to *God*, to date its *Christianity*. To this purpose we may see the [d] answer of the Abbat of *Bangor* to *Austine* the *Monk*, requiring his *subjection* to the *Romish Church*, *Bid yspie a diogel*, &c. i. e. *Notum sit*, *& absque dubitatione vobis*, *quòd nos omnes sumus*, *& quilibet nostrum*, *obedientes & subditi Ecclesiæ Dei & Papæ Romæ*, *& unicuique vero & pio Christiano*, *ad amandum unumquemque in suo gradu*, *in perfecta charitate*, *& ad juvandum unumquemque eorum in verbo & facto*, *fore filios Dei*. *Et aliam obedientiam quàm istam non scio debitam ei quem vos nominatis esse Papam*, *nec esse Patrem Patrum vendicari & postulari*. *Et istam obedientiam nos sumus parati dare & solvere ei & cuique Christiano continuò*. *Præterea nos sumus sub gubernatione Episcopi*

[d] *Concil. Anglic.* p. 188.

Epiſcopi Caerlegionis ſuper Oſca, qui eſt ad ſupervidendum ſub Deo ſuper nobis, ad faciendum nos ſervare viam ſpiritualem. Be it known to you and without doubt, that we are, and every one of us obedient and ſubject to the Church of God and Pope of Rome, and to every true and pious Chriſtian, to love every one in his degree with perfect charity, and to help every one of them by word and deed to be the ſons of God. As for any other obedience, I do not know that I owe it to him, whom ye call the Pope, or that he hath right to challenge or require to be the Father of fathers. This obedience we are ready to give and pay to him, and to every Chriſtian continually. Beſides we are placed under the government of the Biſhop of Caerlyon upon Osks, who is to ſuperviſe under God over us, to make us keep the ſpiritual way. So again, Sir. *Henry Spelman, Concil. Anglic.* p. 26. out of the *Annals of Giſburn*, cites thus, *Ab urbe Legionum Meneviam tranſlata eſt ſedes Metropolitana, tempore Sancti David Epiſcopi per Regem Arthurum, ubi ſteterunt* 13 *Archiepiſcopi, uſque Samſonem ——— à quo uſque tempus Henrici primi ſederunt Meneviæ undecim Epiſcopi, & uſque ad hoc tempus Epiſcopi Menevîæ à ſuis ſuffraganeis Wallenſibus ibidem fuerunt conſecrati, nullâ penitus profeſſione vel ſubjectione factâ alteri Eccleſiæ. From Caerlyon the Metropolitan Seat was tranſlated to Saint Davids by King Arthur, in the time when Saint David was Biſhop there, where there ſtood thirteen Archbiſhops untill Samſon; from whence to the time of King Henry the firſt, there ſate at Saint Davids eleven Biſhops, and untill this time the Biſhops of Saint Davids were there conſecrated by their own Welſh Suffragani, without making any profeſſion of ſubjection to any other Church.* To this I might add that of *Boniface* the *Martyr*, ſtyled the *Apoſtle* of *Germany*, who in a matter of doubt conſulted not onely the *Biſhops* of *Rome*, but *Nothelme* alſo *Primate* of *England*, and by the Reſcript of *Nothelme* reforms the *Popes*, ſaith [e] *Baronius:* And that of *Lanfrank* Archbiſhop of *Canterbury* under *William* the *Conquerour*, who being often cited by *Gregory* VII. to *Rome*, would not be wrought on either by his *threats* or *blandiſhments* to *obey* him. But theſe are not ſo pertinent to our preſent matter.

[e] *T. 9. Ann. 716. n. 57, 58. Ep. Greg. 7. in Concil. t. 4.*

Sect. 9. Secondly, that any ſuch ancient *uſage* of this particular *Church*, if it had no other *ground* to ſtand on (as its *foundation*) or *concurrence* of all other *Chriſtian Churches* (as *pillars*) to ſuſtain it, were a very competent *Authority* for the preſent continuance of ſuch a practice in this *Kingdom*. This *Anglicane*, or rather ancient *Britiſh Church*, being one of thoſe, which by its foundation, and by force of the known *Canon* in the *Council* of *Epheſus*, in the caſe of the *Cypriots*, is ἀυτοκέφαλος, ſubject to no foreign *Patriarch*, and conſequently inveſted with unqueſtionable power to inſtitute *ceremonies* for it ſelf (as it ſhall judge moſt *uſefull*, moſt for *edification*, and moſt agreeable to the *analogy* of *faith*) which conſequently may not, without great temerity, be *changed* and aboliſhed by any. And therefore to every one, which is ſtill willing to continue a member of this *perſecuted Church*, wherein he was *baptized*, and yet hath been willing to comply either with the *humour* of theſe late times (in that which he counts no *ſubſtantial part* of his *Religion)* or with ſome *Proteſtant Churches* elſewhere in diſuſing theſe *obſervances*, I ſhall, before I conclude this part of my deſigned method, tender the conſideration of theſe few things.

Sect. 10. The diſ-uſing of theſe feaſts blameable. Firſt, that it is ſufficiently clear, that this *obſervation* is an undoubted part of that *eſtabliſhment* which the *Reformation* of this *Kingdom* (which alone of all others hath had the *honour* and *reputation* of being *regular* and diſcreet, in oppoſition to *popular* and *tumultuous*, and to be thought worthy to *give*, and not *receive* rules from other platforms) hath enacted for us. And that appears by *Act* of *Parliament* (as well as *Church-Canon*) which gave authority to the *Liturgy*.

Sect. 11. Secondly, that in other *Reformed*, eſpecially the *Lutheran Churches*, this and other *feaſts* of *Chriſt* are retained in their *Eſtabliſhments*, and in ſome few places, where the *Reformation* proceeding leſs *regularly*, hath in the *tumultuary* haſte left out, or ſwept it away, It is yet either by the *Confeſſions* of thoſe *Churches*, or by ſober members of them, approved and wiſhed for: Of this the words of the *Helvetian Confeſſion*, and not onely *Bucer*'s approbation of it in our *Liturgy*, and the like of many others in thoſe times, but alſo the expreſs words of the famous *du Pleſſis* of *France*, complaining that they had not retained the obſervation of it in the *French Reformation*; and ſince him, the practice of ſome others, who in their weekly *preachings* have conſtantly given *Chriſtmas-day* the *ſolemnity* of a *Sermon* (wherein the whole body of their *publick devotions* now adays conſiſts) are ſufficient *teſtimonies*. And much more might be added in that matter.

Sect. 12. Thirdly, that the raſing this *Feſtivity* out of the *Calendar* of the *Church*, or the encouraging thoſe that do ſo, in laying down or *diſuſing* the *obſervation* of it, is an act of *Diviſion* and *Separation* (in the former, and compliance with *Diviſion* and *Separation* in the latter) from the *particular Church* of *England*, and from the *univerſal Church* of *Chriſt* in all ages, eſpecially that of the *firſt*, and the *pureſt* times.

Sect. 13. Fourthly, that the preſent *complexion* of theſe times doth no way invite the laying aſide this *Uſage*, or render it excuſable in them which have diſuſed it; It being for the ignoranter ſort a little too viſible, that the omiſſion of the *Chriſtmas Sermons* and Services, doth tend to raſe out of their minds that ſlender *knowledge*, which they have gathered of the *birth* of *Chriſt*, and the conſequent *myſteries* of our *Religion*, and, by gratifying their worldly affections, doth much aſſiſt *Atheiſm* or *blindneſs*, in the hope and attempt of ſupplanting all *Chriſtian knowledge* among many. And it being with great reaſon affirmed by the *Caſuiſts*, that the *neceſſaries* of *belief*, for the moſt vulgar ſort, are no more than the great *Holidays* of the year, (the *ſervices* of which keep the *ignorance* of them from being excuſable in any) This *ejecting* all thoſe *Holidays* out of the *Chriſtian Church* (being as it is, ſuperadded to the diſuſing of the *Creeds* and *Catechiſm*) will probably, if *God* pleaſe not to avert, ſoon diſpatch all opinion of any *neceſſity* of *believing* any of thoſe *Articles*, and in time, where the *Miniſter*'s care of ſetting apart other days for the *preaching* of thoſe *truths*, doth not *help* to ſupply the *defect* in ſome degree, (for by long diſcourſes *wholly* to *ſupply* it, it is not to be hoped) it will be the *ſupplanting* of the *foundation* it ſelf, and ſo at laſt the *intercepting* of all (the moſt *ſuperficial*) *knowledge* of the *firſt elements* of our *Chriſtianity*.

Sect. 14. As for thoſe of *deeper knowledge*, who leſs ſeem to want ſuch helps, yet is their general *impatience* of *ſound doctrine*, their readineſs to embrace whatever is *novel*, and *contrary* to the *ancient Faith* and *Principles*,

Principles, become now ſo groſly apparent, and the practice of *Chriſtian Precepts*, eſpecially of *hoſpitality* and *charity*, ſo ſcandalouſly *out-dated*, that it is but needfull to take the *gardiner's* courſe, and dig to the *roots* of *Chriſtianity*, to lay it open and bare, if ever we expect it ſhall recover from *barrenneſs*, and flouriſh in more verdure, than of late it hath done.

Sect. 15. Laſtly (to lay aſide all that may be *diſputable*, or poſſible not to be aſſented to by any) I deſire it may be conſidered ſadly, Whether the *abolition* of that *ſolemnity*, which hath no other deſign, but to teach us what we have received from *God* in *Chriſt*, and to aſſiſt us to render *God* a pious *publick acknowledgment* of it at ſome ſet time (which without ſuch proviſion is ſure to be neglected by many) be the fitteſt diſcharge of our *charity* to the ſouls of ignorant *ſeducible* men, or whether they can truly receive *comfort* from having yielded an aſſiſtence, or complyance to the removing it out of this *Church*.

Sect. 16. If to all this be oppoſed the *fear* and danger of a *threefold guilt* in the *continuing* of this *obſervance*, the *firſt* of *Will-worſhip*, becauſe this is not *commanded* in *Scripture*; the *ſecond*, of *Superſtition* in *obſerving days*; the *third*, of *Riot* and *Exceſs*, which is frequently obſervable in ſuch *Feſtivals*, Then as to the two former of theſe, I have given a large *anſwer* in [f] another place, ſo to the *third* I ſhall now enlarge what was there but briefly touched, conceiving it a matter of great *importance*, that ſo *pious* a *cuſtome* ſhould be clearly vindicated from ſo *impious* an *appendage*, and that this diſcourſe, which is ſincerely deſigned to the *advantage* and welfare of *all*, ſhould not be to any an *occaſion* of *falling*.

[f] Treat of *Will-worſhip* and of *Superſtition*, and *Pract. Cat.* l. 2. ſect. 12.

Sect. 17. The riot of which theſe Feſtivals are accuſed.

And firſt, I freely acknowledge, that all *riot* and *exceſs* is a *ſin*, and that far greater and more puniſhable in a *Chriſtian*, than in any man elſe, particularly than in the *Jew*, whoſe *promiſes*, of an *earthly plenty* are not ſo contrary and irreconcileable with *corporal exceſs*, as are the *ſpiritual joys* that are the *Chriſtians* eminent (if not oneIy) *portion* under *promiſe*, both in *this* and in another life.

Sect. 18. The charge anſwered.

But then ſecondly, *Feſtivity* and *Hoſpitality* is very ſeparable from *riot*, or *luxury*, in a *Chriſtian Commonwealth*; The *heathen feaſts* and *ſacrifices* had little elſe in them, *gluttony* and *drunkenneſs* being the preſcribed *worſhip*, and way of approving themſelves to (and of *pleaſing* or *ſerving*) ſome of their *Idol-gods*, and *uncleanneſs* being the deſign of others, if not openly in their *Temples*, yet more cloſely in their receſſes and *myſteries*, their τελεται and ἐποπτειαι, and ſo both ſorts recommended to them under an opinion of *Piety* and *Religion*. But the *Chriſtian Feſtival* being wholly made up of *ſpiritual dainties*, in receiving *Chriſtian* inſtruction, offering *Prayers* and *Thanksgivings* and *Alms*, and not feeding *corporally*, ſave in the *Sacrament* onely, (where I hope no *exceſs* hath ever been obſervable in this Nation) is thus far free from having any degree of *luxury*, *intrinſecal* to it, or *inſeparable* from it.

Sect. 19. As for the *cuſtomary hoſpitality* or *good cheer* of thoſe ſeaſons (beſides that at other times there hath been, by thoſe who have laid down this *cuſtome*, as great *liberty* uſed in *feaſting*, ſince their departure from the *Church*, as ever they uſed before in time of *Chriſtmas*, which argues the *good cheer* not to be the thing diſliked, but the *Chriſtian* occaſion or ſeaſon of it) Firſt it muſt be acknowledged that that is not any other than a *decent attendant* on that, as on any, *Feſtivity*, (not of the *eſſence* or *ſubſtance* of it) And then what reaſon can be aſſigned why it ſhould not be *lawfull* thus *outwardly* to expreſs *Chriſtian joy* by ſome change of *Cloaths* or *Diet*, from that which is *ordinary* at other times, to that which is as *ordinary* at *feſtivities*? Γεωργὸς τὸν σκαπάνην καὶ τὸ ἄροτρον ῥίψας εἰς τὸ τὰς ἑορτάζοντα χλαῖνα ἐκαλλωπίσατο, ſaith *Greg. Nyſſen* of *Eaſter*, *The ploughman dreſſes himſelf in a feſtival guiſe*, and, ὁ πένης ὡς πλούσιος, *The poor man* putteth himſelf in the *rich man's attire*, and the *rich man* σωφρόνως περιαιρεῖται καὶ λύει τὰς ἐντυγὰς, *ſets himſelf out in luſtre above ordinary*. And St. *Heirome* ſaith of thoſe that *mourned* for their *friends*, that at *Eaſter* they laid aſide their *mourning garments*, and put on their moſt *rich apparel*. And ſecondly, why ſhould it not be moſt *lawfull* to *bleſs*, and *praiſe*, and *give thanks* to *God* (after the manner of all men, *Jews* and *Gentiles*, who always had *feaſts* annexed to their *Sacrifices*) and to expreſs and demonſtrate that, in the *enjoyment*, and by the *acknowledgment* of his *temporal goodneſs*, ſo it be done with that one great neceſſary *caution*, and *reſervation* of *ſobriety* and *thanksgiving*, and this more at ſuch a time of *commemorating* ſome ſpecial *mercy* received from *God*, than at another, and eſpecially to take care that the *ſeaſon* of *acknowledging* an *eminent mercy* of *God*, be alſo a remembrancer of the *exerciſe* of that eminent *Chriſtian* duty of *Hoſpitality*, and *Charity* to the poor, and again of a chearfull liberal reception of friends and neighbours, to nouriſh or breed *Chriſtian* acquaintances and correſpondences, and add to the *comfort* of life by the ſociety, and quiet converſe of thoſe others our equals, which ſtand in need of our *examples* of *Piety* and *Chriſtian* commerce, though they want not the *ſupplies* of our *bread*? And accordingly the *Fathers* ſpeak of a *rejoycing*, which they call χοϊκὴ and κοσμικὴ, *earthy* and *worldy*, as well as of another, which they call θεϊκὴ and πνευματικὴ, *ſpiritual* and *divine*, and think that one is very *reconcileable* with the other.

Sect. 20. But then thirdly, if ſuch *plenty* be not by experience found (among the *generality* of the *Kingdom*) to be uſed and enjoyed without *ſin* (though as long as there is *fleſh* in the *world*, unreformed by *Chriſtianity*, this need not be looked on as any *ſtrange* thing, or the *cure* of it undertaken by that new *Empirical* way of applying the *remedy* to the *weapon*, not to the *Patient*, yet) rather than the *faults* of this attendant and acceſſory ſhould be charged to the deſtroying of the *Principal*, and rather than the *external* part ſhould have the fate to devour the *inward* and more excellent, and when it ſhall appear really that the exceſſes and vices of men, occaſioned merely by the *Chriſtmas-cheer* and *ſports*, are more conſiderable to the debauching and ruining of *ſouls*, than the forementioned uſes are *beneficial* to the improving of them, I ſhall then profeſs to beſieve, that there is place and ſeaſon for *Reformation* in this *particular*, this *acceſſory*, this *external* part, that attends on this *Chriſtian feſtivity*; and that it is more than time, that the greateſt *ſeverities* be uſed to that end, that the *exceſſes* of men being ſo impudently *irrational*, as to aſſault and pollute that which is moſt *ſacred*, be alſo cured by *irrational* applications, by impoſed, and forced *abſtinences*, that they be diſcouraged and branded by this *Character*, that the *beaſts Phyſick* was found neceſſary to this *beſtial* diſeaſe, the vertue of *temperance* thought fit to be taught them by a preſcribed impoſſibility of *intemperance*.

Sect. 21. But then ſtill this *penance* which is due to the *guilty*, is not due (but impertinent) to the *innocent*, belongs onely to the *wicked*, as *Abraham* told *God*, and not to the *righteous*, to the *carnal*, not the *ſpiritual*, to the *eating*, not to the *praying* and *praiſing* part of the *feſtivity* (As in the *ancient Church* when on days of *feſtivities* men began to adorn themſelves *ſumptuouſly* to ſhew their *pride*, not to *honour* the day, and fared *deliciouſly* to *ſurfeiting* and *drunkenneſs*, the *Fathers* did not thereupon *forbid* what before they *allowed*, but ſought to reduce them from that *pride* and *luxury*, οὐ κωλύω τὴν ἑορτὴν, ἀλλὰ κολάζω τὴν ἀμετρίαν, *I do not forbid the feſtivity, but reprehend the immoderation*, ſaith *Greg. Nazianzen*) And ſo if it muſt come under the *diſcipline*, it will not be neceſſary, I hope, that the *diſcipline* be more ſevere, than the utmoſt of the *Primitive* ſharpeſt *Cenſures* were, that if it muſt be *delivered up to Satan*, it be no farther than *for the deſtruction of the fleſh*, of the *riotous*, *outward* part of it, ſo as may be reconcileable with the *ſaving of the ſpirit*, that hath deſerved no *wrath*, the *preſerving* of the *inward* more *ſpiritual* part (the *ſoul* as it were) of the *feſtivity*.

Sect. 22. Mean-while it is clear, that the *Church*-part of the *feſtivity* is not ſuppoſed *guilty* in this kind, and therefore can in no *juſtice* be found liable to the *intemperance* of the *Parlour*, whatſoever that be ſuppoſed to be: And for the other, the *eating* and *ſporting* part, againſt which all the *charge* muſt be laid, that need not be *aboliſhed* neither, ſave onely in caſe of *great* and *general abuſes*. And that caſe will not be *pleadable*, till firſt, upon endeavour to *reform*, it appears, that there is no place of *remedy* for the *abuſes*, no imaginable means of reſcuing a *laudable cuſtome* from an *impious appendage* (and then truly I know not to what purpoſe are *Laws*, and deſigns of *Reformation*; if the *Mattock* muſt doe all the work, the *Pruning-hook* is become unuſefull) and, Secondly, till the *abuſes* are not onely ſo *great*, as diſcernibly to out-balance the *good uſes*, but alſo ſo *general*, that (as in the buſineſs of the *brazen Serpent*) the *whole Church* in a manner runs madding into theſe *very great abuſes*.

Sect. 23. Whereas indeed the utmoſt that can, without great want of *charity*, be pretended by any in this matter of *Chriſtmas*, is onely this, that they which are *looſely* or *laſciviouſly* diſpoſed, do turn this *feaſting* into *luxury* and *exceſs*; and ſo, I believe, the ſame men will be obſerved to do the *Lord's-day* alſo, when yet they have not the *temptations* of a *feaſt*, but onely the *advantages* of a *reſt* to recommend it to (or excuſe it in) them; while thoſe that are not *ſo ill*, and yet none of the *beſt*, make it but a time of *refreſhment* from their ordinary *labour* and *travel* in their *Callings*: But on the other ſide, thoſe that are *Chriſtianly* diſpoſed make uſe even of the moſt *external*, *groſſer* part of it to *ſpecial ſpiritual* advantages, to the *glory* of *God*, and *comfort* of their *ſouls*, *Chriſtian converſation*, *pious* diſcourſe, *commerce* of *ſouls*, *charity*, *hoſpitality*, and the like.

Sect. 24. But then laſtly I add, after all this complaint of *great* and *general abuſes*, *revellings*, &c. that if we look no farther than *this Kingdom* of ours, wherein they are thus ſeverely *viſited*, the *charge* appears to be moſt *unjuſt*. For the *day* of the *birth* of *Chriſt*, *Chriſtmas-day* it ſelf, hath never, that I heard of, been obſerved among us to be guilty of theſe, but on the contrary hath been kept (if not much more) certainly as ſtrictly, as any *Lord's day* in the year, in *frequenting* the *ſervices* of the *Church*, in the uſe of the *Liturgy*, *Sermon*, *Sacrament* of the *Lord's Supper*, in keeping at *home* every man and woman in their own Family, and not touching either *Cards* or *Dice* that day. The *exceſſes* which have been obſerved, have been on the days *after* the *Nativity*; and yet I ſuppoſe every *Chriſtian* houſe-keeper may with ordinary diligence ſo regulate his *hoſpitality* and the *ſports* which he permits in his *family*, at thoſe times alſo, that they may tend to no worſe end, than the encreaſe of *Chriſtian charity*, and *kindneſs* among neighbours all the year after.

Sect. 25. And ſo ſtill this (and that really the moſt conſiderable) *prejudice*, taken from the *riots* occaſioned by this *feſtivity*, is proved of ſmall validity againſt any (even the *groſſer*) part of it, and of none at all againſt the *feſtivity* it ſelf; But yet may reaſonably be made uſe of, as an enforcement of

Dom. 1. *adv.* that Exhortation of St. *Auguſtine*, *Quotieſcunque natalem Domini*, &c. *celebrare diſponitis*, *ebrietatem ante omnia fugite*, *Whenſoever ye prepare to celebrate the day of Chriſt's birth, beyond all things avoid drunkenneſs*. And this is the duty of the *Miniſters* to the people, and of all ſorts of *Governours* to the whole Nation, to *exhort* and *perſuade* all men that they would not permit the *abolition* of this *Feſtival* to remain an inſtance of their *beſtiality* to poſterity, that they would pay that as a *tribute* to *piety*, which ſeverity of *Laws* may otherwiſe rend from them, and rather chuſe to adorn a *Chriſtian feaſt* with a *Chriſtian temperance*, (which then is moſt ſuch, when there are advantages and *temptations* to the contrary) than *impiouſly* to *defame* a *pious uſage*, and bring *vengeance* upon it, by an *impertinent Beſtial* inordinacy.

Sect. 26. To which purpoſe is that of *Greg. Nazianzen*, *Or.* in *Pent.* Ἑορτάζει Ἰουδαῖος, ἀλλὰ κατὰ γράμμα, ἑορτάζει Ἕλλην, ἀλλὰ κατὰ σῶμα, καὶ τοὺς ἑαυτῶν θεούς τε καὶ δαίμονας, ἑορτάζομεν καὶ ἡμεῖς, ἀλλ' ὡς δοκεῖ τῷ πνεύματι, *The Jew feaſteth, but according to the letter; the Greek feaſts, but according to the body, celebrating his own Gods and Damons; we alſo feaſt, but ſo as it ſeems good to the Spirit.* And of *Theodoret*, Ἀντὶ τῆς πάλαι πομπείας καὶ αἰσχρουργίας, καὶ αἰσχρορρημοσύνης, σώφρονες ἑορτάζουσι, πανηγύρεις δὲ μείζονα ἔχουσι, καὶ κῶμον, καὶ γέλωτα, ἀλλὰ ὕμνοι θεῖοι, καὶ ἱερῶν λογίων ἀκρόασιν καὶ σωφρονικὴν ἐξιστᾶσιν κοσμιάζουσαν δάκρυσι, *Therapeut.* 9. *Inſtead of the old pomps, and unclean practices and diſcourſes, the Chriſtians keep ſober feaſts, without gluttony, drunkenneſs, laughter, but in ſtead thereof have divine hymns, the hearing of the holy Oracles, and Prayer adorned with tears fit for ſo holy ſolemnities.* And if this importunity may prove ſucceſsfull, this exception will then be throughly anſwered, if it be not *already*, and be as far from *true*, as it is now from *argumentative*.

Sect. 27. Having thus far enlarged on this firſt *Conſideration*, addreſſed peculiarly as to a member of the *Church* of *England*, not yet broken off from that body, wherein he received his *baptiſm*, It will not be now unſeaſonable to conſider him as a ſon of the *Univerſal Chriſtian Church* of the *whole* world, and for his ſatisfaction, as he is ſuch, to ſhew him in brief, what *Authority* it is by which the *Feſtivals* in *general*, and particularly this of the *Nativity* of *Chriſt*, pretend to ſtand, in the *Catholick Church*. And I ſhall do it by theſe *ſteps* and *degrees*.

Sect. 28. Feſtivals not inſtituted by Chriſt. Firſt, by acknowledging that it is not pretended to have its beginning from any *Inſtitution* of *Chriſt's*, whilſt he here continued upon the earth, but either from the *Apoſtles*, or the ſucceeding *Church*; It being very reaſonable, that thoſe which acknowledged the receipt of ſo wonderfull a *mercy* from

God

God as was the gift of his *Son*, and whose hearts were *ravished* with a *sense* of the advantages and benefits of it, should desire to celebrate the *remembrance* of it, and offer it up a *voluntary oblation* to *Christ*, and that their *Piety* should not restrain it self within those narrower *bounds* of doing nothing in the *service*, and to the *honour* of *Christ*, but what was distinctly *prescribed*, and particularly *instituted* by him.

Sect. 29. The Εγκαινια.

Thus among the *Jews* the *feast* of the *Dedication* of the *Altar*, not that of the *building* of the *Temple* by *Solomon*, which was celebrated in the *month Tisri*, nor that other of *repairing* of it by *Zorobabel*, which was kept in the *month Adar*, but a *third*, in *memory* of the *purging* of it by *Judas Maccabæus*, observed in *Casleu*, and so not mentioned in the *Canon* of the *Old Testament*, or *instituted* by *God* himself, but by the *Jews*, 1. *Mac.* 4. 59. was yet observed, and the *observation* of it approved and *confirmed* by *Christ's presence* at that *feast*, *Joh.* 10. 23.

Sect. 30. Marriage feasts.

To these I might add the *festivities* at *Marriage*, never *instituted* by *God*, as far as we can discern, in the *Old Testament*, and yet observed by the *Jews*, *Judg.* 14. 10, 11. by the space of *seven days*, and before them by *Bethuel* in *Mesopotamia*, *Gen.* 24. for the space of *ten days* (as seems to be the importance of *v.* 55.) and by *Laban* in *Padan Aram*, for the space of *seven*, *Gen.* 29. 22. (in like manner as among the *Grecians*, νενόμισται ἄγειν συμπόσια περὶ τὸς γάμους, *'twas law* or *custome to have feasts at marriages* saith *Athenæus Deipn.* l. 4. and *Plutarch* gives the *reasons* of it, *Sympos.* 4. *qu.* 4.) And yet these are so far from being disliked by *Christ*, that they are *honourably* mentioned by him in his *parables*, and vouchsafed his *presence* and *first miracle*, *Joh.* 2.

Sect. 31. The Lord's-day.

But it is more pertinent to our present purpose that it be remembred, that the *weekly feast* of the *Resurrection* of *Christ* was not instituted by *Christ* or *God himself*, but by the *Apostles* of *Christ*, and that the mentions of the *first day* of the *week*, which we have in the *New Testament*, are no *prescriptions* or *law* for the observing of it, but that, if any thing of that nature be there sought for, it will rather appear to belong to the *Annual* than *weekly feasts*. So 1 *Cor.* 5. 8. Ἑορτάζωμεν, *Let us keep* the *Paschal festivity*, is annexed immediately to *Christ* our *Passover*, his having been *slain* (and now *risen* again) for us, and to that also the κυριακὴ or *Lord's day*, once mentioned, *Rev.* 1. 10. is thought to belong; And indeed of the *institution* of that *yearly feast* by the *Apostles*, the evidences are clear in the *ancient Church*, the differences between the *Eastern* and *Western*, concerning the time of keeping it, pretending to two *Apostles* on one side, who kept it according to the *Jews* account, to other *Apostles* on the other side, who went by another rule.

Easter-day,

Sect. 32. Christian Festivals.

Secondly, then for *festival days* in *general* now under the *New Testament*, if for not being instituted in *Scripture*, they be deemed universally *unlawfull*, the *Account* will be clear, First, that *Aerius*, the first that affirmed that, was for so doing *censured*, and for that and other things turned out of the *Church* for an *Heretick* (*Epiphanius Hær.* 75.) Secondly, that the unreasonableness of that pretension will be judged of by this one *evidence*, of the *festivities* of the *Martyrs*, the days of whose deaths were remembred by the *Church*, under the title of γενέθλια *Natalitia*, or *birth-days*, and St. *Stephen's* day (who being the *Captain* of them, that day comprized all other of that rank) placed next in the *Calendar* to the *Nativity* of *Christ*, and celebrated as chearfully as *Pharaoh's birth-day* in the *Old Testament*, as *Herod's* in the *New*, and the *Emperours* in *humane* Authours.

The Martyrs. γενέθλια.

Sect. 33. The Testimony of the Church of *Smyrna* for Festivals.

Of these we have an early Record of *Primitive Antiquity*, in the *Martyrdom* of *Ignatius*, written by them which were *present* at it, who setting down the *day* and *time* of it, say they do it, *ut secundum tempus Martyrii congregati*, *communicemus athletæ* —— *that assembling together at the anniversary of his Martyrdom, we may communicate with this Champion, commemorate his sufferings*, and *bless God* for him, *&c.* So also in the *letter* of the *Church* of *Smyrna*, on occasion of *Polycarp's Matyrdom*, where having set down the story of it, his ἄθλησις and τελείωσις, *combat* and *consummation*, they conclude with their hope and wish, ἡμᾶς συναγομένους ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει καὶ χαρᾷ παρέξει ὁ Κύριος ἐπιτελεῖν τὴν τοῦ μαρτυρίου αὐτοῦ ἡμέραν γενέθλιον, *that God will now permit them to meet together, with exultation and joy to celebrate the birth day of his Martyrdom.* And that this is no intrenchment or diminution to the *worship* and *adoration* due unto *Christ*, they shew their opinion there; for having said before, that they *worship none but Christ onely*, they add, ἀξίως ἀγαπῶμεν μαθητὰς καὶ μιμητὰς Κυρίου καὶ μιμηταὶ, *Let us bestow that love upon the Martyrs, which is due to them, as the disciples, and imitators of the Lord.* This *Testimony* being so near the *Apostles* times, sets a sacred *character* on those *Commemorations* (summed up by the *Church* into that one of the *first fruits*, St. *Stephen*, in whom the whole *heap* of the following *harvest*, this *Polycarp*, and all others are *included*) as such as were in *use* before the *writing* of that *Letter*, and then there will be no reason to doubt, or need to produce more *Testimonies* to avouch, that, as *Polycarp's* day of *Martyrdom*, was celebrated by that *Church* of which he was *Bishop*, so the days of the *death* or *Martyrdom* of the *Apostles* themselves, the *Universal Bishops* of the *whole Church*, were formerly solemnized by them, and that thus early, so as that *Church* of *Smyrna* might transcribe that custome from them, it being not imaginable that *Polycarp* should have a *solemnity* assigned him, and the *Apostles* of *Christ*, whose *copy* he but *transcribed*, be denied that *honour*.

Sect. 34. The assemblies at the monuments of Martyrs.

Agreeably to this, is that known *practice* of the *first antiquity* to assemble at the *Monuments* of *Martyrs*, before *Churches* were built, and from such meetings most of the *ancient Churches* in the world had their beginnings. And (not to enlarge on so known a Theme) 'tis not onely the affirmation of *Gregory Nyssen* in the life of *Thaumaturgus*, that he brought up all his *Converts* to celebrate the *birth-days* of the *Martyrs*, and of St. *Cyprian*, that he used to celebrate their *Passions* with an *anniversary Commemoration*, but *Tertullian*, one of the best *Repositories* of the *practices* of the *Primitive Church*, saith that *Christians* were wont to celebrate yearly the days of the *Martyrs birth*, i. e. their *sufferings*, *ex majorum traditione*, received it *from the tradition of their Ancestours*, *de Cor. Mil.* c. 3. All which doth clearly vindicate and give *authority* (such as no *Christian* may despise) to all the *festival* observations of *Saints days*, which have been in our *Calendar* observed, and by our *Laws*, since the *Reformation*, continued in our *Church*, and so without descending more particularly, applyes this whole *discourse* unto them.

Sect. 35. The feast of Christ's Nativity.

But then thirdly, for this one *feast* of the *birth* of *Christ* (in which our concernments are so great, that [g] *Leo* could truly say, *Dum Servatoris nostri recolimus exortum, invenimur nos nostrum celebrare Principium; Generatio enim Christi, est origo populi Christiani, & natalis capitis est natalis corporis, The Generation of Christ is the beginning of the Church, the birth-day of the head is the birth-day of the body*) we have [h] elsewhere produced many Testimonies out of *Origen*, *Cyprian* and *Chrysostome*, each of them deducing it from the practice of the *first Antiquity*, and St. *Augustine* making it a character of a *son* of the *Church*, to solemnize the *festivals* of it, and this (principally and by name) of the *Nativity*. To which may be added that of the [i] *Author* of the *Constitutions*, τὰς ἡμέρας τῶν ἁγίων φυλάσσετε, καὶ πρώτην γε τὴν γενέθλιον, *Keep the days of the feasts, and first the day of Christ's birth.* And although [k] *Nicephorus* a later *Historian* say, that *Justinus Emperour* first commanded it to be kept *festival over* the *world* (as *Justinian*, saith he, *appointed the day of Purification*, under the name of ὑπαπάντη, because *Simeon*, &c. met *Christ*'s parents in the *Temple* that day) yet that belonging onely to the *Edict* of the *Emperour* for the *universal* observation, doth no way prejudge the *Churches*, whether *Apostolical* or *Primitive*, *Institution* of it. For long before them in *Diocletian*'s time, the observation of it is sufficiently known and *solemnized* in *story* by the 20000. *Christians* which were burnt by him on *Christmas-day*.

[g] *Hom.* 6. *de Nat.*
[h] *Pract. Cat.* p. 86.
[i] *Constit.* l. 5. c. 13.
[k] ταῦτα καὶ τὴν τοῦ Σωτῆρος Ὑπαπάντην, ἄρτι σαρκὸς τῆς ἐκ παρθένου, ὥσπερ Ἰουστῖνος καὶ τὴν Χριστοῦ ἀγίαν γέννησιν, l. 27. c. 28.

Sect. 36. The 25 of December.

Fourthly, for the *particular day*, whereon this *feast* is wont to begin, though that be not of any importance to the *Institution* it self, yet there is little reason to doubt of the truth of our *calculation* which sets it on the 25*th*. of *December* (That argument drawn by some from the *courses* of the *Priests*, is in a little Tract intituled [*Christ's birth not mistimed*] evidently demonstrated by a very [l] *worthy* and *ingenious* person, to be a mere deceit.) And (to pass by the many *Testimonies* [m] elsewhere produced to this purpose) In *Joseph* the *Egyptian*'s *Arabick Codex* of the *Councils* (a *Manuscript* in the *Archives* of the *Publick Library* of the *University* of *Oxford*, of the gift of Sir *Thomas Roe*) this *day* as well as this *feast*, is affirmed to stand by *Apostolical Canon*. The words of the *Canon*, as it is transcribed by Mr. *Gregory*, are in *English* these, *Also that you constitute an anniversary feast at the Nativity of the Lord Christ, on the day on which he was born, and that was the five and twentieth of the first Canun* (i. e. of *December*) *for this is the Principal of all the feasts. Also that ye do every year celebrate the baptism of the Lord Christ upon the day in which he was baptized by John his Prodromos* (πρόδρομος) or *forerunner, and that was the sixth day of the second Canun*, i. e. of *January*.

[l] Mr. *I. P.*
[m] *Pract. Cat.* p. 85.

Sect. 37. The Apostolical Canons.

Of this *Canon* these things are to be observed, First, that although it be not affirmed that this was made by the *twelve Apostles*, principally so called, yet if it were framed by those that early succeeded the *Apostles* in *governing* the *Church*, the first *Bishops* of the *Church* (called *Apostles* also, by communication of that title) and *Apostolical* men (and so 'tis probable they were first intituled Κανόνες Ἀποστολικῶν, *Canons of Apostolical men*) it may truly be styled an *Apostolical Canon*; Or if it were one of those which in *succeeding* times were added and put into that *volume*, yet is this an argument of the great *antiquity* thereof.

Sect. 38. Christmas-day.

Secondly, that in this *Canon* not onely this *anniversary feast* of *Christ's Nativity* is commanded to be observed, but also the *very day* defined, on which he was *born*, that which we now celebrate, *December* 25.

Sect. 39. Twelf-day.

Thirdly, that together with that *day* which *begins* the *solemnity*, at the same *time*, and by the same *Authority*, the *sixth* of *January*, which we call *Twelf-day*, and which *ends* that *solemnity*, and according to the custome of the *Jews* (which kept the *first* and the *last* day of every *feast*, days of *solemn assembly*, and so μεγάλαι ἡμέραι, *great days*) is a *special Holiday*, was instituted also, and so that feast consisted of all the *twelve days*.

Sect. 40. The day of Christ's Baptism. Epiphany.

Fourthly, that this *twelfth day* was observed as the *day* of *Christ's baptism* by *John*, at which time the *holy Ghost appeared* and *lighted upon him*, *Mat.* 3. 16. That that day was called *Epiphany*, from the appearing of the *Star* to the *Magi*, *Mat.* 2. 2. is ordinarily conceived, and it may possibly be so, so that we do not from thence believe, that the *Magi* came to *Christ* the *twelfth* day after his *birth*, for this for many reasons seems to be a mistake; for immediately upon the departure of the *Magi*, ἀναχωρησάντων αὐτῶν, *Mat.* 2. 13. *Joseph* and *Mary*, with the *young child*, *fled into Ægypt*, according to order from *God*, v. 14. and yet the *Text* saith, *Luke* 2. 22. that at the time of *Mary's Purification*, *forty* days after his *birth*, they *went up* from *Bethlehem* to *Jerusalem*, and therefore the *coming* of the *wise men* must needs be after their *return* from *Jerusalem* again to *Bethlehem*: as for that of his *returning* to *Nazareth*, *Luke* 2. 39. that sure refers to the time of his coming out of *Ægypt*, *Mat.* 2. 22. and cannot be imagined before his journey thither, which appears to have been taken from *Bethlehem*. This, together with the length of the *journey* from their *country*, thorough both the *Arabia*'s to *Judea*, renders it no improbable conjecture, that their coming to *Bethlehem* was a *twelve-month* after *Christ's birth*; To which it is consonant which we read of *Herod's Edict*, having from the *wise men exact intelligence* of the *time*, he appointed the *killing* of all the *children from two years old and under*, v. 16. That this *day* was also the *day* of the *baptism* of *Christ*, though many years after, is farther affirmed by *Alcas Cyriacus* (an *Arabick* MS. of *Astronomical Tables* in the *Archbishops archieves* in the *Oxford Library*) who calls the *sixth* of *January* the *feast* of the *Epiphany*, or *benediction* of *Waters*, and so do others also. And accordingly the *Church* of *England* hath appointed the *first Lesson* to be of the *Mission* of the *Baptist*, *Isa.* 40. and the *second Lesson* to end with the *baptism* of *Christ*, *Luke* 3. 23.

The time of the *Magi* coming to Christ.

Sect. 41. The name Epiphany.

That the *benediction* of the *Waters* denoteth the day of *Christ's baptism*, whereby he is, by *Chrysostome* and other of the *Ancients*, affirmed to *sanctifie* the *waters*, there is no place of *question*; but whether that day were called *Epiphany* from thence, in respect of the *visible opening* of the *heavens*, and *descending* of the *holy Ghost* upon him, or from the first appearing of the *Star* in the *East* to the *Magi*, *Mat.* 2. 2. which well might be, on the very *twelfth day* after *Christ's birth*, or from that other *appearing* of the same *Star*, when they drew toward the end of their long journey from their Countrey to *Bethlehem*, v. 9. at that time *twelve-month*, or whether the word signifie no more than the *birth* of *Christ*, which is ordinarily called ἐπιφάνια, and τὰ ἐπιφάνια in the *plural* (τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν ἐπιφανίων ὅτι ἐγεννήθη ἐν σαρκὶ, &c. *on the day of Epiphany, when Christ was born in the flesh*, saith *Epiphanius*) and may be applied to the *last*, as well as the

In fine l. 3.

the *first* day of the *feast*, I shall not now define, but acknowledge my self inclined to the last, upon this one score, because many *Orthodox Christians* in *Egypt* are by *Epiphanius* affirmed to keep the *feast* of the *Nativity* on that day: Which as it is confuted by St. *Hierome* on *Ezek.* c. 1. so might well have its rise from the equivocalness of that word *Epiphany*, which as it signifies any kind of *appearing*, and so that to the *Magi*, the *manifestation* of *Christ* to the *Gentiles*, so it may be the *appearing* of *Christ* first in the *world*, of which St. *Paul* affirmeth, and saith, that the *saluifick grace of God* ἐπεφάνη *hath appeared*, *Tit.* 2. 11.

Sect. 42. So *Sahid Aben Batric* (a MS. *Arabick Historian* in the *Archives* of the *Publick Library* of the *University* of *Cambridge*) as he is transcribed by Mr. *Gregory*, in the life of *Constantine*, affirmeth it in these words, *Our Lord and Redeemer Jesus Christ was born upon the twenty fifth of the first Canun*, i. e. of *December*, *and upon the eleventh day of Tybi*, i. e. the *sixth* of the *second Canun*, i. e. *January* was the *Epiphany* or *Baptism* of *Christ*. So the *Egyptian Calendar* in *Kircker de Comput. Eccles. Copt.* c. 3. And so *Johannes Antiochenus* or *Melala*, that *Christ* was born, μηνὶ Δεκεμβρίῳ κε. upon the *five and twentieth* of *December*, but was *baptized* in *Jordan* a *river* of *Palestine*, μηνὶ Αὐδυναίῳ τῇ ϛ' Ἰανουαρίου, ἤτοι, *on the sixth of the month Audine*, or *January*.

Sect. 43. So in the forecited *Authour* of the *Constitutions*, Τὴν δὲ τεσσαρακοστὴν ἑορτὴν πέμπτῃ τῆς ἐνάτου μηνὸς, *Constit.* l. 5. c. 13. *Let the Nativity be celebrated on the 25th. day of the ninth month*, beginning the year in *March*, when he was *conceived*. So in the 93. *Question* under the name of *Anastasius Nicænus*, 'tis cited out of the Ἀποστολικὰ διδάγματα, Ἐτέχθη μὲν ὁ Κύριος Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστὸς ἐν Βηθλεὲμ τῇ πόλει τῆς Ἰουδαίας ἐπτακαιδεκάτῃ καὶ ὀγδόῃ τοῦ μηνὸς Καλανδῶν Ἰανουαρίων, *Our Lord was born the 25th of the Egyptian month Chœach, which is eight days before the Calends of January*, and so the 25th. of *December*.

Sect. 44. But this is put beyond all question by what hath [a] elsewhere been cited out of *Chrysostome*, and by him produced out of the *Censual Tables* of *Augustus*, *i. e.* those *Registers* of all that were *enrolled* by *Augustus's Decree*, *Luke* 2. 1. together with the *place*, and *day* of the *Month*, and *year* wherein it was done. That *enrolment* or ἀπογραφὴ or *Census* was, we know, the sole occasion of bringing up *Joseph* and *Mary* to *Bethlehem*, and while they were there on that occasion *the days were accomplished that she should be delivered, and she brought forth her first born*, v. 6, 7. To these *Tables* therefore *Justin Martyr* makes this resort, *Apol.* 2. for the *evidencing* the *place* of *Christ's birth*, and doth it to the *Emperours* of *Rome*, who would easily have been able to disprove him if it had not been so, ὡς καὶ μαθεῖν δυνατὸν ἐκ τῶν ἀπογραφῶν, *as you may learn out of your Rolls*. And so *Tertullian*, *Censum Augusti fidelissimum testem Dominicæ Nativitatis Romana Archiva custodiunt*, *The Roman Archives preserve Augustus Censual Roll, a most faithfull witness of the birth of Christ*. And from these *Rolls* St. *Chrysostome* professes to have it, that this was the day of his *birth*, ἐξ ἐκείνων ἀκριβῶς τῶν τὰ οἰκεῖα εἰδότων καὶ τὴν πόλιν ἐκείνην οἰκούντων παρειλήφαμεν τὴν ἡμέραν, *We have received the day from those that accurately knew these things, and which dwell in the City of Rome*. And accordingly 'tis known, that before St. *Chrysostome*'s times this day had been observed at *Rome* by the *Christians* there, ἄνωθεν καὶ ἐκ παλαίας παραδόσεως, saith he, *from their Antecessors, and from ancient Tradition*.

[a] *Pract. Cat.* p. 85. The Censual Rolls of *Augustus*.

Cant. Mar. l. 14. c. 19.

Hom. in Nat. ad Pop. Ant.

Ib.

Sect. 45. Having past through all the *degrees* and *steps*, wherein the *observation* of this *Festival* can be concerned, and whereby it is vindicated to that *veneration* which it hath had so long in the *Universal Church*, (and by the way the other *Festivals* of the *Church* deduced from the *first times*, especially by that *Testimony* of the *Church* of *Smyrna*, delivered by them within few years after *Christ's Epistle* was sent to them in the *Revelation*) there is no more needfull to be added to this Theme, but the *Conclusion*, which is obvious and evident from all this, That the fastidious *rejecting* or not observing the *Festivals* of the *Church Universal*, the *Great days* and times set apart for the *commemorating* the several *parts* of our *Redemption* wrought by *Christ* (in his *birth*, and the attendants on that, in his *Death*, and *Resurrection*, and *Ascension*, and *Mission* of his *Spirit*) and also the *lives* and *deaths*, *faith* and *patience* of his *holy Martyrs*, *Apostles*, and the whole *society* of the *Saints* (who by their *examples* and *doctrine* have contributed so much to our highest advantages, and *being dead*, do by this means *yet speak* unto us) must certainly be looked on by every man, as an act of *affected departure* from the *Universal Church* of *Christ* in all ages, and not onely from the *Mother* which brought him forth in the *faith*, the *Reformed Church* of *England*. And this will set no excellent *character* on that which can have nothing but the *novelty* and contempt of *Antiquity*, to recommend it to any; nor will it prove any very good *omen* or ground of *hope*, that the despising of these *observances* will ever bring in more *honour* to *God*, and benefit to the *Church*, than the *Institution* or Usage of them was by our pious *predecessours* designed to do.

The conclusion.

Sect. 46. And here I must not be so injurious to the *Authour* of the Sixteen *Quæres*, *touching the rise and observation of Christmas*, as to leave him any temptation of overvaluing his own *dexteritie*, or thinking his attempts prosperous and *victorious* over the whole *Church* of *God* for so many *Centuries*, or of continuing his uncharitable *conceit* of all those who have retained this *feast* in their *Calendar*, as of men, that beside the guilt of *befooling* and *misleading* the *people*, are, saith he, *utterly unable to give any rational account of their practice*.

An answer to sixteen Quæres about Christmas.

Sect. 47. To his *Quæres* therefore, though I now hear that others have applyed those *Antites*, which might make this of mine *unnecessary*, yet I shall give a particular *Answer* in few words, without repeating unnecessarily what hath more largely been said elsewhere, and in this foregoing discourse.

Sect. 48. To the first [*Whether such religious-customs, as are binding to all the Churches of Jesus Christ, ought not to have sure footing upon the word of God, or Apostolical practice?*] I say, that there is no *necessity* that every *religious custome* (as that signifies no more than the performing of those duties to *God* on one set day, which are in every particular *justifiable* and pious, whensoever they are performed) which is *binding to all the Churches of Jesus Christ* (by the *obligation* that lyeth on every one to continue in *Unity* with the *Universal Church* of the *purest* times, and to observe their *pious Institutions*) should be better founded than so, or be obliged to have any other *sure footing upon the word of God, or Apostolical practice*. The *Primitive Universal Church of Christ* may (and among all *pious Christians* hath alway been allowed to) have *authority* sufficient to *prescribe* and *institute* such a *rite*, as this hath appeared to be, and that *Institution* to deserve *obedience* from all *meek sons* of the *Church*, who have

no

no reaſon to break her *unity*, or loſe their parts of the *benefits*, which are conſequent to that, upon ſuch *untempting*, *gainleſs* terms as thoſe.

Sect. 49. To the ſecond [*Whether I can ſubſtantially prove that Chriſt was born on the* 25. *of December, and what my proofs are?* I anſwer, that it may be as ſubſtantially proved, as of a *fact* ſo long *diſtant* from us can well be expected (and as to the buſineſs in hand [the *celebrating* an *anniverſary day*] may be ſufficient) *that Chriſt was born on the* 25 *of December: And what the proofs are*, hath been ſet down, *Sect.* 36. &c.

Sect. 50. To the third [*Whether the celebration of that day, (grant he was born on it) can be clearly warranted from Scripture, and what thoſe Scriptures are?*] That if by [the *clear warranting* the *celebration* of that *day*] be meant, as the words import, the *ſecuring* one's ſelf or others, that the *celebration* of a *day* is no way *unlawfull*, neither *prohibited* by, nor contrariant to *Scripture*, then it is *clearly warranted*, and that the *warrant* hath been cleared by the ſeveral ſtages of the precedent diſcourſe, beginning *Sect.* 28. &c. And that ſuch *warrant* as that is abundantly *ſufficient* to *juſtifie* that *practice*, which the Church in the *beſt* and *pureſt* times hath on ſuch *pious* and *prudent* grounds *univerſally practiſed*.

Sect. 51. To the fourth [*Whether I can clear it by ſound conſequence from the New Teſtament, though not ſet down there* in totidem verbis?] That I can clear the *warrantableneſs* of the *celebration*, and perfect *lawfulneſs* to continue it, from the *no-objection* that lyes in force againſt it, and add unto that the *Piety* of the *Inſtitution*, the *Authority* of the *Inſtitutors*, the *advantages* that may be made of it by all good *Chriſtians*, and that is as ſound a *conſequence* from the *New Teſtament*, as this matter can ſtand in need of.

Sect. 52. To the fifth, [*Whether I can do it by univerſal Tradition?*] That what *I undertake* to *aſſert*, viz. the *blameleſneſs* of this *Inſtitution* in it ſelf, and the *truth* of *fact* concerning the *Churches inſtitution*, yea and the *uſage* and *continuance* of it through all times, hath been already competently *evidenced*, and may farther, by *Tradition* ſo *Univerſal*, that none but *Aerius* for very many *hundred* years, was known to contradict it, and he hath been ranked by the *Fathers* of the *Church* among *Hereticks* for ſo doing.

Sect. 53. To the ſixth [*Whether* (*in caſe it can be evidenced by none of theſe*, viz. *plain Text, ſolid Inference, Univerſal Tradition*) *it be not a mere humane invention, and ſo will-worſhip? and how we will one day acquit our ſelves before God, for placing and crying up mens inventions, inſtead of the Inſtitutions of Jeſus Chriſt? And whether it were not faithfull dealing with poor ſimple people, to tell them that we have neither of theſe to warrant it?*] That it matters little what it ſhould be, if it were warranted by none of theſe, ſeeing it doth appear by the former anſwers, as far as to the matter is *ſufficient*, *warranted* by *all* of them. And moreover, that a *humane invention*, ſuch it may be, an *Inſtitution* of the *Pure virgin Apoſtolical Church* of *Chriſt*, and ſo *propounded* (not for a *doctrine* of *God*'s, but an *Eccleſiaſtical Inſtitution*) may be very far from having any *hurt* in it: No act of *will-worſhip*, as that ſignifies a *voluntary ſervice piouſly* performed to *God*, or an *uncommanded act* of *Piety*, being *eo nomine*, a *ſin*, but an act of *Chriſtian vertue*, as hath been ſhewed at large in a full *Tract* of *Will-Worſhip*, and applied to this particular purpoſe, *Pract. Cat.* 84. And therefore to ſay we, or any, by obſerving this *feſtivity*, or teaching others to *continue* the *obſervance* of it, do *place and cry up the inventions of men, inſtead of the Inſtitutions of Jeſus Chriſt*, is an *unprovoked cauſleſs calumny*. And for the *fidelity* required to *poor ſimple people*, we have diſcharged our ſelves oft in our *miniſtry*, as far as that (in *duty* or *charity*, or for directing them into *all truth*) appears to be required of us.

Sect. 54. To the ſeventh [*Whether* (*ſince days and times commanded by God himſelf to be obſerved under the Law, were and are unlawfull under the Goſpel*) *days and times commanded by men, and not by God, under the Goſpel, are not leſs lawfull?*] That the ſuppoſed *unlawfulneſs* of *continuing* under the *Goſpel*, thoſe *days* and times *commanded* by *God* to the *Jews* under the *Law*, is no *prejudice* againſt the *Apoſtles* or the *Churches inſtituting* of other *days* and *times* upon *Chriſtian* grounds for the uſe of *Chriſtians* under the *Goſpel*. The conſequence is clear, by the *diſparity* of the caſes, eſpecially if it be obſerved, That it was not the bare *continuing* or *uſing* thoſe *Jewiſh rites*, which was deemed *unlawfull*, but the *impoſing* them as by *law* from *God* on thoſe which were never *ſubject* to them, as on *Gentiles* converted to *Chriſtianity*, who were never ſubject to the *Jewiſh Law*. But to this alſo the *anſwer* is given at large, *Pract. Cat.* p. 85.

Sect. 55. To the eighth [*Whether the true and genuine interpretation of Chriſtmas be Chriſtman? And whether to perſuade people 'tis ſo, be not to delude them? And whether we may not as well interpret Candlemas, Candleman, Michaelmas, Michaelman, as Chriſtmas, Chriſtman?*] That the *genuine interpretation* of *Chriſtmas* is not *Chriſtman*, and that to *perſuade the people* 'tis ſo, or to perſuade the *Authour* of the *Queres* that any man that *underſtands words*, can think it poſſible it ſhould be ſo, is to *abuſe* and *delude* both them and him; And any man might as *reaſonably* tell him, that *Candlemas* and *Michaelmas* ſignified the *Candle* and the *Angel* to be *men*, as that was the notation of the word *Chriſtmas*. And indeed, it is but my duty to be ſorry for any, that ſhould *challenge* all men with ſo much confidence, and yet at the ſame time be capable of having ſuch a *trope* put upon him as this was.

Sect. 56. For whoſe ſatisfaction in this point, it will not be amiſs to add what I conceive concerning the notation of the *word*, that the old *Saxon* word mæſſan and from thence the *Engliſh Meſſe*, and *Maſſe*, ſignifies a *feaſt*, and accordingly with them, any *holy* or *feſtival* day, is called mæſſan dæg *Maſs day*: And ſo, ſaith *Varro*, doth the *Greek* μίσα, and the *Latine Meſſa*, from whence the common word *Menſa* is but lightly removed and ſignifies the *meat*, and not the *table* onely (——*menſaq; remota* in *Virgil*, the *meat taken away*, and *menſa ſecunda*, the *ſecond courſe*) and all this from the *Latine Miſſa*, becauſe *ad menſam mittitur*, it is *ſent*, or *ſerved* up to the *table*. And this is perfectly agreeable alſo to the *Greek* uſe of πέμπω and ἀναπέμπω, in their *libations* and *ſacrifices*, ἐγὼ σοι τόδε πέμπω, *I ſend*, i. e. *offer this unto thee*, and from thence is their [o] πομπὴ or *pompa*, for [p] *ferculum*, a *meſs*, or *ſervice*, (ſo in *Pliny*, *Nat. hiſt.* l. 7. c. 23. *Criſpum Hilacum cum filiis novem——prælatâ pompâ in Capitolio immolaſſe*) as this is accommodated to the *Chriſtians Worſhip*, or *ſpiritual feaſt*,

[o] μετεὶ διῶν πομπὼ τελῶν Ῥωμαῖοι. Herodian *in* Commodo. πομπὰς πέμπειν ὑμῖν μᾶλλ ἢ ἱερουργῶν. Demoſth. *Philipp.* 1. διῶν ὑπ' ἀμύμονι πομπῇ. Hom. *Il.* ζ. So we have τὰ βεβήλα τῆς πομπῆς τοῦ Σατανᾶ, *the meats of Satan's pomp*, or *feaſt*, oppoſed to the ἄρτου καὶ οἴνου τῆς εὐχαριστίας, *the bread and wine of the Euchariſt*. Cyril. Hieroſol. *in Catech.*

[p] *Pomparum fercula*, Tull. *de Offic.* l. 1.

feaſt, among the *Fathers*, ſo πεμπειν ἡμνους τῳ πατρι, in *Juſtin Martyr*, p. 60. ἀγειν πομπην, and ἀδειν, ἡ ἀρον τῳ ἀναπεμπειν, *to ſend up praiſes and prayers*, i. e. *pomps* and *miſſa's* to *God*. And this again agreeable to the known *origination* of the *Hebrew* שלחן a *table*, from שלח *miſit*. And then it remains, that the word in *compoſition* muſt follow the notation of it in the *ſimple*, and own no other ſignification, than that *Chriſtmas* be the *feaſt* of *Chriſt*, *Michaelmas* the *feaſt* of *Michael* the *Archangel*, as it is commonly explicated.

To the ninth [*Whether the Saints are bound to rejoyce in the birth of Chriſt on that day that men ſuperſtitiouſly call Chriſtmas, more than at other times? And whether the Lord's day be not* [*the*] *day appointed for them to rejoyce on?*] That the *Inſtitution* and *uſage* of the *Univerſal Church of God* for ſo many hundred years, is an *obligation* to all *faithfull* ſons of that *Church* (if that be the meaning of the word *Saints*) to *rejoyce* in (as that ſignifies to *commemorate* with *joy and thankſgiving* to *God* the *Father*) the *birth* of Chriſt on that *day*, which is far from being [q] *ſuperſtitiouſly* (it might as properly have been termed *murtherouſly* and *felonioufly*, and *adulterouſly*) called *Chriſtmas*, more than the ſame *Church*, or any other *Authority* equal to that, obliges to do at any other ſet time. And though the *Lord's day* be by the ſame *Authority* appointed for *Saints* to *rejoyce* on, yet that was in *reflexion* on the *Reſurrection*, not *birth* of *Chriſt* on that *day*: And beſides, that excludes not *other* ſeaſons of *rejoycing*, any more than the *mercy* of *Chriſt's Reſurrection*, either concludes *Chriſt* never to have been *born*, or that *birth* not to be a *mercy* worthy of a *Chriſtian's rejoycing*. *Sect.* 57.

[q] From the charge of *ſuperſtition* this *obſervation* of *Chriſtmas* is at large vindicated, *Pract. Cat.* p. 84.

For the inforcing of this *Objection*, it hath been farther ſaid by others, that the *Reſurrection* of *Chriſt* comprehendeth the *birth* under it, and conſequently that the *Lord's day weekly feaſt*, being the *commemoration* of the *Reſurrection*, comprehends the celebration of all other *antecedent* mercies, that of the *Nativity* and *Paſſion* alſo. But 1. this is a very infirm way of *arguing*, and if it had any force in it, would conclude againſt the *obſervation* of the *Lord's day* it ſelf: For, doth not the *Aſcenſion* of *Chriſt* as much *include* and *comprehend* the *Reſurrection* of *Chriſt*, as his *Reſurrection* doth his *Nativity*? Certainly it doth, and by that way of diſputing, would infer, that the *Aſcenſion* is the one onely *Feaſt* to be obſerved, and all others to be *baniſhed* out of the *Church*. But then ſecondly, it is obſervable of thoſe that thus *vehemently* expreſs their *diſlikes* to *commemorating* of *Chriſt's birth*, that their wrath is equally extended to the *obſervation* of *Eaſter*, and ſo can as little boaſt of their *zeal* to the *Reſurrection*, as to the *birth* of *Chriſt*. But this *Objection* is not made uſe of by the *Authour* of the *Quæres*, and therefore I ſhall no farther enlarge to ſhew the *invalidity* of it. *Sect.* 58.

To the tenth [*Whether Chriſtmas-day ought in any reſpect to be eſteemed above another of the Week-days? And whether people may not without offence to God follow their lawfull vocations on that day?*] That that which the *Univerſal Church* of *God* hath ſet apart for the *publick ſervice* and *commemoration* of an eminent *mercy* of *God*, ought in that reſpect to be eſteemed above other *days* of the *year*, as [*eſteeming a day*] ſignifies the [*ſetting it apart*] and ſo *conſecrating* from common to *ſacred* uſes and employments. And therefore ſuppoſing this *Inſtitution* and precept of the Church, and the command of *God* to *honour* our *Parents*, and to *ſubmit our ſelves to thoſe who have rule over us*, *Heb.* 13. 17. (under which phraſe, by ἡγουμένοις, the *Governours* of the *Church* are contained, if not ſolely meant in that place) people may not without *offence* to *God*, *Schiſm* from his *Church*, and culpable *diſobedience*, *ſeparate* wilfully, or withdraw from the *publick Aſſembly* on that *day*, and follow their *lawfull* (as that ſignifies *ordinary*, *particular*, or on other days *lawfull*) *vocations*; It being moſt *evident*, that our *ordinary labour*, and driving our *ſecular* deſigns of worldly *gain*, hath been always looked on by *God*, as an inconvenient attendant of his *publick* or *ſolemn worſhip* (as *God* and *Mammon* are not eaſily *ſerved* together) and a *reſt* preſcribed from thoſe *employments*, which may render the *mind unfit*, or the *body uncapable* of that more *Divine attendance*; which *reſt* is farther capable of the *honour* of being an *oblation* to *God*, if in *honour* to him, we thus offer ſome part of our *time*, (which is alſo *interpretatively* ſome part of our *wealth*) unto his ſervice. *Sect.* 59.

To the eleventh [*Whether I think the Parliament and Aſſembly have erred and plaid the fools, in condemning and raſing out Holidays not warranted in the Word? And whether to obſerve them, be not highly to diſlike, and flatly to contradict* (*in point of practice at leaſt*) *their proceedings in order to a Reformation?*] That I am not ſo rude and unmindfull of our *Saviour's* interdict, *Matth.* 5. 22. as to pronounce of any ſociety of men, or ſingle man, that he hath *played the fool*; Yet I profeſs not to commend the turning out all *Holidays* beſides the *Lord's day* (and particularly this of the *Nativity* of *Chriſt*) out of the *Church*, nor do I believe it a good expedient toward *Reformation*. *Sect.* 60.

To the twelfth [*Whether* (*ſince moſt men and women in England do blindly and ſuperſtitiouſly believe that Chriſt was born on that day*) *preaching on it doth nouriſh and ſtrengthen them in that belief?*] That the *believing Chriſt* to have been born *December* 25. is no *blind* (and 'tis impoſſible it ſhould be any *ſuperſtitious*) *belief*. And therefore 'tis not amiſs that by any lawfull means (ſuch I hope preaching may be) men be nouriſhed and *ſtrengthened* in that *belief*. And yet why the *preaching* on *Decemb.* 25. ſhould *nouriſh people* in the *belief*, that *Chriſt* was *born* that day of the *Month*, when the *preaching* on *March* 25. (when *Eaſter* day falls on that day) doth not perſuade any that *Chriſt roſe* again on that *day* of the *Month*, I cannot eaſily foreſee, what account will be given; It being as little important to the *celebration* of a *Chriſtian feaſt*, that the day ſet apart for it ſhould be infallibly the day whereon the thing *commemorated* was done ſixteen hundred years ſince, as it is neceſſary to the preſerving the memory of *William* the *Conqueror*, that the *picture* of him, which I now have, was rightly and exactly taken. *Sect.* 61.

To the thirteenth [*Whether this feaſt had not its riſe and growth from Chriſtians conformity to the mad feaſts* Saturnalia (*kept in December to Saturn the father of the Gods*) *in which there was a ſheaf offered to Ceres Goddeſs of Corn, and a hymn in her praiſe, called* ἴυλος *or* ἰυλος? *And whether thoſe Chriſtians by name, to cloak it did not afterwards call it Yule and Chriſtmas* (*as though it were for Chriſt's honour?*) *And whether it be not by ſome* (*more ancient, than truly or knowingly religious*) *called Yule, and the mad Plays or Sports* (*wherewith 'tis celebrated, like thoſe* Saturnalia) *Yule games? And whether from the offering that ſheaf to Ceres, from that Song in her praiſe, from thoſe gifts the heathens gave their friends* *Sect.* 62.

on the Calends of January, ominis gratiâ, *did not ariſe or ſpring our Blazes, Chriſtmas Carols, and New-years-Gifts?*] I anſwer to the ſeverals, Firſt, that a *Sheaf* or leſſer proportion, an *handfull* of *ears* of *corn*, was cuſtomarily offered to *Ceres* by the *heathen Greeks*, is an unqueſtioned truth, and might be teſtified by *Theocritus*, *Eidyll.* 10. and by others; So likewiſe it is true, that this *Sheaf* or *handfull* of *ears* was called ἴυλος or ἴολος. But that this was done in the *Saturnalia*, or that it hath any relation to our *Yule* and *Carols*, is a double miſtake in the propounder.

Sect. 63. *Ceres* games. The *Saturnalia* were clearly a *Roman feaſt*, celebrated by them in *December*, and oft continued the *whole Month*. But for *Ceres Games*, they appear not to have any thing to do there, but to be of a *Greek beginning*, and improved into their *Eleuſinia Sacra*, thoſe filthy *Myſteries* of theirs, ſo famous for all *villany*.

Sect. 64. Ἴυλος. For the word Ἴυλος, 'tis acknowledged alſo, that that ſignified not onely the *Sheaf*, but *hymn* to *Ceres*, ſo ſaith *Athenæus*, l. 14. c. 3. out of *Semius Delius*, περὶ παιάνων, Ἀπὸ τῆς Δημητρὸς ἀρημάτων τύτε καρπὸς (τὰ δεράγματα τῆ Κριθῶν.) καὶ τὸς ὕμνος τὸς εἰς τὸν θεὸν, ἴολας καλῶσι καὶ ἴυλας, the *fruits* and the *hymns* are both called by that name. So the *Greek Scholiaſt* on [r] *Apollonius Rhodius*, Ἴυλος, ὄνομα ᾠδῆς ὕμνος, φησὶ Δίδυμος, εἰς Δήμητρα, It is the *name of a Song*, [ſ] *and Hymn*, *ſaith Didymus*, *on Ceres*. Beſide this, the word Ἴυλος ſignifies many things; *John Zetzes* in his *Chiliads* reckons ſix ſignifications of it; And yet beſides thoſe, it is the name of a *Paphian month*, and if the *Engliſh Yule* be taken from thence, the moſt *Reverend Primate* of *Armagh* hath ſhewed that it will fall out commodiouſly enough.

[r] *Argon* l. 1. v. 972.

[ſ] *f. an*

De Ann. Maced. The πρὸ ὀκτὼ εἰδῶν Ἰανναρίων, which *Epiphanius* makes the day of our *Saviour's Nativity*, being coincident with the fourteenth of the *Cyprians* (and among them of the *Paphians*) *Julius*, and ſo conſequently the firſt of that *Month*, muſt be on the 24 of the *Roman December*, the *vigils* of our *Saviour's Nativity*, according to all other *Calculations*. But the truth is, there is not ſo much affinity betwixt our *Northern Engliſh* or *Scotiſh* (nor was there between our *Anteceſſours Britiſh* or *Saxon*) and either the *Grecians* in general, or the *Cypriots* and *Paphians* in particular, as will be able to countenance or authorize this deriv ation, unleſs it may be thought that we and they both had it from ſome *Common Fountain*, ſome more *Univerſal Mother-Language*.

Sect. 65. *Yule.* It is, I conceive, far more probable, that the word *Yule*, ȝiul, or (as in *Alfred's* Laws 'tis alſo called) ȝehol, ſhould be taken immediately from the *Latine Jubilum*, as that ſignifies a time of *rejoycing* and *feſtivity*, and as 'tis ſure enough that they have it from the *Hebrew* יובל *jubilum*, *jubilatus*, *clangor tubæ productior*, the *longer* and *louder ſounding* of the *Trumpet*, which was uſed to call men to *Aſſemblies* and *Feſtivities*. From thence, we know, that was their word to ſignifie any *Feſtivity*, either *day* or *year*, and belongs to their *New-Moons* (on which, ſaith the *Pſalmiſt*, the *Trumpet* was to be *blown*, and upon the *ſolemn feaſt days*, whatſoever they were) and doth by no peculiarity belong to that which they call the *year* of *Jubilee*, but onely as that was a *Feſtival year*, and a *year* of *Reſt*, and *remiſſion*, attendant on, and annexed to *Feaſts*) This is very readily changed into that, the *Hebrew* ו or j conſonant, being pronounced by moſt nations like *y*, and ſo is the *Saxon* ȝ alſo, as *gate* is among the *Northern*, *yate*, and *given* is *yeaven*, and the *Saxon* ȝea is *year*, and elȝe in *Bede* is *Elye*, and ȝea is *yea*, l. 5. cap. 2. and the *particle* ȝif is *if*. So the old *Scotiſh* that pronounce *yule* and *year*, write ȝule and ȝupe. As for the other change in the word, the ſoftning the *b*, or turning it into *u*, nothing is more ordinary. That this is the original *Yule*, may farther appear by the uſe of the old word *gule* in ancient Records, as when the firſt of *Auguſt*, *Lammas*, or (as in the *Saxon* 'tis read) hlafmæſſ, i. e. *Loaf-maſs*, or *Bread-maſs* (ſo named as a *Feaſt* of *Thanks-giving* to *God* for the *firſt-fruits* of the *corn*, and ſeems to have been obſerved with *bread* of *new Wheat*, and accordingly 'tis an uſage in ſome places for *Tenants* to be bound to bring in *Wheat* of *that* year to their *Lord* on, or before the *firſt* of *Auguſt*) is called *gula Auguſti*, or the *Yule* of *Auguſt*. In the ſame ſenſe both (and ſo is unreconcileable with the other derivations, either from ἴυλος the *hymn* to *Ceres*, or the name of the *Paphian month*) ſave onely that the *feaſt* of *Chriſt's Nativity* is called *the Yule*, καθ' ἐξοχὴν, the other the *Yule of Auguſt* determinately: So likewiſe 'tis at this day ordinary in many *Shires* to call the *annual feaſt* or *Wake*, which moſt *Pariſhes* keep on ſeveral ſet days in *commemoration* of the *dedication* of their *Church*, the *Yuval* or *Yule*, which is an evidence that the word ſignifies *Jubilum*, a *day* of *feſtivity*, rejoycing, and no more.

Sect. 66. *Blazes.* As for the *Blazes*, if in any part of this Kingdom any ſuch be now uſed at this time, I know no other *beginning*, or *occaſion* of them, than that *flames* of *fire* may have been uſed as *expreſſions* of *joy* among us, as *bonefires* have always been. The *Carols*, if they be worthy of the *ſubject*, I ſhall preſume free from that charge, as being *hymns* in honour of our *Saviour's birth*, or commemorations of that part of the *hiſtory* in the *Goſpel*, and no more than other *divine hymns* or *Anthems* ſung at a *Feſtival* by way of *thanksgiving* to *God*.

Sect. 67. *New-years-gifts.* There remains onely the cuſtome of *New-Years-Gifts*, and for thoſe I anſwer, that the *heathens* giving their *friends gifts* in the *Calends* of *January*, was (beſide the [*ominis cauſa*]) a part of the *worſhip* of *Janus* a *falſe God*,

> —*Jano etiam celebri de menſe litatur*
> *Auſpiciis epuliſque ſacris*—ſaith *Prudentius*.

You ſee *ſacrificing* to *Janus*, as well as *auſpicia*. And yet what the *Poet* means by *auſpicia*, is ſufficiently cleared by *Pliny*, *Fauſtis ominibus*, *bonis verbis*, *precationibus felicibus*, *ſtrenis & muneribus*, *ſe invitabant*, *Hiſt. Nat.* l. 28. c. 2. *good wiſhes*, and *good abodings*, *gifts* and *preſents*. And *Lucian* gives the reaſon why the *Romans* did this, becauſe, ſaith he, they believed that the *Gods* anſwered *mens prayers*, ἐν ἐκείνῃ μάλιϛα ἡμέρᾳ, *on that day moſt eſpecially*. What was thus done by the *heathens* to their *falſe Gods*, or out of ſuch ridiculous perſuaſions, that the *Gods* heard *prayers* more on that *day* than another; or if there were any other *folly* in it, is (to another *end*, and ſeparate from thoſe *follies*, and with a far diſtant intention) continued among *Chriſtians* to the *true God*, i. e. onely thus far.

The

The *Church* obſerves this *firſt day* of the *year*, as the *feaſt commemorative* of the *Circumciſion* of *Chriſt*. The ſending of *gifts* to one another, where it is continued, is no part of the *worſhip* of *God*, nor, I think, miſtaken by any to be ſo, but a *civil* uſage among men, for the acknowledging the relations that men ſtand in, one toward another. And if we ſhould imitate ſuch *moral duties*, even from *heathens*, there would be no more hurt in it, than in *learning* a *moral ſentence* out of *Theognis*, or *Seneca*. And if a *prayer* for the *proſperity* of the *year* following, or but the expreſſion of that *Chriſtian wiſh*, be an *appendage* of the *New-Years-gift*, 'tis not imaginable that there ſhould be more hurt in that *gift* or *wiſh*, than there is *poiſon* in the *Scholars Epiſtle* to his *Governour*, from the *Διδασκολεῖτ*, or, to an *irrational* importune diſputer, from an *ἐφεκτικὸν* at the *top* of it. Sect. 68.

And yet after all this, it may be added, that this *cuſtome* hath not been of late years any thing *ſolemnly* obſerved in this *Kingdom*, ſave onely between the *Lords* and the *King*, the *Lords* preſenting ſuch a *ſum* of *money*, and the *King* returning ſo many *ounces* of *Plate*. And this *cuſtome* is juſtly thought to have been brought into ours from the *Roman Commonwealth* (not the *Roman Church*) as into that by the *Emperour Auguſtus*, every one of the people being appointed to preſent to him a *tribute* on the *Calends* of *January*. So far is this from being a *ſuperſtitious*, or indeed a *Religious obſervance*. Sect. 69.

And what e'er the *Ancient Fathers* have poured out in *declamations* againſt the *practices* on the *Calends* of *January*, appears clearly to have been aimed not againſt the *mutual expreſſions* of *duty* or *kindneſs* in the *New-years-Gifts*, or *New-years-wiſhes*, but againſt the *conſecrating* that *day* to the [t] *Idol Janus*, and the *drunkenneſs* and *revellings* uſed on it, the due *ceremonies* of an *Idol-feaſt*. And if mens endeavours might be like *their Sermons* in this, labour to *purge* this, and the like *feaſts* from the profane *exceſſes* (the greateſt and moſt dangerous remainders of *Idolatry* and *Heatheniſm* among us) and to retain nothing, but what were agreeable to the *worſhip* of the *true God*, and *Chriſtian life*, I ſhould not give any man ſuch an *example* of ill nature, or *contentious ſpirit*, as to diſpute againſt them, but profeſs my *ſpirit* to be pleaſed with *healing Balſams*, as much as my *fleſh abhors amputations*, and to believe that *purging phyſick* may be ſometimes as *uſefull*, as at other times *cordials* are acknowledged to be. Sect. 70.

[t] *Bifrontis illâ ſuperſtitione utuntur.* Ambr. *in* Gal. 4.

To the fourteenth [*Whether conformity to, and retention of heatheniſh cuſtoms be commendable in Chriſtians, ſuitable or agreeable with Goſpel principles, though under pretext of Chriſt's honour and worſhip?*] That *conformity* to, or *retention* of ſome *cuſtoms* of *civil* life, uſed formerly by the *nation*, whilſt it was *heathen*, as paying *tributes*, *homages*, interchanging *hoſpitalities* or *civilities*, yea and *wiſhing good health* or *proſperity* (*good even, good morrow, good day, good year, good ſpeed, good do it you*) are not *unſuitable*, or *diſagreeable* with *Goſpel principles*, eſpecially if they either not pretend at all to be *acts* of *worſhip*, or pretending to be ſuch be *really* (what they pretend to) deſigned, to the *honour* of *Chriſt* who was given us by *God* as a *mercy* of ſuch a weight, as may well conſtrain us to doe any thing that is *pious*, *charitable*, or *kind* on occaſion of that *commemoration*. Secondly, that 'tis known of *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles*, that they did, to attract the *Jews* to the *Chriſtian Religion*, gratifie them in *retaining* many of their *cuſtoms*, So they were not ſuch as had a *peculiarity* of *oppoſition*, and *unreconcileableneſs* with the *Goſpel*. And therefore for any *innocent cuſtoms* of the *heathens*, ſuch, as having nothing of *Idolatry* in them, might be accommodated to the *Chriſtian* purpoſes, there is nothing to be charged upon thoſe that *planted Chriſtianity* among the *Gentiles*, if to ſo *pious* an end, as was the *attracting* of the *heathens* to *Chriſt*, they did ſo *accommodate* them. Sect. 71.

To the fifteenth [*Whether I am not bound to prove my practice for the conviction and ſatisfaction of my brethren, whoſe duty it is to walk with me in things agreeable to the mind of Chriſt? And in caſe I cannot, whether I ought not to acknowledge my errour, lay down my practice* (*as others have done theirs*) *no longer befooling and miſleading the people committed to my charge?*] Firſt, That I have in obedience to this admonition endeavoured to *prove* and *juſtifie* my *practice* and the *practice* of the *Church* of *England*, not yet *unbeautifull* in her *ruines*, for the *conviction* or *ſatisfaction* of my *brethren*; and can perſwade my ſelf *chearfully* that all that live in *obedience* to our perſecuted *Mother*, or to the *Univerſal Church* of the *pureſt ages*, and are content to allow me the title of one of their *brethren*, will reſt in ſome degree *ſatisfied* with this account, *whoſe duty* that *it is to walk with me in things agreeable to the mind of Chriſt*, I ſhall willingly acknowledge, and therefore hope, they will not think themſelves obliged to *ſeparate* at once from me, and the *Church* of *England* (that I ſay not the *Apoſtolical, Primitive, Univerſal Church of God*) in that, which is thus far cleared from being *diſagreeable* to any thing *revealed* by *Chriſt*. Secondly, that till the *practice* have been convincingly proved to be *erroneous* or *fooliſh* (which the making of ſixteen *Quæres* is not at all apt, or probable to have done, without the annexation of *weighty reaſons* againſt any thing poſſible to be affirmed by the *defendant*) It is an uncomely image of the inward part of the *Authour* of the *Quæres*, to blaſt the reputation of an *Inſtitution* of the *Ancient Church* of *God*, and the *Rule* of his *Reformed Mother*, the *Church* of *England*, with that *ugly* ſtyle or *character* of *befooling the people*, and in plain words, that a little *weight* of *reaſon* doth better become our *Chriſtian Profeſſion*, than never ſo much, or never ſo little *ill language*. Thirdly, that as to this one, ſo to the reſt of the *practices* of the *Primitive Church*, it muſt be obſerved, that what they then did, they did with ſo *great conſideration*, and *deſigns* and weights of *Piety*, that no *Chriſtian* that then lived, had any objection againſt them: And that ſome among us now have, it cannot be more *charitably* imputed, than to their great *diſtance* from, and *ignorance* of thoſe *reaſons*. Accordingly they that now *know* and *conſider* the true *reaſons* of them, do ſincerely, and cannot but *reverence* their *Inſtitutions*, and *imitate* their *Practices*. And when nothing but *ignorance* qualifies others to *accuſe* them of *folly*, there is no danger of falling under that *Cenſure* before any tolerably *wiſe Tribunal*, but by being *diſpleaſed*, or *thinking* it *ſtrange*, that *men* ſhould doe after their kind, or that the *old* ſaying ſhould have any truth in it (which it is ſo univerſally noted to have, that it is converted into a *Proverb*) That the *ignorant* man hath the *incloſure*, or *privilege* to *hate knowledge*. Sect. 72.

To the ſixteenth or *laſt* [*Whether in caſe I return no anſwer to theſe Quæres, he have not ground ſufficient to conclude me utterly unable to give any rational account of my practice, now put upon it?*] That the returning no *anſwer* to the *Quæres*, is as *unſufficient* a *ground* to *conclude* all thoſe (which make no ſuch return) *utterly unable to give any rational account of their practice*, as it was an argument before ſetting *pen* to *paper*, that I was *not able* to *write* what I have now written, the *negative* arguing *ab actu ad potentiam*, being as far from con- Sect. 73.

cluding *logically* (that what any man doeth *not*, he is *utterly unable* to doe) as the *affirmative* is *infallible*, that I am able to give this *account*, because I have now done it.

Sect. 74. And whosoever thinks fit to resume this business into his consideration, and enquire any farther into this subject, may, if he please, be directed to this shorter way, To *question* or *debate* the *truth* or supposed *certainty* of some of his own *principles*; And for an *essay* or trial to set this one *question* before him,

Sect. 75. Two Queres. *Whether it be not lawfull for the Church, either National, of one, or Universal, of all parts of Christendom, especially of that age which was neerest the Apostles, of the first and purest times, to take upon it to institute one or more days, upon any special occasion of some eminent mercy of God's, toward the whole Church, to be used yearly in acts of Christian piety and charity by all the children of that Church, and to expect obedience from them? And whether that one Authority may not secure and justifie all from any crime of superstition, &c. in case they shall think fit to yield this obedience?*

Sect. 76. If to this *question* thus proposed, it be necessary to add any other, it may most reasonably be this.

Sect. 77. *Whether such an ancient Institution of the Church of Christ, by name the anniversary feast of Christ's birth, though it be not affirmed to be commanded by Christ, or instituted by the Apostles, or* (in *it self* considered, without respect to the *Institution*) *absolutely necessary to the being of a Church, yet being thus (more than lawfull) pious in it self, proper in respect of the ground, primitively Catholick (if not Apostolick) in respect of the Institution, may be lawfully abolished by private men, without authority of the Church, or by any particular Church, without regard and reverence to the Universal, and for the Universal of this age, after so long observance*, whether it be *morally possible*, that it should consent to the *abolishing* of that, which is founded on such *Piety* and *Authority*? Finally, *Whether by any obligation of conscience it appear (not onely lawfull, but) necessary to be thus abolished (either as superstitious in it self, or as subject to abuses) on this onely ground of truth, because the following days have sometimes been mis-spent in riot, &c. by some wicked men?*

Sect. 78. If these *Questions* may be thus proposed, it will be easie for any to satisfie himself (upon the grounds premised) of the truth of the *affirmative* of the former, and *negative* of the latter, and withall to secure himself that there need be no other *question* in this matter.

ΚΑΡΙΣ

ΧΆΡΙΣ ΚΑΙ῎ ΕΙΡΉΝΗ,

OR,

A *Pacifick* Diſcourſe of

God's Grace and Decrees.

IN

A LETTER of FULL ACCORDANCE

Written to the Reverend, and moſt Learned,

Dr. ROBERT SANDERSON.

By *Henry Hammond*, D. D.

To which are annexed the Extracts of Three Letters concerning God's *Preſcience* reconciled with *Liberty* and *Contingency*.

TO ALL OUR

BRETHREN

OF

The Church of England.

§ 1. *IN relation to the Controverſies concerning* God's Grace *and* Decrees, *nothing was ever Superiour, in my thoughts, to the fear that the great Intereſts of Religion,* Chriſtian practice, *and particularly that of* Charity, *might be obſtructed by them.*

§ 2. *It hath long been the Complaint of pious and learned men, (of the juſtice whereof, if formerly we had, we cannot now reaſonably retain any doubt,) that the crude and unwary treating of theſe, and (from thence derived,) an haſty premature perſwaſion of their being in Chriſt, (aſſiſted by a belief of* irreſpective Decrees, *and* Grace irreſiſtible, *and no poſſibility of* interrupting *their juſtified eſtate,) was apt to contribute to the preſumptions, and ſecurities, and final impenitences of ſome men, who having moſt loudly renounced the* power, *chuſe yet not to quit* the form of Godlineſs.

§ 3. *And for the heats, and uncharitable diſtempers, which the managing of theſe Controverſies particularly have been guilty of, we need not look abroad among the* Dominicans *and* Jeſuites, Janſeniſts *and* Moliniſts, *for proofs. Our own Region hath not of a long time failed of evidences. The old weapon of* Ὦ κατάρατε, *crying down for* carnal *men and* hereticks, Pelagians *and* Semipelagians, Papiſts, Socinians, *and what not? (even rifling the Poets Hell to fetch out Titles for their adverſaries,) hath never been more nimbly taken up, and vigorouſly handled, than in theſe days.*

§ 4. *And as if ſewel to diſſenſions were ſtill wanting, it hath been the endeavour of ſome to ſuggeſt this jealouſie, and clancularly to infuſe it into the minds of men, that they which oppoſe* unconditionate Decrees, *&c. (and pretend to think they effectually ſerve the ends of Chriſtianity thereby,) have entertained ſuch vehement diſlikes, and averſations to all that Scheme of doctrines, that they retain no* charity *to the maintainers of them, though they be in other things as conſtant, obedient ſons of the* Church *of* England, *as any; and when opportunity ſhall aſſiſt their deſign, will take care rigorouſly to fence their communion from them, and whatever the accord be in other doctrines, (wherein our Church is eminently concerned againſt the common Adverſaries) will proceed finally to exterminate and exclude them.*

§ 5. *The Conſequences of this perſwaſion, once imbibed, be it never ſo cauſeleſs and unprovoked, how noxious and inauſpicious they may prove to all that are on either ſide concerned in them, what leven of* bitter zeal *and animoſities it may cauſe to ferment in the minds of ſome, what blaſts and improſperities it may bring on the endeavours of others; and, betwixt both, what detriment to the true and ſolid ends, whether of* Religion, *or* Reformation, *(the ſquaring of our lives according*

cording to that other, more ſublime, pattern in the Mount, Matt. v. *the inhaunſed, tranſcendent, indiſpenſable Laws of* Purity *and* Peaceableneſs,) *I ſhall not here need to ſet forth, every man's ſagacity ſerving him competently to make this diſcovery.*

§ 6. *Yet was it not a rational hope, that the bare diſclaiming and renouncing ſo great a guilt, would be admitted to the purgation of thoſe, againſt whom it had been ſuggeſted and believed. It therefore ſeemed to me more ſeaſonable to tender an ocular demonſtration of the contrary, by bringing my* Lamb, *or* Turtle, (*my offering to the* Temple *of* Peace,) *and really exemplifying the* charity *and accordance, that may readily be attained between diſſenters, when minds prepared with meekneſs, and love of the Truth, whereſoever they meet with it, can take courage to deny themſelves, and ſo to depoſite prejudices, and inſtead of names and ſhadows, to give themſelves up to the entire guidance of that light which ſhines in* Scripture.

§ 7. *In order to this end, it ſeemed not improper, to offer at this time to publick view the preſent Sentiments of the judicious Dr.* Sanderſon, *the* Regius Profeſſor *of the* Univerſity *of* Oxford, (*and the rather, becauſe ſome manuſcript Tables of his former thoughts, and ſome paſſages from his Sermons, long ſince preached, and now republiſhed, have been made uſe of, to gain authority to thoſe Doctrines which he is now far from owning,*) *and briefly and perſpicuouſly to annex unto, and compare with them thoſe* Amicable *and* Pacifick *Reflexions, which may hope to gain the unanimous conſent of all true Sons of our Venerable Mother, the* Church *of* England, *whoſe chief aim it hath always been to diſcountenance diviſions and fractions, and occaſions, and fomenters of thoſe, eſpecially* ſingular Doctrines, *and* novel Articles *of* Faith, *and in a* Catholick *harmonious charity, to plant* Primitive *belief, and* zeal of good works, *and ſo inſtead of the empty* Form, *the full* power of Godlineſs.

§ 8. *What is ſo largely added on that one head of* Preſcience, *had ſome appearance of neceſſity, to repell a ſhaft borrowed of late from the* Socinians *quiver, who having reſolved it impoſſible for God himſelf to foreſee future Contingents, have given diſputers their choice, whether they like beſt, bluntly to deny* God's Preſcience, *and ſo, at his coſt, maintain their own* Liberty, *or more piouſly to maintain* Preſcience, *and then give it the ſame force of evacuating all* Liberty *and Contingency, which* Predetermination *of all events was juſtly accuſed to draw after it; The miſtake very dangerous on either ſide, and the temptation equally fitted for both, if it were not timely obviated.*

§ 9. *That theſe enſuing Diſcourſes may be effectually ſucceſsfull to the deſigned end, of advancing the threefold intereſt of* Truth *and* Peace, *and* Uniform Chriſtian obedience, *that it may ſupplant the* Vinegar *by the* Oil, *the* Nitre *by the* Balſam, *and procure, by conſent of Litigants, a ſolemn* Superſedeas, *if not Concluſion to debates, (an averſion to theſe heathen* Agones, *which afford nothing, but to the combatant blows, and leaves to the Conquerour,) above all, that it may provide us, by this truce, a greater vacancy for the continued exerciſe of real* Piety, *and engage us to make diligent uſe of it, (to* add, *as to our* Faith vertue (*or* courage,) *ſo to our* Godlineſs brotherly-kindneſs, *and to that the yet higher aſcent and accompliſhment of* charity,) *that it may compact us all into that union that moſt ſucceſsfully contributes to our* growth, *and ſo poſſeſs us of that qualification, to which* immarceſſible *joys are awarded by our* Righteous Judge, *ſhall be continually the prayer, as in the following ſheets it hath been the ſincere ſingle endeavour, of*

'Aρτιλν, 2 Pet. 1. 5.

1659. *Feſto omnium Sanctorum.*

Your Fellow-labourer, *H. Hammond.*

A Letter of full Accordance,

Written to

D. ROBERT SANDERSON,

CONCERNING

God's Grace and Decrees.

Dear Sir,

Sect. 1. HAving had a ſight of the Letter which you ſent M.——about the Antiremonſtrant Controverſies, dated *Mar.* 26. and obſerving one of the reaſons, which you render of your having avoided to appear on that theme, [*a lothneſs to engage in a quarrel whereof you ſhould never hope to ſee an end*] I thought my ſelf in ſome degree qualified to anſwer this reaſon of yours, and thereby to do acceptable ſervice to many, who do not think fit that any conſiderations, which have not real and weighty truth in them, ſhould obſtruct that which may be ſo much to the common good, I mean, your writing and declaring your mind on any profitable ſubject.

Sect. 2. That which qualifies me more than ſome others, to evacuate the force of this one reaſon of yours, and makes me willing to attempt it, though not to appear in oppoſition to any other paſſage, that ever you have written, is the true friendſhip that hath paſſed between us, and the ſweet converſation that for ſome time we enjoyed, without any allay or unequableneſs, ſharp word, or unkind, or jealous thought. The remembrance whereof aſſures me unqueſtionably, that you and I may engage in this queſtion, as far as either of us ſhall think profitable, without any the leaſt beginning of a *quarrel*, and then that will competently be removed from ſuch, as of which *you cannot hope to ſee an end.*

Sect. 3. And before I go any farther, I appeal to your own judgment, whether herein I do not at leaſt ſpeak probably, and then whether it were not a miſpriſion, which you are in all reaſon to depoſite, to apprehend ſuch inſuperable difficulties or impoſſibilities at a diſtance, which when they are prudently approached, and examined, ſo preſently vaniſh before you. If this one reflexion do not convince you, it remains, that the ſpeculation be brought to practice, and exemplified to your ſenſes.

Sect. 4. You ſet out with a mention of ſome *poſitions, wherein*, you ſay, *Divines, though of contrary judgments, do yet all agree.* And then it is not credible that you and I ſhould be ſo ſingular, as to differ in them endleſly; of this number you propoſe five, 1. *That the will of man is free in all his actions.* 2. *That very many things in the world happen contingently.* 3. *That God from all eternity foreſeeth all, even the moſt free and contingent events.* 4. *That whatſoever God foreſeeth ſhall infallibly come to paſs.* 5. *That ſinners are converted by the effectual working of God's grace.* Of each of theſe you ſay *we have from Scripture, Reaſon and Experience, as good and full aſſurance, as can be deſired for the ẽn, or truth of them, that they are ſo.*] And I who fully ſubſcribe to the undoubted truth of each of the Propoſitions, and do it alſo upon the very ſame three grounds (of *Scripture, Reaſon* and *Experience*) which you mention, need not the interceſſion of our friendſhip to render it impoſſible to give you any the leaſt trouble of ſo much as explaining your ſenſe in any of theſe. Five Poſitions agreed on by all.

Sect. 5. Next, when you reſolve, that *all the difficulty is about the nũs* (referring that to no more than *three heads*) 1. *How to reconcile the certain futurition of what God foreſeeth, with the liberty of the rational creature, and the contingency of caſual effects, as they proceed from inferiour cauſes.* 2. *In what manner or meaſure the effectual Grace of God cooperateth and concurreth with the free will of man, in the converſion of a ſinner.* 3. *How to cut ſo even a thread, as to take the whole of what we doe amiſs to our ſelves, and leave the whole glory of what we doe well to his grace.*] You are again as ſecure as any amulet can make you, that this reſolution of abbreviating the Controverſies, and confining them to theſe few heads, ſhall never engage you in the leaſt degree of Debate: And then I ſhall challenge you to feign, how it can remain poſſible, without contradicting ones ſelf (which ſtill is not quarrelling with you) to engage you in any uneaſie contention, unleſs it be on one of theſe *three* heads, and when I have by promiſe obliged my ſelf, which now I do, not to raiſe any Diſpute, or attempt to enſnare or intangle you in any of theſe three, you have then nothing to retract but your fears, to which if I tell you, you cannot adhere, diſcerning a ſure and near period to that which you apprehended *endleſs*, this is all the victory I ſhall project, or be capable of in this matter. Three heads of difficulty.

Sect. 6. Of the firſt of theſe three Difficulties, the *reconciling the certain futurition of what God foreſees, with the liberty of the rational creature, and the contingency of caſual effects*, It falls out, that you have in your ſhorter Of reconciling Preſcience with Liberty of Contingency.

ſhorter Letter, dated *Apr.* 8. given that account, which evidenceth it to be, in your opinion, no invincible difficulty; your words are theſe, [*That God's preſcience layeth no neceſſity at all upon any event, but that yet all events, as they are foreſeen of God, ſo ſhall they certainly and infallibly come to paſs, in ſuch ſort as they are foreſeen, elſe the knowledge of God ſhould be fallible, which certainty of the event may in ſome ſort be called neceſſity, to wit,* conſequentis *or* ex hypotheſi, *according as all the moſt contingent things are neceſſary, when they actually exiſt, which is a neceſſity infinitely diſtant from that which predetermination importeth.*] This I take to be ſo clear an explication of that difficulty, and ſo ſolid a determining of the τὸ πῶς, the manner of reconciling preſcience with contingence, that as I fully conſent to it in every part of your period, ſo I doubt not but the laſt part alone hath made it as intelligible to any ordinary underſtanding, as whole Books of Philoſophers have attempted to do.

Sect. 7. For God's preſcience from all eternity being but the ſeeing every thing that ever exiſts, as it is, contingents, as contingents, neceſſary, as neceſſary, can neither work any change in the object, by thus ſeeing it, (convert a contingent into a neceſſary) nor it ſelf be deceived in what it ſees, which it muſt be, if any thing in proceſs of time ſhould be otherwiſe, than from all eternity God ſaw it to be.

Sect. 8. I was lately adviſed with by a Divine, to me unknown, but one that ſeems to be a man of good learning, about the diſtinction frequently made in this matter, betwixt *inevitably* and *infallibly*, and my anſwer and replies to his ſeveral objections, (becauſe I would demonſtrate the perfect accordance betwixt you and me in this, which within this year or two is put into a very grave attire, and revered as a great difficulty) I will give you at large by way of Appendage at the end of this Letter, having by hap a copy retained by me, and though it coſt you ſome minutes to ſurvey them, yet I know your patience of all ſuch exerciſes ſo well, that I doubt not of your willingneſs to be thus detained by me, which yet here you ſhall not, *loco non ſuo.*

Of the manner and meaſure of the cooperation of Effectual Grace with the free will of man.

Sect. 9. Then for the ſecond, *In what manner and meaſure the effectual Grace of God cooperateth, or concurreth with the free will of man in his converſion*] you ſeem to me to have given a punctual account of each part of that alſo, in the ſaid ſecond Letter, in theſe words, *That God worketh not by his Grace irreſiſtibly, but yet ſo effectually on thoſe whom he hath* ex beneplacito *appointed to ſalvation, in ordering the means, occaſions and opportunities with ſuch congruity to that end, as that* de facto *it is not finally reſiſted*] Here it is evident your reſolution comes home to each term in the difficulty; For if effectual Grace work not irreſiſtibly, then we ſee in what manner it *cooperates with the free will of man, viz.* ſo as it ſtill remains poſſible for him to reſiſt it. And if the effectualneſs of his working conſiſt in *ordering the means, occaſions, and opportunities with ſuch congruity,* &c. then as that ſtateth the meaſure of the cooperation (the onely ſecond part of the difficulty) and doth it expreſly in Biſhop *Overal*'s way, ſo this ſuppoſeth Grace ſufficient to converſion and ſalvation to be given to thoſe, who are not converted, and ſaved, quite contrary to the three grand pretenſions of Doctor *Twiſs*, the *Supralapſarians*, and *Sublapſarians*, and whether it be true or no, is preſently freed from all the odious conſequences charged on the ſeveral Schemes of the Antiremonſtrants, and ſo may ſafely be granted, or not oppoſed by them, who yet want evidence of Scripture to eſtabliſh it, and ſo this is not likely to bring any uneaſie engagement upon you.

How to attribute all good to God, and evil to our ſelves.

Sect. 10. And then as there remains no more difficulties, but the third, ſo, if you mark it, the grounds are already laid, whereby that is unqueſtionably reſolved, for having granted that God gives *ſufficient* Grace, and yet, when he cooperates moſt *effectually*, he doth it not *irreſiſtibly*, this is the very *thred* you ſeek *to cut by*, ſo as to devolve the whole blame of all our miſcarriages on our ſelves, and the entire glory and praiſe of all our κατορθώματα, good performances, or good ſucceſſes on his Grace. Were any of us ſo left or paſt by, as to be denied *ſufficient grace*, and yet deſtined to periſh, merely through want of neceſſaries; the whole blame could not rationally fall on our ſelves, it could not be ſaid of Chriſt's *yoke*, that it were [a] *eaſie*, or his [b] *Commandment not far from us*, the *fault* that was found with the Moſaical œconomy, *Heb.* 8. 8. and which made another (the Evangelical) neceſſary, would ſtill lie againſt this, *viz.* that men were not enabled to perform what was required, and yet the non-performance eternally revenged on many of them. But *ſufficient Grace* being tendred by God, and by no default, but their own, proving ineffectual, the entire blame falls unavoidably on thoſe, who do not thus *open* to him that *knocks*, ſo receive, as to make uſe of it, but *reſiſt*, or *grieve*, or *quench* what was ſo mercifully deſigned, and might have been improved by the humble and diligent receivers unto their greateſt advantages.

[a] Matth. 11.
[b] Rom. 10.

Sect. 11. On the other ſide, if our nature being univerſally corrupted by *Adam*'s fall, all poſſibility of riſing out of the grave of ſin be the effect and benefit of the *Grace*, as that is of the death of Chriſt, if it be *God that worketh in us both to will and to doe, of his good pleaſure*, the firſt by his preventing, the ſecond by his aſſiſting Grace, and both thoſe bottom'd merely in his εὐδοκία *good pleaſure*, nothing in us any way meriting the firſt act, or purpoſe of Giving Grace, any farther than our wants and miſeries rendred us the proper objects of his compaſſions and reliefs; and the ſubſequent aids in like manner challengable, onely from his promiſe, and the purport of the parable of the Talents, of *giving to him that hath*, rewarding the uſe of the lower, with the gift of an higher degree of Grace, then ſtill is this, the attributing nothing to our ſelves, but demerits, and provocations, and giving the whole glory to God.

Sect. 12. Having gone thus far without any conſiderable diſagreement, about the τὸ πῶς, how to reconcile theſe three ſeeming repugnances, wherein you apprehended the greateſt difficulty to lie, and being hereby, as by ſo many *poſtulata* accorded between us, competently provided and furniſhed of a ſtandard, and umpire, (in caſe any light difference ſhould ariſe) what objection can Saint *Paul*'s Ὦ βάθος, *Rom.* 11. 33. (belonging expreſly to another matter, the cutting off the obdurate, and gathering all perſwaſible believing Jews and Gentiles, and no way applicable to this) interpoſe, why we ſhould not proceed together to the conſideration of the Doctrine of Decrees, as it hath been variouſly debated by others, and by you perſpicuouſly recapitulated in the proceſs of your papers?

Saint *Paul*'s *O the depth.*

An Hiſtory of Doctour *Sanderſon*'s thoughts in theſe points.

Sect. 13. To this therefore I preſume of your good leave that we now proceed, and whereas you have prudently choſen to begin with an hiſtory of your own thoughts on this ſubject, which you have laid down with great particularity, I ſhall ſet out with a bare tranſcript of that, which will need no comment of mine, to render it uſefull to the Reader, in diſcovering to him the true and ſole original of thriving

(for

(for ſome time) of thoſe Doctrines among us, and how ſo many of our Church came to be ſeaſoned with them, and in giving him a but neceſſary caution for the laying the grounds of the ſtudy of Divinity in the writings of the ancient Church, rather than in our modern ſyſtemes and Inſtitutions. Your words are theſe,

Sect. 14. *When I began to ſet my ſelf to the Study of Divinity as my proper buſineſs, (which was after I had the degree of Maſter of Arts, being then newly xxi. years of age) the firſt thing I thought fit for me to doe, was to conſider well of the Articles of the Church of England, which I had formerly read over twice, or thrice, and whereunto I had ſubſcribed. And becauſe I had then met with ſome Puritanical Pamphlets written againſt the Liturgy, and Ceremonies; although moſt of the Arguments therein were ſuch as needed no great skill to give ſatisfactory anſwers unto, yet for my fuller ſatisfaction (the queſtions being* de rebus agendis, *and ſo the more ſuitable to my proper inclination) I read over with great diligence and no leſs delight that excellent piece of Learned* Hooker's *Eccleſiaſtical Polity. And I have great cauſe to bleſs God for it that ſo I did, not onely for that it much both cleared and ſettled my judgment for ever after in very many weighty points, (as of Scandal, Chriſtian Liberty, Obligation of Laws, Obedience, &c.) but that it alſo proved (by his good providence) a good preparative to me (that I ſay not Antidote) for the reading of* Calvin's *Inſtitutions with more caution than perhaps (otherwiſe) I ſhould have done. For that Book was commended to me, as it was generally to all young Scholars in thoſe times, as the beſt and perfecteſt ſyſteme of Divinity, and fitteſt to be laid as a ground-work in the ſtudy of that profeſſion. And indeed being ſo prepared as is ſaid, my expectation was not at all deceived; in the reading of thoſe Inſtitutions. I found, ſo far as I was then able to judge, the method exact, the expreſſions clear, the ſtyle grave, equal and unaffected: his Doctrine for the moſt part conform to S.* Auguſtine's, *in a word, the whole work very elaborate, and uſefull to the Churches of God in a good meaſure; and might have been (I verily believe) much more uſefull, if the honour of his name had not given ſo much reputation to his very errours. I muſt acknowledge my ſelf to have reaped great benefit by the reading thereof. But as for the queſtions of Election, Reprobation, Effectual Grace, Perſeverance, &c. I took as little notice of the two firſt, as of any other thing contained in the book; both becauſe I was always afraid to pry much into thoſe ſecrets, and becauſe I could not certainly inform my ſelf from his own writings, whether he were a Supralapſarian (as moſt ſpeak him, and he ſeemeth often to incline much that way) or a Sublapſarian, as ſundry paſſages in the Book ſeem to import. But giving my ſelf moſtly ſtill to the ſtudy of Moral Divinity, (and taking moſt other things upon truſt, as they were, in a manner generally taught both in the Schools and Pulpits in both Univerſities) I did for many years together acquieſce, without troubling my ſelf any farther about them, in the more commonly received opinions concerning both theſe two, and the other points depending thereupon. Yet in the Sublapſarian way ever, which ſeemed to me of the two, the more moderate, rational and agreeable to the goodneſs, and juſtice of God: for the rigid Supralapſarian doctrine could never find any entertainment in my thoughts from firſt to laſt. But MDCXXV. a Parliament being called, wherein I was choſen one of the Clerks of the Convocation for the Dioceſe of* Lincoln, *during the continuance of that Parliament (which was about four months, as I remember) there was ſome expectation that thoſe Arminian points (the onely queſtions almoſt in agitation at that time) ſhould have been debated by the Clergy, in that CONVOCATION. Which occaſioned me (as it did ſundry others) being then at ſome leiſure, to endeavour by ſtudy and conference to inform my ſelf, as throughly and exactly in the ſtate of thoſe Controverſies, as I could have opportunity, and as my wit would ſerve me for it. In order whereunto, I made it my firſt buſineſs to take a ſurvey of the ſeveral different opinions concerning the ordering of God's Decrees, as to the ſalvation or damnation of men; not as they are ſuppoſed to be really in* Mente divina *(for all his Decrees are eternal and therefore coeternal, and ſo no priority or poſteriority among them,) but* quoad noſtrum intelligendi modum, *becauſe we cannot conceive or ſpeak of the things of God, but in a way ſuitable to our own finite condition, and underſtanding: Even as God himſelf hath been pleaſed to reveal himſelf to us in the holy Scriptures by the like ſuitable condeſcenſions and accommodations. Which opinions, the better to repreſent their differences to the eye,* uno quaſi intuitu, *for their more eaſie conveying to the underſtanding by that means, and the avoiding of confuſion and tedious diſcourſings, I reduced into five Schemes or Tables, much after the manner as I had uſed to draw Pedigrees (a thing which I think you know I have very much fanſied, as to me of all others the moſt delightfull recreation) of which Scheme, ſome ſpecial friends, to whom I ſhewed them, deſired copies: who, as it ſeemeth, valuing them more than I did (for divers men have copies of them, as I hear, but I do not know that I have any ſuch my ſelf) communicated them farther, and ſo they are come into many hands. Thoſe are they which Doctour* Reynolds, *in his Epiſtle prefixed to Maſter* Barlees *Correptory Correction, had taken notice of. Having all theſe Schemes before my eyes at once, ſo as I might with eaſe compare them one with another, and having conſidered of the conveniences and inconveniences of each, as well as I could, I ſoon diſcerned a neceſſity of quitting the Sublapſarian way, of which I had a better liking before, as well as the Supralapſarian, which I could never fanſie.*

Sect. 15. *Thus far your hiſtory,* which, I verily believe to have perfect truth in every ſtep of it, without any diſguiſe or varniſh, and ſo I paſs from it without any farther Reflexions.

Sect. 16. Next then follows your diſtincter view of the ſeveral ways, which have been embraced by thoſe of the Antiremonſtrant perſwaſion, and the motives on which you were forced to diſſent and depart from each of them, and to this I am obliged to attend you κατὰ πόδα. And the ways being eſpecially three, the method of greateſt advantage will be to begin with a tranſient view of thoſe, each of which you with great reaſon reject, and to ſet Doctour *Twiſſe*'s firſt (though it came laſt into the world and adorn'd it ſelf with the ſpoils of the other two) becauſe that ſets the object of Election higher, than the other do, *homo creabilis*, man conſidered before he is created. His deſign and Scheme you have perſpicuouſly drawn, thus, [*That God making his own Glory the onely end of all other his decrees, all theſe decrees of creating man, of permitting ſin, of ſending Chriſt, of preaching the Goſpel, of Electing ſome, of Reprobating others, and the reſt, make up one entire coordinate Medium, conducing to that one End, and ſo the whole ſubordinate to it, but not any one part, or joint thereof ſubordinate to any other of the ſame.*] Againſt this, your objection I profeſs to be very convincing, taken from his own beloved axiome, ſo oft repeated by him, (and borrowed from him, and built upon by others) that *whatſoever is firſt in the intention, is laſt in the execution.* For as it is moſt evident that of theſe his ſuppoſed coordinate decrees ſome are after others in execution (the fall after the creation, the coming of Chriſt after both, and ſo of the reſt) ſo if he will ſtand to his principle, he muſt, as you ſay, grant, *that thoſe that were thus after any other in the execution, were in God's intention before*

D. *Twiſs* his way.

Cauſes of rejecting it.

before them, which will neceſſarily bring in a *ſubordination* among them, and *ſo quite overthrow this* (as you call it) *new crutches of coordination.*

Sect. 17. Your other cauſes of diſlike to His way are equally rational, 1. the *falſeneſs of that his Logick Maxime*, which he builds ſo much upon, which yet hath no *certain truth, or other than caſual, but when it is applied to final cauſes, and the means uſed for the attaining any end.* 2. The prodigiouſneſs of his other doctrine, that there are *more degrees of bonity* in damnato quàm annihilato, ([a] becauſe the *bonitas entis*) and ſo that it is better for the *Creature* to be *in eternal* miſery, than ſimply not to be; when Chriſt expreſly pronounceth the contrary of wicked men, that it had been *better for them never to have been born*, to have a *milſtone about the neck, and to be caſt into the ſea*, (a figure to repreſent annihilation) than to be involved in thoſe dangers that attend their ſins. 3. *His reſolving God's Election of a man to life eternal to be* [b] *no act of his mercy, and likewiſe his* [c] *reprobating and ordaining to damnation to be no act of his Juſtice, but of his pleaſure.*] A few ſuch Propoſitions as theſe are competent to blaſt and defame any cauſe, which requires ſuch aids, ſtands in need of ſuch ſupporters, and therefore you will be confident I concurr with you in rejection of that, though I think neither of us likely to undertake the travel of refuting of his whole work.

[a] *l.* beſide

[b] *L.* 1. *digr.* 9.

[c] *Ibid. digr.* 10.

The Supralapſarians way, The Sublapſarians.

Sect. 18. Next then for the *Supralapſarians*, with whom the *object* of the *decree* is *homo conditus*, man *created*, not *yet fallen*, and the *Sublapſarians*, with whom it is Man faln, or the *corrupt Maſs*, your rejections and reaſons thereof are twined together, and are eſpecially *two*, which you juſtly call very weighty, and ſo I ſuppoſe they will be deem'd by any man, that ſhall conſider the force of them, without prejudice, I ſhall therefore ſet them down from your letter in your own words.

Reaſons againſt both.

Sect. 19. The firſt reaſon is, *becauſe though it might perhaps be defenſible, as to the juſtice of God, in regard of his abſolute power over his own creature, yet it ſeems very hardly reconcileable with the goodneſs of God, and his exceeding great love to mankind, as they are plentifully and paſſionately ſet forth in his holy word, to decree the eternal damnation of the greater part of mankind, for that ſin, and for that ſin onely which was utterly and naturally impoſſible for him to avoid; for the Decree of Reprobation according to the Sublapſarian Doctrine, being nothing elſe but a mere preterition or non-election of ſome perſons whom God left, as he found them, involved in the guilt of the firſt Adam's tranſgreſſion, without any actual perſonal ſin of their own, when he withdrew ſome others, as guilty as they, without any reſpect to Chriſt the ſecond Adam, it muſt needs follow that the perſons ſo left are deſtin'd to eternal miſery, for no other cauſe, but this onely, that Adam ſome thouſand years ſince did eat the forbidden fruit, and they being yet unborn could not help it.*

Sect. 20. The other reaſon was, *becauſe the Scripture not onely ſaith expreſly, that God hath choſen us in Chriſt before the foundation of the world*, Eph. 1. 4, 5. *and conſequently the decree of ſending Chriſt muſt be precedaneous to that of Election, but alſo doth every where, and upon all occaſions hold forth the death of Chriſt, as intended by God for the benefit of mankind, in the utmoſt extent* [*the world, the whole world, mankind, every man, &c.*] *and not for the benefit of ſome few onely, the reſt by an antecedent peremptory decree excluded. To which it would be conſequent, that according to the tenure of (the more moderate of theſe) the Sublapſarians doctrine, Jeſus Chriſt the Judge at the laſt day, when he ſhould proceed to pronounce ſentence upon the damned, ſhould beſpeak them to this effect*, Ite maledicti, voluit enim Pater meus pro beneplacito, ut Adam peccato ſuo vos perderet, noluit ut ego ſanguine meo vos redimerem, *Go ye curſed, for my Father of his mere pleaſure will'd that Adam by his ſin ſhould deſtroy you, will'd not that I by my bloud ſhould redeem you; the very thought whereof* (you ſay) your *ſoul ſo much abhorr'd, that you were forced to forſake that opinion of the Sublapſarians*, (having, as you profeſs, never *fanſied the Supralapſarians) and conclude it unſafe to place the decree of Election before that of ſending Chriſt.*

Sect. 21. Theſe two reaſons of changing your judgment, are, I confeſs, ſo worthy of a conſidering man, who makes God's revealed will his Cynoſure, and doth not firſt eſpouſe doctrines of men, and then catch at ſome few obſcure places of Scripture, to countenance them, nor makes his retreat to the abyſs of God's unfathomable Counſels, as the reaſon of (that which is its contradictory) his attempting to fathome and define them, that I doubt not but the tendering of them to all diſpaſſionate ſeekers of truth, that have not ſome intereſts to ſerve by adhering peremptorily and obſtinately to their prepoſſeſſions, will be of the ſame force to diſabuſe and extort from them the ſame confeſſions, which they have from you, cauſing them fairly to depoſite theſe two Schemes, and either not to define at all, or to ſeek out other ſolider Methods, and more Catholick Grounds of defining; and if the wiſe heathen were in the right,

Virtus eſt Vitium fugere, & ſapientia prima
Stultitiâ caruiſſe — —

this will be ſome degree of proficiency, which they that ſhall with unſpeakable joy have tranſcribed from you, will alſo have temptation to accuſe your fears, or warineſs, that they received not this leſſon ſooner from you, eſpecially when they are told, what here you expreſs, that *theſe have been your thoughts, ever ſince the year*, 1625. *i. e.* 34. years ſince, which is an age or *generation* in the Scripture-uſe of the word.

Sect. 22. That none may be any longer deprived of this means of their conviction, or permitted to think or teach ſecurely and confidently, and as in accord with you, what you profeſs your *ſoul* thus long to have *abhorred the very thoughts of*, I deſire you will at length communicate your thoughts your ſelf, or elſe allow this letter of mine to be your αὐτοψία and doe it for you, under ſome teſtimony of your full approbation of this your ſenſe.

Sect. 23. But all this, thus far advanced, is but the rejection of the ſeveral erroneous ways, and onely the negative part of your thoughts, which yet, by the way let me tell you, is fully ſufficient both to the peace of Churches, and of particular ſouls; If the erroneous ways be rejected, from whence all the miſapprehenſions of God, and ill conſequences thereof flow, the Church is competently ſecured from tares, and then what need expreſs articles, and poſitive definitions come in to her reſcue?

The negative part ſufficient to Peace, &c.

Our Churches moderation. The King's Declaration in order to Peace.

Sect. 24. This I ſuppoſe the reaſon both of our Churches Moderation in framing the *Article of Predeſtination*, and of our *late King's Declaration*, in ſilencing the debate of the queſtions. For if by theſe methods the Church could but have prevailed to have the definitions of the ſeveral pretenders forgotten,

all

all men contenting themſelves, as our Article preſcribes, with the *promiſes of God, as they are declared in Scripture*, (which ſure are *Univerſal* and *conditionate*, not abſolute and particular) the turmoil and heat, and impertinence of Diſputes had been prevented, which now goes for an engagement in God's cauſe, the bare fervour and zeal in which is taken in commutation for much other piety, by many the moſt eager contenders. The doctrines being deemed doctrines of God, are counted evidences of ſanctified men, and affix the cenſure of carnality on oppoſers, and from hence come *bitter envyings, railings*, and at the leaſt *evil ſurmiſings*, and theſe are moſt contrary to the outward peace of a Church or Nation.

Good life.

Sect. 25. And for particular mens ſouls, if the rigid doctrines be found apt to cool all thoſe mens love of God, who have not the confidence to believe themſelves of the number of the few choſen veſſels, and to beget ſecurity and preſumption in others, who have conquered thoſe difficulties, and reſolved that they are of that number, and to obſtruct induſtry and vigorous endeavours, and fear of falling, and ſo to have malignant influences on practice, yet ſeeing it is the believing the Antiremonſtrant Schemes (one or other of them) to be the truth of God, which lies under theſe ill conſequences, the bare laying them aſide, leaves every man indiſpenſably under the force of Chriſt's *commands* to diſciples, *terrours* to the unreformed, and *conditional* (moſt expreſly *conditional*) *promiſes* to all; and thoſe being ſubſtantially backed with the firm belief of all the Articles of the Creed, particularly of the judgment to come, are by the Grace of God abundantly ſufficient to ſecure Evangelical obedience, the true foundation of peace to every Chriſtian ſoul, and therefore I ſay, *eſt aliquid prodire tenus*, your *negative* part, if there were no more behind, will be of ſovereign uſe to all that have been ſeduced into any liking of thoſe errours, which are by a man of your moderation and judgment, in deſpight of contrary prepoſſeſſions, on reaſons ſo convincing and perſpicuous, rejected.

Sect. 26. But in the ſpace of thirty four years, though you have permitted your genius to lead you to other ſtudies (which if your rejections be granted, I ſhall willingly confeſs to be more univerſally profitable, than any minuter ſearches into the decrees) thoſe of *moral* or *practical Divinity*, yet it ſeems you have not liv'd ſuch an obſtinate Recluſe from the diſputes and tranſactions of men, but that occaſions you have met with to excite your faculties, to wade a little farther into the Poſitive part of theſe Doctrines: and indeed it is hard to conceive how a man can have ſpent ſo many hours, as the Survey of Dr. *Twiſſe*'s *Vindiciæ Gratiæ*, were it never ſo ſlight and deſultory, muſt have coſt you, without ſome other reflexions, beſides thoſe of bare averſation to his Hypotheſes.

Sect. 27. To theſe you at length proceed, propoſing them with difference, owning ſome of them, as your *preſent thoughts*, and *opinion*, whilſt in others you profeſs to be purely *ſceptick*, and to propoſe them *onely as conjectures*, that ſeem to you, in the mean time not improbable, untill you meet with ſome other more ſatisfactory. And in making this difference I fully accord with you, diſcerning that undeniable evidence of grounds in the former, which is not ſo readily diſcoverable in the latter. I ſhall therefore follow your direction herein, and rank theſe ſeverally, ſetting down thoſe which you own as your *opinion* firſt, and afterward, with that note of difference, proceed to your *Conjectures*.

Difference between Opinions and Conjectures.

Sect. 28. Concerning the *Decrees of Election and Reprobation*, your *preſent opinion* is contained in theſe three propoſitions (prefaced with two more, which are but the diſavowing the three ways of *Maſſa nondum condita, condita ante lapſum, & corrupta.)*

Three Propoſitions concerning God's Decrees,

Sect. 29. I. *That man being made upright, and ſo left in* manu conſilii ſui *(God permitting him to act according to that freedom of will wherewith as a reaſonable creature he had endowed him) did by his own voluntary diſobedience, through the cunning of Satan, tempting him thereunto, fall away from God, caſt himſelf into a ſtate of ſin and miſery, under the bondage of Satan, without any power, poſſibility, or ſo much as deſire to recover himſelf out of that wretched condition; All which God did decree not to hinder, as purpoſing to make uſe thereof, as a fit occaſion for the greater manifeſtation of his power, wiſedom, goodneſs, mercy, juſtice*, &c. Of this my opinion is, that it is, in every branch of it, ſo undeniably founded in the expreſs affirmations of holy Writ, that there can be no doubt of it to any Chriſtian.

Man's Fall.

Sect. 30. II. *That man being thus faln, God out of his infinite compaſſion to his creature, made after his own image (and that Satan might not finally triumph in ſo rich a conqueſt, if the whole maſs of mankind ſhould periſh) decreed to ſend his onely begotten Son Jeſus Chriſt into the world, to undertake the great work of our Redemption, and to ſatisfie his juſtice for ſin, that ſo notwithſtanding the ſame, the whole maſs of mankind loſt by the fall of the firſt Adam, might be reſtored to a capability of ſalvation, through the mercy of God, and the merits of Jeſus Chriſt, the ſecond Adam.*

The giving of Chriſt for Mankind.

In this, compared with what you before ſaid, and afterwards add, I diſcern your full agreement to the words of our Church-Catechiſm, as thoſe are exactly conſonant to the manifold teſtimonies of ſacred Writ, that Chriſt died for, and thereby *redeemed all mankind*; your words being not (to my apprehenſion) capable of any of thoſe evaſions, that others are willing to reſerve themſelves in this buſineſs, as of his dying ſufficiently, but not intentionally for all, for that χρησφύλον is ſuperſeded by your words of *God's ſending Chriſt*, &c. *that ſo mankind*, &c.] which muſt needs import his unfeigned intention, that mankind ſhould be reſtored to a real capability of ſalvation, which is not with truth affirmable, if any one individual of that whole kind he abſolutely paſſed by, or left, or excluded from his part in this reſtauration, and capability of ſalvation, which yet we muſt reſolve many millions to be, if that which is perfectly neceſſary to the recovery of thoſe which were ſo totally loſt, as your former propoſition truly ſuppoſed, be not really and effectually made up to them by Chriſt. And as in this full latitude I am obliged to underſtand you, ſo I wiſh not any more pregnant words to expreſs it, than thoſe which you have choſen.

Sect. 31. III. *That man having by his fall rendred himſelf uncapable of receiving any benefit from the Covenant made with him in his firſt Creation, God was graciouſly pleaſed to enter into a new Covenant with mankind, founded in his Son Jeſus Chriſt, conſiſting of Evangelical but conditional Promiſes, of granting remiſſion of ſins, and everlaſting life, upon the condition of faith in Chriſt, repentance from dead works, and new obedience, and gave commandment that the ſaid Covenant by the preaching of the Goſpel ſhould be publiſhed throughout the world*, this, you ſay, you conceive to be *that which the Arminians call the general decree of Predeſtination, but is rejected by the Calviniſts,*]

The new Covenant.

niſt is,] *And that all theſe Decrees are (according to our weak manner of underſtanding the way of God's counſels,* ſalvâ coexiſtentiâ & præſentialitate rerum omnium in mente divina ab æterno) *antecedent to the Decrees of Election and Reprobation.*

To this alſo I fully aſſent, both as to the truth, and fulneſs of the expreſſion in every part, eſpecially in that of God's entring with *mankind* (without any reſtraint) the *new Covenant*, founded in Chriſt: of the *conditionateneſs* of the *promiſes* of that new *Evangelical Covenant*: of *repentance* and *new obedience*, together with *faith* in *Chriſt*, making up that complete *condition*: of the *antecedency* of this *Covenant* in *Chriſt*, (and the command of publiſhing it throughout the world) to the *decrees* of *Election* and *Reprobation*: which ſeems to me to be expreſly ſet down from Chriſt's words, *Mark* 16. 15, 16. *And he ſaid unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the Goſpel to every creature, he that believeth and is baptized, ſhall be ſaved, he that believeth not, ſhall be damned.*] which evidently founds thoſe two decrees in the precedaneous preaching, and mens receiving or rejecting of the Goſpel.

The Decree of publiſhing the Goſpel to all the world.

Sect. 32. And when the Goſpels are all ſo expreſs in ſetting down that command of Chriſt to his Apoſtles of *preaching the Goſpel* to all the *world*, to the *whole Creation*, i. e. the *whole Gentile*, as well as *Jewiſh world*, (and the travels of the Apoſtles witneſs their obedience to it) and when the command of Chriſt is equivalent with a *decree*, and his giving of that in time an evidence of its being by him predeſtin'd from all eternity, it is very ſtrange that this ſhould be denied or queſtioned by the Calviniſts, or the Arminians rejected by them, when in effect they do but repeat Chriſt's own words, who if he gave command to publiſh the Goſpel to all, then muſt the publiſhing of the Goſpel be matter of a general decree, there being no other ſo ſure a way of diſcerning what was *ab æterno* predeſtined by God in his ſecret counſel, as the Scriptures telling us what was by the Father, or Chriſt in time actually commanded.

Evangelical Obedience.

Sect. 33. Thus far and no farther reach thoſe which you own to be your *preſent opinions*, and pronounce of them, that you are ſo *far convinced from the phraſes and expreſſions frequent in Scripture, that you cannot but own them as ſuch.* And then let me tell you, it were very happy that all men would agree in theſe, and yet more happy, if inſtead of more curious enquires, they would ſit down, and betake themſelves uniformly and vigorouſly to that task, which theſe *data* bind indiſpenſably upon them, and which is of that weight, that it may well imploy the remainder of their lives to perform it to purpoſe, I mean the work of *Evangelical obedience*, the condition of the new Covenant, without which the capability of pardon and ſalvation, which was purchaſed for mankind in general and for every man, ſhall never be actuated to any.

Matters of Conjecture.

Sect. 34. Beyond theſe therefore what you add, you acknowledge to be but *conjectures*, which though to you they ſeem *not improbable*, yet you profeſs to maintain your ἐποχὴ or *Scepticiſm* in them. And if in any of theſe I ſhould, on the ſame terms of *conjecture*, or *ſeeming probability*, differ from you, this ſtill were fully to accord with you in the *general*, viz. the *ſuſpenſion of belief*, and proceeding *no farther than conjectures* in theſe things.

What the iſſue will be, ſhall now be ſpeedily experimented, by proceeding to a view of them, remembring ſtill that you propoſe them but as *conjectures*.

The firſt.

Sect. 35. The firſt is, *That the object of the decrees of Election and Reprobation, as they are ſet forth in the Scripture, ſeemeth to you to be man preached unto,* Thoſe *being elected to eternal life, who receive Chriſt, as he is offer'd to them in the Goſpel,* viz. *as their Lord and Saviour, and thoſe reprobated, who do not ſo receive him.*] Herein I not onely perfectly agree with you, but more than ſo, I do think it an unqueſtionable truth, which carries its evidence along with it, and ſo will be acknowledged by any that obſerves the limitation by you affixt to the ſubject of the Propoſition, the object of the decrees [*as they are ſet forth in the Scripture*] For he that ſhall but conſider, that the holy Scripture is a donative afforded us by God, and deſigned for our eternal advantages, not to enable us to judge of others, but our ſelves, not to diſcover all the unſearchable receſſes of his cloſet, or ſecret counſels (*abſcondita Domino Deo noſtro*) but to reveal to men thoſe truths, which themſelves are concern'd in, would make no difficulty to conclude, that the Scripture ſpeaks onely of thoſe, to whom it ſpeaks, and as the Apoſtle ſaith, 1 *Cor. ver.* 12. *What* hath he *to doe to judge them that are without*, leaving them wholly to *God's judgment*, ſo doth the Scripture declare God's dealing onely with thoſe, to whom the Scripture comes, to whom ſome way or other (whether by writing or preaching it matters not) the Goſpel of Chriſt is revealed.

The object of Scripture Election.

Sect. 36. This as it appears by innumerable evidences in the Scripture, ſo it is put beyond all diſpute by that even now recited Text, as Chriſt's farewell, *Mark* xvi. his commiſſion to his Apoſtles, and declaration of the fixed determin'd conſequences of it, an expreſs tranſcript of God's eternal deſtinations or decrees in that matter, *Go into all the world, and preach the Goſpel to every creature, He that believeth and is baptized ſhall be ſaved, and he that believeth not ſhall be damned*] In which words what can be the meaning of [*ſhall be ſaved, and ſhall be damned*] but this, that *God hath decreed ſalvation and damnation to ſuch?* Thoſe therefore are the object of thoſe divine decrees, who are the ſubject of that propoſition, and thoſe are evidently men preached to, of which ſome believe, and are baptized, and thoſe have their parts in the firſt *decree*, that of *election* to ſalvation, ſome reject the Goſpel, and believe not, and thoſe fall under the ſecond branch, that of rejection to Damnation.

All Scripture decrees conditionate.

Sect. 37. Againſt the evidence of this, no oppoſition can be made, and to this it is undeniably conſequent, that all the Decrees whereof Scripture treateth, are *conditionate*, receiving Chriſt as the Goſpel offers him, as *Lord* and *Saviour*, the former as well as the latter being the condition of Scripture-election, and the rejecting, or not receiving him thus, the condition of the Scripture-reprobation.

Temerity of introducing abſolute Decrees.

Sect. 38. As for any other which can be fanſied diſtant from this (and ſo all abſolute Election or inconditionate Reprobation) it muſt needs be reſolved to be the mere invention and fabrick of mens brains, without the duct of God's Spirit in Scripture, which if at leaſt it hold not a ſtrict analogy with that which the Scripture hath thus revealed to us, will never be excuſed from great temerity, and the ſin of dogmatizing, the rifling God's ſecrets, and ſetting up our own imaginations if not prejudices, for the oracles of God. If this were well thought of, it would infallibly ſet a period to all farther diſputes on this ſubject. And the Propoſition, which I have laſt ſet down from you, is ſo irrefragably convincing,

that

that I hope it may be ſucceſsfull to ſo good an end, and all men that reade it, reſolve it their duty to preach no other Decrees of God from Scripture, but this that all *that receive the Goſpel preached, and live according to the preſcript rule thereof,* (for that is to *receive Chriſt as there he is offered to them, as a Lord and Saviour*) ſhall be ſaved, and all they that reject it, when it is thus revealed, or live in contradiction to the terms whereon it is eſtabliſhed, ſhall be damned. This would probably change curioſity into induſtry, unprofitable diſquiſitions into the *ſearch and trying of our own ways*, and *working out our own ſalvation.*

Sect. 39. To this propoſition, if it ſhall be granted, you annex *two Corollaries*, and I that have not onely yielded but challenged the undoubted truth of the Propoſition, can make no queſtion of the Corollaries. The *firſt* is this,

Sect. 40. *That it will be impoſſible to maintain the Doctrine of Univerſal Grace in that manner as the Remonſtrants are ſaid to aſſert it, againſt the objection which is uſually made by their adverſaries, how evangelical Grace can be offer'd to ſuch nations or perſons, as never had the Goſpel preached unto them.*]

Sect. 41. The truth of this Corollary (as of all other) muſt be judged of by the dependence from the *Principle*, the connexion it hath with the former propoſition; That ſpake of the *Decrees, as they are ſet forth in Scripture*, and of the *condition* required of them that are *elected to ſalvation, receiving Chriſt preached, as he is offered in the Goſpel*, and accordingly it is moſt evident, that they that will found their Doctrine on *Scripture*, muſt find not onely difficulty, but impoſſibility to maintain the gift of *evangelical Grace* (which I ſuppoſe to be a ſupernatural power to believe and obey the Goſpel) to thoſe, to whom the Goſpel hath never been revealed. What the *Remonſtrants* are ſaid to aſſert in this matter, I ſhall forbear to examine, becauſe I deſign not to engage in any controverſie at this time with any; onely as on one ſide it is evident, that their adverſaries can receive no benefit by the objection, the ſalvability of all to whom the Goſpel is preached, being as contrary to their Doctrine of *onely the Elect*, as it would be, if extended to the heathens alſo, all Chriſtians being not with them in the number of the Elect; ſo on the other ſide, I ſhould think it ſtrange, that in our preſent notion of *Evangelical Grace*, for a *ſtrength* from *God to receive and obey the Goſpel* preached, it ſhould, by the Remonſtrants, or any other, be affirmed from Scripture that it is given, or offered to thoſe to whom the Goſpel hath not been revealed: S. *Paul* ſtyles the *Goſpel, the power of God unto ſalvation, and* the preaching of it the διακονια πνευματος *adminiſtration of the ſpirit*, and indeed the *ſpirit* is in Scripture promiſed onely to them who *believe in Chriſt*, and therefore ſpeaking of what may be maintained by Scripture, and confining the ſpeech to *Evangelical Grace*, the Univerſality of it can no farther be by that maintained to extend, than to thoſe to whom the Goſpel is preached, for if *Faith cometh by hearing*, and *hearing by the word*, i. e. preaching the Goſpel, it muſt follow, *they cannot believe*, and ſo have not Evangelical Grace, or ſtrength to believe, *without a Preacher.*

Whether the Heathens have Evangelical Grace.

Sect. 42. And therefore I remember the Learned Biſhop of *Sarisbury*, Doctour *Davenant* in his Lent Sermon (I think the laſt he preached before the King) declared his opinion to be (as for *Univerſal Redemption*, ſo) for *Univerſal Grace within the Church*; and as for this he was, I think, by none accounted an Arminian, ſo I never heard any that was of the Remonſtrant perſwaſions, unſatisfied with the ſcantneſs of that declaration, but thought it as much, as, ſpeaking of Grace in the Scripture notion of it, *Evangelical Grace*, could with any reaſon be required of him.

Sect. 43. As for the ſtate and condition of heathens, to whom the Goſpel is not revealed, and yet it is no fault of theirs that it is not, as all thoſe that lived before Chriſt and many ſince, as it is evident the Scripture was not delivered to them, nor conſequently gave to us Chriſtians rules for the judging of them, ſo it is moſt reaſonable which you add in your ſecond Corollary, which is this,

Sect. 44. That *into the conſideration of God's Decrees ſuch nations or perſons are not at all to be taken, as never heard of the Goſpel, but they are to be left wholly to the judgment of God, ſince he hath not thought fit to reveal to us any certainty concerning their condition, but reſerved it to himſelf, amongſt his other ſecret counſels, the reaſons of his wonderfull and unſearchable diſpenſations in that kind.* To which I moſt willingly ſubſcribe in every tittle, and challenge it as the juſt debt to the force of that reaſon, that ſhines in it, that no man paſs fatal decretory ſentences on ſo great a part of mankind, by force of thoſe rules, which they never heard of, nor without hearing could poſſibly know that they were to be ſentenced by them. And this the rather upon four conſiderations which Scripture aſſures us of. Firſt, that as *all men* were *dead in Adam*, ſo *Chriſt died for all*, that were thus *dead*, for *every man*, even for thoſe that *deny him*, and finally *periſh*: which as it muſt extend and be intended by him, that thus *taſted death for* them, to the benefit of thoſe that knew him not (for if he *died for them that deny him*, why not for them that are leſs guilty, as having never heard of him, eſpecially when 'tis not the *Revelation* of Chriſt, to which the *Redemption* is affixt, but his *Death*) ſo the certain truth of this is moſt expreſly revealed and frequently inculcated in the Scripture (though nothing be there found of God's decrees concerning them) upon this ground eſpecially, that no perſon of what Nation ſoever ſhould have any prejudice to Chriſtian Religion, when it ſhould be firſt revealed to him, when he finds his intereſt ſo expreſly provided for by ſo gracious a Redeemer, who if he had not died for *every man*, 'twere impoſſible for any Preacher to aſſure an Infidel, that he died for him, or propoſe any conſtringent reaſon to him, why he ſhould believe on him for ſalvation. To this it is conſequent, that whatſoever God's unrevealed ways are, to deal with any heathen, what degree of *repentance from dead works*, obedience, or performance ſoever he accept from them, this muſt needs be founded in the Covenant made with mankind in Chriſt, which you have moſt truly eſtabliſhed, there being *no other name under heaven*, no ſalvation poſſible to lapſed man by any other Covenant; Which, being ſet in oppoſition to the firſt Covenant of perfect unſinning obedience, and therefore called a ſecond and Evangelical Covenant, on condition onely of ſincere obedience, of doing what by God's gift, purchaſed by Chriſt, men are enabled to doe, it follows ſtill, that whatſoever acceptation or mercy they, who never heard of Chriſt, can be imagined to have afforded them by God, muſt be conformable to the tenour of the Evangelical Covenant, and *ſo to the praiſe of the Glory of that Grace*, whereby whoſoever is accepted by God, is *accepted in the beloved.*

Of the condition of thoſe to whom the Goſpel is not revealed.

Four conſiderations concerning them. The firſt.

Sect. 45.

The ſecond. *Sect.* 45. The ſecond Conſideration is the analogy, which, in one reſpect, is obſervable between thoſe to whom the Goſpel is not revealed, and all children and Idiots within the pale of the Church; for although believing in Chriſt were ſuppoſed equally by the law of Scripture to be exacted of all, and ſo of both thoſe ſorts (nay by the intervention of the vow of Baptiſm to be more expreſly the obligation of thoſe that are baptized, than thoſe that are not) yet there is no reaſon producible to free the Chriſtian children and idiots from the blame of not believing, which will not with equal force be producible for thoſe heathens, to whom the Goſpel was never revealed, it being as impoſſible to ſee without the preſence of the *object*, as without the *faculty* of ſight, without the *Sun*, as without eyes, without the revelation of Chriſt, as without the intellective faculty; which if it be not part of the importance of that decree of heaven, *Go and preach, and then he that believeth not ſhall be damned*, yet it is fully accordant to it, and ſhews that that Text was not deſigned to give ſuffrage to the damnation of all but Chriſtians, which is all that your Corollary, or my obſervations have aſpired unto; to which it is yet farther neceſſarily conſequent, that theſe *Scripture Decrees* which you ſpeak of (and whoſoever ſpeaks of any other muſt be reſolved to ſpeak from ſome other dictate, than that of Scripture) compriſe not all men, no nor all baptized Chriſtians under them, being terminated onely in thoſe to whom the Goſpel is revealed, and thoſe certainly are not all that are brought into the world, or even to *Baptiſmal* new birth.

The third. *Sect.* 46. The third Conſideration is, that ſeeing the Scripture aſſures us, that they which have *received more, of them more ſhall be required*, and that *he that knoweth and doeth not, ſhall be beaten with many ſtripes*, this muſt needs advertiſe us, that whatever privileges Chriſtians may have beyond Heathens, this is not one, that a ſmaller degree of obedience and performances ſhall be accepted of them, than of Heathens would be, but the contrary, that to whom *leſs is given, leſs will be required*, according to that of S. *Auguſtine*, *Ex eo quod non accepit, nullius reus eſt, No man is guilty from that which he hath not received.*

De lib. Arbit. l. 3. *c.* 16.

The fourth. *Sect.* 47. The fourth Conſideration is, that God rewards thoſe that have made uſe of the ſingle talent, that loweſt proportion of Grace, which he is pleaſed to give; and the method of his rewarding is by giving them more grace, which as it is in ſome degree applicable to heathens, who have certainly the talent of natural knowledge, and are ſtrictly reſponſible for it, ſo if they uſe not that, but *retain the truth in unrighteouſneſs*, *Rom.* 1. 18. that makes their condition but the ſame with ours, (who are finally loſt alſo, and at the preſent have our talent taken away from us) if we make not the due uſe of it.

Sect. 48. This, 'tis viſible, hath befaln thoſe Nations who once had the Goſpel preacht to them, and after the knowledge of the truth, return'd to their heathen ſins, and ſo had their candleſtick taken from them (to which and not to God's primary denying them Evangelical Grace, their preſent Barbarity is to be imputed) And the onely concluſion which we can hence duly make, is the acknowledgment of God's juſt judgments on them, and reaſonable fear leſt he deal in like manner with us, if we tranſcribe their copy, imitate them in their demerits. Should God moſt juſtly thus puniſh this Nation at this time, could it either now or in future ages be reaſonable hence to argue againſt the Doctrine of *Univerſal Grace*, in caſe there were a concurrence of all other evidences for the truth of the Doctrine? Certainly it could not. In like manner then it cannot be reaſonable to argue thus from the like fate, and effects on other Nations.

Sect. 49. To which I may add, that Chriſt being, we know, in God's decree and promiſe, *the Lamb ſlain from the beginning of the world*, if this argument be now of force againſt the heathens, it muſt equally hold againſt all that underſtood no more of the *Predictions* of Chriſt, than the Pagans do now of the *Hiſtory*.

Sect. 50. And then it muſt, ſhould it have force, follow, not onely that the Sacrifice of Chriſt was intended to be of avail to none but the Jews, to whom onely the Oracles of God were committed, (which yet you acknowledge was intended to all) but alſo that as far as we have ways of judging, a very ſmall part of thoſe Jews received the ſalvifick Grace of Chriſt, if it were confined and annext to the revelation and belief of him; For if we may judge of other ages by that wherein Chriſt appeared, the Prophecies of the Crucified Meſſias were very little underſtood by that people. All this makes it more prudent, and rational, and pious to ſearch our own ways, than to paſs ſentence on other men, which is the onely thing I have aimed at in theſe four Conſiderations.

The ſecond Conjecture an undoubted truth. Inward grace annexed to the Miniſtery of the Goſpel. *Sect.* 51. Your ſecond Propoſition, which you tender as a *Conjecture*, I cannot but own under an higher ſtyle of an evident truth of Scripture, It is this, *That there is to the outward tender of Grace in the miniſtery of the Goſpel annexed an inward offer alſo of the ſame to the heart, by the ſpirit of God going along with his word, which ſome of the Schoolmen call* auxilium Gratiæ generale, *ſufficient in it ſelf to convert the ſoul of the hearer, if he do not reſiſt the Holy Ghoſt, and reject the Grace offer'd: which as it is grounded upon theſe words, Behold, I ſtand at the door and knock, and upon very many other paſſages of Scripture beſide, ſo it ſtandeth with reaſon, that the offer, if it were accepted, ſhould be ſufficient* ex parte ſui *to doe the work, which if not accepted, is ſufficient to leave the perſon, not accepting the ſame, unexcuſable*] This I ſay I am obliged to aſſent to in the terms, and upon the double ground both of *Scripture* and *reaſon*, whereon you induce it. If there were but one text of *Scripture* ſo convincingly inferring it, that ſure would advance it above a barely probable *Conjecture*. But I think the whole tenour of the New Teſtament inforceth the ſame, and though you name but one, you ſay there are *many other paſſages of Scripture*, on which 'tis founded. I ſhall mention but two, 1. that of the Apoſtle who calls preaching the word, διακονια πνευματος *the adminiſtration of the Spirit*, which the Father expreſſes by *verbum vehiculum Spiritus*, the *word is the chariot in which the Spirit deſcends to us*, 2. that deſcription of *reſiſting the holy ſpirit*, which S. *Stephen* gives us, *Act.* 7. 51. by their being like the Jews, *which perſecuted the Prophets which ſpake unto them*, which concludes the *holy ſpirit to be given with the preaching* of the *Goſpel*, elſe how could the rejecting and perſecuting the one be the *reſiſting* of the other? So likewiſe though you mention but one *reaſon*, yet that is as conſtringent as many, nothing but ſufficiency of ſupernatural Grace being competent to render him, that is acknowledged naturally impotent, *unexcuſable*. And therefore deeming that abundantly confirmed to advance it above a diſputable

disputable probleme, I proceed to the next Propoſition, the third, which you rank under the ſtyle of Conjectures, It is this,

Sect. 52. That *becauſe the ſufficiency of this General Grace notwithſtanding, through the ſtrength of natural corruption, it might happen to prove uneffectual to all perſons, God vouchſafed out of the ſupereffluence of his goodneſs, yet* ex mero beneplacito, *without any thing on their part to deſerve it, to confer upon ſuch perſons as it pleaſed him to fix upon (without inquiring into under what qualifications, preparations or diſpoſitions conſidered) a more ſpecial meaſure of Grace which ſhould effectually work in them faith and perſeverance unto ſalvation*] This (you ſay) you take to be *the election eſpecially ſpoken of in the Scriptures*, and if ſo, then the *Decree of Reprobation muſt be nothing elſe but the dereliction or preterition of the reſt, as to that ſpecial favour of conferring upon them this higher degree of effectual Grace. Againſt this*, you ſay, *you know enough may be objected, and much more than you eſteem your ſelf able to anſwer, yet to your apprehenſion ſomewhat leſs than may be objected againſt either of the extreme opinions.* The third Conjecture of effectual Grace and Scripture Election and Reprobation.

Sect. 53. Of this Propoſition, as being the firſt by you produced, to which your caution ſeems to be due, ſome things may in paſſing be fitly noted. Animadverſions on this Conjecture.

Firſt, that for the ſtating of that community which is here ſet down as the object of Election and Reprobation, and expreſt by a general ſtyle [*all perſons*] this Caution is neceſſarily to be taken in, that the propoſition is not to be interpreted in the *utmoſt* latitude, that the ſtyle [*all perſons*] is capable of, but as analogy with your former doctrine ſtrictly requires, for the *generality of men preach'd to: and ſo neither belongs to heathens, nor to the Infants or Idiots, or uninſtructed among Chriſtians, but to thoſe that having the Goſpel revealed to them, and ſufficient grace to enable them to receive it, are yet left in the hand of their own counſel, whether they will actually receive it, or no.* The firſt.

Sect. 54. Now of theſe (which is the ſecond thing to be obſerved in your Propoſition) it is manifeſt, that if (as you ſuppoſe both in the former, and in this Propoſition,) they have *grace* truly *ſufficient* afforded them, then they want nothing neceſſary to a ſaln weak ſinfull creature, to converſion, perſeverance and ſalvation, and if ſo, then by the ſtrength of this Grace, without addition of any more, they may effectually convert, perſevere and be ſaved; and then though what may be, may alſo not be, and ſo it be alſo poſſible that all that are thus preach'd to, and made partakers of this Grace, no one ſhall make uſe of it to theſe effects, yet this is but barely poſſible, and not rendred ſo much as probable, either upon any grounds of Scripture or Reaſon. In the Scripture there is no word revealed to that ſenſe, or, that I ever heard of, produced or applied to it, but on the contrary, in the Parable of the Talents (which ſeems to reſpect this matter particularly) they that received the Talents to negotiate with, did all of them, except one, make profit of them, and bring in that account to their Maſter, which received a reward, which is utterly unreconcileable with the hypotheſis of God's foreſeeing that the Talent of ſufficient Grace would be made uſe of by none that received no more than ſo. As for that one that made not uſe of it, all that is intimated concerning him, is, that if his ſhare comparatively was mean, yet by the Lord he is charged as guilty for not *putting it into the bank, that at his coming he might receive his own with uſury*, which certainly evinces, that that lazy ſervant is there conſidered as one that might have managed his ſtock as well as the reſt, and that that ſtock was improvable no leſs than the other, according to their ſeveral proportions, and ſo herein there is no difference taken notice of in favour to your Conjecture. The ſecond from Scripture.

And in *Reaſon* it hath no ſound of probability, that of ſo great a number of Chriſtians, ſufficiently furniſhed by God, no one ſhould make uſe of it to their ſouls health; 'tis evident in the Apoſtles preaching at *Jeruſalem* and elſewhere, that at the firſt propoſal of the truth of Chriſt to them, and the Doctrine of Repentance, whole multitudes received the Faith, and came in, and no doubt many of them proved true, and conſtant Chriſtians, and it is not amiſs to obſerve of the heads of Doctrine, which the Apoſtles agreed to publiſh in all their peregrinations, that they are of ſuch force (and were on that account pitcht on by them) as might reaſonably and probably, with the ſuppoſed concurrence of God's Grace, beget repentance, and new life in all, to whom they were preach'd over the whole world, (and then what the Apoſtles deemed a rational and probable means to that end, there is no reaſon or probability to think ſhould never in any produce this effect) according to that of *Athanaſius*, that the *Faith conſeſt by the Fathers of Nice, according to holy Writ*, is αὐτάρκης πρὸς ἀνατροπὴν πάσης δυσεβείας, οὖσαν ἡ εὐσεβείας ἐν Χριστῷ, *ſufficient for the averting of all impiety, and the eſtabliſhment of all piety in Chriſt.* To which may be applied that of S. *Auguſtine* of the Creed, *Quæ pauca verba fidelibus nota ſunt, ut credendo ſubjugentur Deo, ut ſubjugati recte vivant, recte vivendo, cor mundent, corde mundo, quod credant, intelligant; Theſe few words are known to believers, that by believing, they may be ſubjugated to God, that by being ſubjugated, they may live well, that by living well they may cleanſe their hearts, that by cleanſing their hearts they may underſtand what they believe.* And herein the all-wiſe providence and infinite mercy of God ſeems to be engaged, who in the Parable of his dealing with his Vineyard, *Iſa.* v. not onely expoſtulates, *What could I have done more to my vineyard which I have not done*] but alſo affirmeth that he *looked it ſhould bring forth grapes*, and as a farther evidence of that, *built a wine-preſs*, in expectation of its bearing fruit by ſtrength of what he had done to it, which could not well be affirmed by, or of God, if it were not probable and rational, that in ſome it ſhould have the deſired effect. And Reaſon. *In Ep. ad Epictet.* *In libel. de fide & ſymbolo, in Tom. iii.*

Sect. 55. And if what, on account both of Scripture and reaſon (the onely ways left us to judge by in this matter) is thus far removed from improbable, may be ſuppoſed to have any truth in it, *i. e.* if the ſufficient grace annexed to the authoriſed ſufficient means, have without farther addition, ever converted any, it then follows neceſſarily in the third place, that the Election and Dereliction now propoſed by you muſt have for its object not indefinitely (as before you ſet it) *man preach'd unto*, or all that part of mankind to whom the Goſpel is offered, and that Grace annexed thereto, but onely that portion of ſuch, as are not wrought upon, or who God in his infinite preſcience diſcerns would not be wrought upon effectually, and converted by that meaſure of ſufficient Grace, which he hath annext to the word preach'd. For without enquiring what proportion of the number of men preach'd unto may probably be placed in that rank (or without aſſuming any more, than that it is neither impoſſible And the unreconcileableneſs of this Conjecture with making man preach'd to the object of the Decrees.

nor

nor improbable that there ſhould be ſuch a rank) of men converted, and perſevering by the ſtrength of that foreſaid *ſufficient Grace*, annexed to the *word*, the inference is undeniable, that all, whether few or many, that are of this rank (it being no-way probable there ſhould be none) ſhall certainly be ſaved by force of the *ſecond Covenant, which decreed eternal life to all that ſhould believe on him and receive him, as the Goſpel tenders him, as their Lord and Saviour*, and ſo cannot be compriſed in the number of them to whom this *ſupereffluence* of goodneſs is ſuppoſed to be vouchſafed, in the *granting of which ex mero beneplacito* your conjecture makes the *Scripture-Election* to conſiſt, and in the *Derelict̃ion and Preterition* of the reſt (in reſpect of that ſpecial favour) the Decree of Reprobation.

Sect. 56. The plain iſſue whereof is but this, that if this conjecture, thus explicated, be adhered to, then many not onely of Children, Idiots, heathen (formerly reſerved to God's ſecret judgments) but of adult baptized Chriſtians alſo, either are or may be ſaved, who are not of the number of the Scripture-Elect. Which whether it be reconcileable with the purport of thoſe places, which in Scripture ſeem to you to reſpect Election, or to favour this opinion, I muſt leave to farther conſideration, being as yet incompetent to interpoſe any judgment of it, becauſe I know not what thoſe places are which moſt ſeem to favour it.

The Doctrine of ſupereffluence of Grace to ſome, acknowledged.

Sect. 57. As for the Doctrine it ſelf, of *ſupereffluence of Grace* to ſome, (abſtracted from making it any account of God's *Decrees of Election and Reprobation*) It is ſuch as I can no-way queſtion, for certainly God being granted to give ſufficient Grace to all, there is no objection imaginable againſt this *ſuper-abounding to ſome ex mero beneplacito*; Nothing more agreeable to an infinite abyſs and unexhauſtible fountain of goodneſs, than ſuch ſupereffluence, and he that hath not his part in it, yet having his portion, and that ſuppoſed ſufficient, ought not to have *an evil eye*, to complain and murmur at this partiality, and inequality of diſtribution of God's *goodneſs*, or if he do, the words of the Parable of the Labourers in the Vineyard muſt here have place, *Friend, I doe thee no wrong, did not I agree with thee for a peny, take that is thine, and go thy way, is it not lawfull for me to doe what I will with my own?* *Matt.* xx. 13, 14, 15. And it is there obſervable, that all the occaſion of murmuring aroſe from the order there obſerved in accounting with, and paying the Labourers, *beginning* with them that came *laſt into the Vineyard*, for by that means they being allowed a days wages for an hours labour, the others expectation was raiſed to an higher pitch, than probably it would, if they had been paid, and diſcharged firſt, for then not ſeeing the liberality that others taſted of, they would in all probability have expected no more, than the hire for which they agreed; And then why ſhould ſo caſual a circumſtance, as the being paid laſt or firſt, have any influence on their minds, or tempt them to murmur at God's goodneſs, who from the nature of the thing had no leaſt temptation to it?

But this of ſupereffluence no part of the Covenant of Grace.

Sect. 58. Onely by the way it muſt be yielded to the force of that Parable, that that *ſupereffluence* of which ſome are there ſuppoſed to taſte, was no part of the *Covenant of Grace*, (his agreement with them being but in theſe words, *Go into the Vineyard, and what is right ye ſhall receive*, ver. 7.) but, above what his bargain or Covenant obligeth, *of his good pleaſure*, though, on the other ſide, it be obſervable, 1. That an allowable account is there given by thoſe men of their not coming ſooner into the Vineyard, and conſequently of their not *bearing the heat of the day*, in which all the diſproportion between them and others, all the ſeeming ſupereffluence is founded, *viz.* they were no ſooner *called*, or hired by any man, and 2. that by the application of the parable to the ἐσχάτους and πρώτους, to thoſe that came *firſt*, and thoſe that came *later* into the Apoſtleſhip, to *Peter* and *Paul*, there might ſtill be place for more *abundant labouring* in thoſe that came laſt, and ſo for reward, in proportion (though through mercy) to that more *abundant labouring*, according to the way of ſetting down the ſame Parable among the Jews in * *Gemara Hieroſol.* where the King's anſwer to the murmurers is, *He in thoſe two hours hath laboured as much as you have done all the day.*

* *Cod. Berathoth.*

Sect. 59. But without examining the Acts of God's munificence, according to any rules but thoſe of *munificence*, and again without inſiſting on the method which God himſelf ſeems to direct us to in this matter, in the Parable of the Talents, where the Rule is general, that *to him that hath ſhall be given, and he ſhall have abundance*, i. e. that the ſupereffluence of Grace is ordinarily proportioned to the faithfull diſcharge of former truſts, making uſe of the foregoing *ſufficient Grace*, there will be little reaſon to doubt, but that God out of *his mere good pleaſure*, without any deſert on our part, doth thus diſpenſe his favours to one, more than to another, to *one* ſervant *five Talents*, to *another ten*, *but to all ſome*, onely the difficulties will be, 1. whether it be not as poſſible, though not as probable, that the *ſupereffluence of Grace* may be reſiſted, as the lower, but ſufficient degree? and then, whether the condemnation be not the greater, there will be no doubt; *Paul* that is the moſt pregnant example of the ſupereffluence, is ſtill, under a *woe*, obliged to *preach the Goſpel*, and *whilſt he preached to others*, ſuppoſes it poſſible, that himſelf, if he do not *bring his body in ſubjection*, may *become a caſtaway*, and till he hath *fought his good fight*, and *finiſh'd his courſe, and* conſtantly *kept the faith*, we never find him confident of *receiving his crown*, which then he challenges from *God's righteouſneſs*, or fidelity; 2. whether the extraordinary favour of God, which ſome men receive, and by virtue of which, over and above the ſufficient Grace, they may be thought to be wrought on effectually, may not rather be imputed to *God's ſpecial Providence*, than his *ſpecial Grace?* ſo in Biſhop *Overal*'s way it ſeems affirmable, for in his Scheme the effectualneſs ſeems to be attributed to the giving what is given, *tempore congruo*, at a time when (whether by ſickneſs, or by any other circumſtance of their ſtate) they are foreſeen by God to be ſo qualified and diſpoſed, that they ſhall infallibly accept Chriſt offered, on his own conditions, and ſo convert, and receive *the ſeed into good ground*, and ſo perſevere and be ſaved, when the ſame man, out of thoſe circumſtances, would not have been wrought on by the ſame means. And if this be it which you mean (as I doubt not but it is, and that herein you perfectly agree with Biſhop *Overal*) then I ſay the queſtion is, whether the ſeaſonable application or timing be not rather to be imputed to *ſpecial Providence*, the mercy of God's wiſe and gracious diſpoſal to thoſe men that are thus favoured, than to *ſpecial Grace*, as that ſignifies a higher degree of God's grace, than is that *ſufficient meaſure*, which is afforded to others; it being poſſible that an equal, nay a lower degree of Grace, being congruouſly timed and tendred, may prove effectual, when the like, nay an higher, at ano-

Difficulties concerning ſupereffluence.

I. Whether it be not Reſiſtible.

II. Whether it belong not rather to providence than Grace.

at another time, proves uneffectual. And though all acts of God's good *providence* may in ſome ſenſe be ſtyled acts of his *Grace*, and ſo extraordinary providences may be ſtyled ſpecial Graces, in which ſenſe, the ſtriking *Paul* in his journey to *Damaſcus*, and calling to him out of heaven with grace proportionable to that call, may fitly be called a work of God's *ſpecial Grace*; and ſo is every ſickneſs or other judgment, that is ſent to melt any, ſuppoſeable to have a proportionable, and that is an extraordinary and ſpecial Grace annext to it; and the providence, and ſo the grace is the greater, if it be applied *tempore congruo*, when there is no potent obſtacle or principle for reſiſtence; yet ſtill the queſtion is ſeaſonable, whether this be all that is meant by this ſpecial meaſure of Grace, which ſhall work effectually, or if more be meant, what ground there is for it in the Scripture.

Sect. 60. To this ſecond queſtion your advertiſement by letter hath given the ſatisfaction I expected, *that you were not curious to conſider the diſtinction between the Grace and the providence of God, there being no neceſſity for ſo doing, as to your purpoſe, which was onely to expreſs your ſenſe that it muſt be the work of God (whether of Grace or Providence it matters not) that muſt doe the deed, and make the ſufficient Grace effectual.* This anſwer I accept, and make no farther return to it; onely from the uncertainty of the former, as to any eſtabliſhment from Scripture-grounds, and ſo likewiſe of this latter, till it ſhall appear by any ſure word of promiſe to have any real influence on the matter in hand, there is way made for a third queſtion.

III. Whether this be it to which Election is determined.

Sect. 61. Whether granting the truth of all that is pretended for the ſupereffluence of God's goodneſs to ſome, this can fitly be defined the thing, whereto *Election* is determined, and whether all that have not their part in this, are in Scripture-ſtyle ſaid to be *Reprobated*. This I ſay, not to propoſe any new matter of diſpute, or to require anſwer to all that may be objected againſt this notion of Decrees, which you (and other very Learned and ſober men) have propoſed by way of *conjecture* onely, but rather to demonſtrate my concurrence with you, that this can amount no higher at moſt, than to a matter of *conjecture*.

Conſiderations from Scripture oppoſed to the former conjecture.

Sect. 62. And having ſaid this, I ſhall propoſe it to your impartial conſideration, I. Whether the Scripture ought not to be our guide in all even opining and conjecturing in ſuch matters, which are ſo much above our reaſon? II. Whether the Scripture do not furniſh us with theſe expreſs grounds, 1. that there are ſome ſort of auditours that come to Chriſt, become his Proſelytes, embrace the Goſpel, when 'tis preach'd unto them, that are ἱτοιμοι εἰς βασιλειαν τῦ Θεῦ, *fit*, or prepared, or diſpoſed *for the kingdom of God*, obedience to the Goſpel, πεπαγμενοι, *diſpoſed for eternal life*, on *file* for it (in oppoſition to others who are ὐκ ἀξιοι ζωῆς, *ver.* 46. *not worthy of*, meet, or qualified for the Evangelical ſtate) 2. that *probity* of mind is ſpecified to be this temper, a *willingneſs to doe God's will*, that (in the parable) of the *good ground*, and the *honeſt heart* meant by it. 3. That the Evangelical diſpenſations are governed by the maxim of *habenti dabitur*, *to the humble he gives more grace*, the *poor are Evangelized*, the *children*, and *poor in ſpirit*, of *ſuch*, and *of them is the Kingdom of Heaven*; and laſtly, that *God hath choſen the fooliſh things of the world, the weak, the degenerous, the vilified, thoſe that are not*, in oppoſition to the *mighty, powerfull, noble and wiſe*. III. Whether on theſe and many other the like fundamental Truths of the Goſpel, it be not more reaſonable to fetch the ground of the effectualneſs of that ſufficient grace to one, which is not effectual to another, from the temper and diſpoſition of the heart, to which the Goſpel is preached, than from any other circumſtance (eſpecially when this doth not deny, or exclude the proper efficacy of thoſe circumſtances, whatſoever they or it ſhall any way appear to be) God having made the Baptiſt the forerunner to Chriſt, repentance to Faith, the * *breaking up our fallow grounds*, to his *not ſowing among thorns*, and the very nature of the Goſpel being ſuch, that all that are truly ſenſible of their ſins, the odiouſneſs and danger of them, and heartily deſirous to get out of that ſtate, the *weary and heavy laden*, the *humble*, docile, tractable, *honeſt heart*, willing to *take* Chriſt's *yoke upon* them, are conſtantly wrought on, and converted, when the promulgate mercies, or promiſes of the Goſpel, and the Grace annext to it, are addreſt to them; whereas the very ſame, nay perhaps a greater degree of light and Grace, meeting with a proud, refractary, pleaſurable, or any way hypocritical, and deceitfull, heart, either is not at all heeded and received or takes no firm root in it.

Luk. 9. 62. Act. 13. 48. Jo. 7. 17. Mat. 13. 8. Luc. 8. 15. Mat. 13. 15. Jam. 4. 6. Mat. 11. 5. Mat. 19. 14. and ver. 3. Luc. 6. 22. 1 Cor. 1. 27.

The ground of effectualneſs of grace more probably deduced from probity of heart.

* Jer. 4. 3.

This probity no natural preparation, but of God's planting by preventing grace.

Sect. 63. And if now (the onely objection I can foreſee) it be demanded, whether this of *probity, humility*, &c. the *ſubactum ſolum, ſoil mellow'd, and prepared* for this effectual work of Grace, be not ſome natural quality of the man, for if ſo, then the efficacy of grace will be imputed to theſe *natural*, or *moral preparations*, which is groſly prejudicial to the grace of God, and to the owing of all our good to his ſupernatural operations, the anſwer is obvious and unqueſtionable, that this (I ſhall call it Evangelical) temper is far from being natural to any corrupt child of *Adam*, whereever 'tis met with, 'tis a ſpecial plant of God's planting, a work of his preparing, ſoftning, preventing grace, and as much imputable to the operation of his holy Spirit, as any effect of his ſubſequent or cooperating grace is, which I challenge to be the meaning of thoſe words of Chriſt, *Joh.* 6. 37. *All that my Father giveth me ſhall come to me*; where ſuch as theſe are firſt fitted by God, and then by him are ſaid to be *given to Chriſt*, works of his finger, his ſpirit, and then by the authour of them preſented to Chriſt, as the perſons rightly diſpoſed for his diſcipleſhip, and his kingdom in mens hearts, and this work of God's in fitting them, is there called his *drawing* of them to *Chriſt*, *ver.* 44. and as there it is ſaid that *none but ſuch can come to Chriſt*, ſo *v.* 37. *all ſuch ſhall come to him*, which is an evidence that the *coming*, wherein the effectualneſs of the grace conſiſts, is imputable to this temper wrought in them by God. And if ſtill it be demanded why this is not wrought in all Chriſtians hearts, I anſwer finally, that the onely reaſon the Scripture teaches us is, becauſe ſome *reſiſt* that *ſpirit* that is graciouſly given by God, and purpoſely deſigned to work it in them.

The one objection againſt this ſatisfied.

Sect. 64. And if it ſtill be ſuggeſted, that ſome are *naturally* more proud and refractary, and voluptuouſly diſpoſed than others, (an effect of their temper, owing oft to their immediate parents, who may tranſfuſe their depravations and corruptions immediately to their children, as well as *Adam* hath done to us all mediately) and ſo a greater degree of grace will be neceſſary to the humbling and mollifying them, and a lower, which might be ſufficient for meeker tempers, will be unſufficient for them, and ſo ſtill theſe are as *infallibly* excluded, and barred out, as if it were by a fatal decree paſſing them by in *Maſſa*, this will be alſo ſatisfied, by reſolving, that God in his wiſe diſpoſals and abundant mercies pro-

portioned according to mens wants, gives a greater degree of preventing Grace to ſuch as he ſees to be naturally in greateſt need of it, or elſe applies it ſo advantageouſly by congruous timing, as he knows is ſufficient even to them, to remove theſe natural obſtacles, but all this (to them, as to others) *reſiſtibly* ſtill, and ſo, as though it ſucceed ſometimes, yet is frequently reſiſted.

Sect. 65. By this means he that is proud and obſtinate, and continues, and holds out ſuch againſt all the ſoftning preparations of Heaven, (ſufficient to have wrought a kindlier temper in him) being ſo ill qualified for the *holy ſpirit of diſcipline*, is not converted, but hardened by the ſame or equal means of the word and grace, by which the humble is converted, and then repleniſhed with higher degrees; and when the Scripture is ſo favourable to this notion, ſaying expreſly that *God chuſes one*, and not the other, *gives more grace* to one, and from the other *takes away that which he hath, reſiſts the proud* (when they refuſe diſcipline) * *ſpeaks to them onely in parables, becauſe ſeeing they ſee not*, reſiſt and fruſtrate God's preventing graces, and infinite the like, why may not this rather be the Scripture-election, than that other which ſeems not to have any, at leaſt not ſo viſible grounds in it?

* Mat. 13. 13.

Sect. 66. Should this be but a *Conjecture* too, it is not the leſs fit for this place, where our diſcourſe hath been of ſuch, and the onely ſeaſonable inquiry is, either 1. which is of probables the moſt, or of improbables the leaſt ſuch, (and that I ſuppoſe is competently ſhew'd already) or 2. which may be moſt ſafe, and leaſt noxious, in caſe it ſhould fail of exact truth.

The ſafeneſs of this ſtating.

Sect. 67. On which occaſion I ſhall add but this, that the onely conſequence naturally ariſing from this Scheme is, that we make our *elections* after the *pattern* of *God*, chuſe *humility* and *probity*, and avert *pride* and *hypocriſie*, that before all things in the world, every man think himſelf highly concerned 1. not to reſiſt or fruſtrate God's preventing Graces, but chearfully to receive, cooperate, and improve them, to pray and labour, and attend and watch all opportunities of Grace and Providence, to work humility and probity in his heart, impatience of ſin, and *hungring and thirſting after righteouſneſs*, as the onely ſoil, wherein the Goſpel will ever thrive, to begin his diſcipleſhip with *repentance from dead works*, and not with aſſurance of his election and ſalvation, to ſet out early, and reſolutely, without procraſtinating, or * *looking back*, *Luke* 9. 62. and 2. if he hath overſlipt ſuch opportunities, to bewail and retrieve them betimes, leſt he be hardened by the deceitfulneſs of ſin. And 3. whatſoever good he ſhall ever advance to, by the ſtrength of God's ſanctifying and aſſiſting grace, to remember with the utmoſt gratitude, how nothing hath been imputable to himſelf in the whole work, but from the beginning to the end, all due to ſupernatural Grace, the foundation particularly (that which if it be the moſt imperfect, is yet the moſt neceſſary part of the building, and the ſure laying of which tends extremely to the ſtability of the whole) laid in God's preventions, cultivating our nature and fitting us with capacities of his higher donatives; And what can leſs prejudice, nay more tend to the glory of his grace, than this?

* Μελλήσεως καὶ ἀναβολῆς μετάνοια, *Tit. Boſtr.*

Compared with the other.

Sect. 68. Whereas the other Scheme, as it takes ſpecial care to attribute all the work of converſion to Grace, and withall not ſo to limit that communicative ſpring, as to leave any deſtitute of a ſufficient portion of it (in which reſpect I have nothing really to object againſt it, if it could but approve it ſelf by God's word to be the Truth) ſo when it bears not any ſuch impreſs of Divine Character upon it, it may not be amiſs to conſider, Whether he that is perſwaded that the ſufficient Grace is ſuch as may, and (as ſome ſet it) God ſees will never doe any man good, without the addition of his ſupereffluence, which he affords to few (and that if that come, it will infallibly doe the work, if it come not, he is ſo paſt by, as to be reprobated by God) may not have ſome temptations to deſpair on one ſide, and not doe his utmoſt to cooperate with that ſufficient Grace, which is allowed him, and ſo with the fool in *Eccleſiaſtes* * *fold his hands together* till he comes to *eat his own fleſh*, or elſe to preſume on the other ſide, and expect ſecurely till the coming of the congruous good time of God's choice, which ſhall give the effectualneſs to his Grace, and ſo be ſlothfull and periſh by that preſumption?

* Cap. 4. 5.

Sect. 69. Whether the Scheme, as it is ſet by learned men, (abſtracting now from the truth of it) be in any conſiderable degree liable to this danger, I leave thoſe, that are favourable to it, to conſider, preſuming that if it be, it will not be thought fit to be pitcht upon, as the moſt commodious without either the authority of Scripture, or ſome other preponderating advantages tendred by it, which to me are yet inviſible. And thus much may ſerve for the doctrine of God's Decrees, which if I miſtake not, leaves them in relation to man, in this poſture, (as far as the Scripture-light leads us.)

An Anacephalæoſis of the Doctrine of God's Decrees.

Of Election.

Sect. 70. 1. That God decreed to create man after his own image, a free and rational agent, to give him a Law of perfect unſinning obedience, and confer on him grace and faculties to perform it, and to reward that obedience with eternal bliſs, and proportionably to puniſh diſobedience.

2. That foreſeeing the wilfull fall of the firſt Man, with whom, and with all mankind, in him, this Covenant was made, and conſequent to that, the depravation of that image and that grace, (the image of Satan, corruption of the will, and all the faculties, taking the place of it) he decreed to give his Son to *ſeek and to ſave that which was loſt*, making in him, and ſealing in his bloud a new Covenant, conſiſting of a promiſe of pardon and ſufficient Grace, and requiring of all the condition of uniform ſincere obedience.

3. That he decreed to commiſſionate meſſengers to preach this Covenant to all mankind, promiſed to accompany the preaching of it to all hearts with his inward ſufficient grace, enabling men to perform it in ſuch a degree, as he in this ſecond Covenant had promiſed to accept of.

4. That the method which he hath decreed to uſe in diſpenſing this ſufficient Grace, is, 1. to prevent and prepare mens hearts by giving them the grace of humility, repentance and probity of heart, by awaking and convincing men of ſin, and giving them (in anſwer to their diligent prayers) grace ſufficient to produce this in their hearts, and then upon their making uſe of this Grace to the deſigned end, to add more powerfull aſſiſtences and excitations, enabling them both to will and to doe, and upon their conſtant right uſe of theſe, ſtill to advance them to an higher degree of ſanctification, and perſeverance, till at length he accompliſh and reward them with a crown of Glory.

Sect. 71.

Sect. 71. On the other ſide, to forſake them in juſtice, that obſtinately reſiſt and fruſtrate all theſe wiſe and gracious methods of his, and having moſt affectionately ſet *life and death* before them, and conjured them to *chuſe* one, and avoid the other; ſtill to leave unto them, as to free and rational Agents, a liberty to refuſe all his calls, to let his talents lie by them unprofitably; which if out of their own perverſe choices they continue to do, he decrees to puniſh the contumacy finally, by aſſigning them their own options, to take their talents from them, and *caſt them into outer darkneſs, where ſhall be weeping and wailing and gnaſhing of teeth.* Of Reprobation.

Sect. 72. How clearly every part of this Scheme is agreeable to the ſeveral parables, whereby Chriſt was pleaſed to adumbrate the Kingdom of Heaven, and innumerable other paſſages in the Goſpel, and the whole purport of the new Covenant, I leave to every man to conſider, and then to judge for himſelf, whether it be not ſafer and more Chriſtian to content our ſelves with this portion which Chriſt hath thought fit to reveal to us, than to permit our curioſities to deeper and more pragmatick ſearches, eſpecially if thoſe ſhall either directly, or but conſequentially undo, or but darken what is thus explicitely ſetled. The concluſion.

Sect. 73. I proceed now to your ſecond head of diſcourſe, (which alſo I ſuppoſe, is, by what hath been already conſidered, competently eſtabliſhed) concerning the *efficacy of Grace, &c.* where your Propoſition is thus ſet down. Of the efficacy of Grace.

Sect. 74. *That in the converſion of a ſinner, and the begetting of Faith in the heart of man, the Grace of God hath the main ſtroke, chiefeſt operation, yet ſo, that the free will of man doth in ſome ſort cooperate therewith (for no man is converted or believeth without his own conſent) all parties pretend to agree. The point of difference is, how to ſtate the manner and degree of the cooperation, as well of the one as of the other, ſo as neither the Glory of God's Grace be eclipſed, nor the freedom of man's will deſtroyed. In which difficult point,* you ſay, *you think it fitter to acquieſce in thoſe aforeſaid acknowledged truths, in which both ſides agree, than to hold cloſe to either opinion.*]

Sect. 75. In this propoſition, it being by you in the Concluſion moſt undeniably and Chriſtianly reſolved, that the one care ought to be, that *neither the glory of God's Grace be eclipſed, nor the freedom of man's will deſtroyed,* It would not be amiſs a little to reflect on the former part, and demand whether your expreſſion were not a little too cautious, in ſaying, *the grace of God hath the main ſtroke and chiefeſt operation*] did I not diſcern the ground of that caution, becauſe you were to expreſs that whereunto *all parties* muſt be ſuppoſed to *conſent.* This being abundantly ſufficient to account for your caution, I ſhall not doubt of your concurrence, with me, that it may with truth be ſaid, and I ſuppoſe alſo by the agreement, if not of all Chriſtians, yet of both parties in this debate, particularly of the Remonſtrants, that the grace of God is in lapſed man the *one ſole principle of ſpiritual life, Converſion, Regeneration, Repentance, Faith and all other Evangelical vertues*, and that all that can juſtly be attributed to our will in any of theſe, is the obeying the motions, and making uſe of the powers, which are thus beſtowed upon us, by that ſupernatural principle; To *work* and *work out our own ſalvation*, upon the ſtrength of God's *giving us to will and to doe*; by [*giving us to will and to doe*] meaning his giving us *power* to each, as Δύναι λαὸν τῷ κυρίῳ, *Luke* 1. is *giving* us power to *ſerve him in holineſs and righteouſneſs all the days of our lives*, every initial and more perfect act of holineſs, eſpecially perſevering in it all our days, being wholly imputable to that power, which is given by God's Spirit. For indeed when it is conſidered, what the ſtate of our corrupt Will is, being naturally averted from God, and ſtrongly inclined to evil, it ſeems to me ſcarce proper to call this in relation to ſupernatural vertues, a *free will*, till God by his preventing Grace hath in ſome degree manumitted it, till Chriſt hath made it free; Being then what it is, *i. e.* in ſome degree emancipated by God's Grace, and by Grace onely, (this act of Chriſt's love, and Grace being reached out to enemies, to men in their corrupt ſtate of averſion and oppoſition to God) the will is then enabled (ſtill by the ſame principle of Grace) to *chuſe life*, when it is propoſed, and the ways and means to it, and though it be left free to act or not to act, to chuſe or not to chuſe, yet when it doth act and chuſe life, it doth it no otherwiſe (to my underſtanding) than the body doth perform all the actions of life, merely by the ſtrength of the ſoul, and that continual animation it hath, it receives from it; which makes the parallel complete, and gave ground to the expreſſion and compariſon betwixt giving of natural life, and regeneration. The power of Grace in converſion, &c. What the freedom of will now is.

Sect. 76. What freedom the Will naturally (under this corrupt ſtate) hath to other things, of all ſorts, I do not now conſider any farther, than that it is fully furniſhed with ability to ſin, and ſo to refuſe and contemn, and to receive in vain the Grace of God, and Grace it ſelf doth not deprive it of that part of its corrupt patrimony: As for an uniform conſtant choice of thoſe things that belong to our peace and ſpiritual end, for the beginning of that, and every ſtep of motion through, and perſeverance in it, It's freedom, and ſtrength, and every degree of life, or action, is wholly and entirely from Grace, and then he that without him *can doe nothing, can doe all things through Chriſt that ſtrengthens him.* And ſo the onely remaining queſtion is (which to me, I confeſs, is a poſing one) What exception can poſſibly be ſtarted againſt this ſtating, and conſequently what farther doubt there can be in this matter. Ability to ſin.

Sect. 77. I have of my ſelf by my natural generation, (but this is alſo from God) power for natural, nay ſinfull actings, for this I need no farther principle, and the ſupervenience of a ſupernatural takes it not from me; Our experience aſſures us, what the Scripture ſo oft mentions, that we often *reſiſt the Holy Ghoſt*, which we could not do, if at leaſt it were not tendered to us: But for all degrees of good, from the firſt good motion toward converſion, to the enſtating us in glory, it is wholly received from the Spirit of God, and the glory of it cannot in any degree, without the utmoſt ſacrilege, be arrogated or aſſumed to our ſelves, as the work of our free will; and ſeeing it is one act of ſuperabundant grace to enable us to doe any thing, and another to reward us for doing it in ſo imperfect a manner, (and with ſuch mixtures of manifold pollutions) and a third to exerciſe us in, and reward us for thoſe things, which are ſo agreeable and gratefull to our reaſonable nature, *Commandments* far from *grievous*, a *gracious yoke*, as well as a *light burthen*, *Not unto us, O Lord, not unto us, but to thy Name, give we the praiſe. Praiſe the Lord, O my ſoul, and all that is within me, praiſe his holy Name.* All good due to Grace.

Sect. 78. What you add on this theme, is by way of reflexion, on the inconvenient opinions of the oppoſite parties in this matter.

Predetermination and irreſiſtibility.

I. *That on the Calviniſts part theſe two things,* viz. *the phyſical predetermination, and (which muſt neceſſarily follow thereupon) the Irreſiſtibility of the work of Grace, ſeem to you to be ſo inconſiſtent with the natural liberty of the will, and ſo impoſſible to be reconciled therewith, that you cannot yet by any means fully aſſent thereto*] The ſtyle wherein this concludes [*cannot yet fully*] ſignifies to me, that you have, with great impartiality, (if not with favour and prepoſſeſſion of kindneſs to the Antiremonſtrant ſide) endeavoured your utmoſt

How unreconcileable with Chriſtian principles.

to reconcile theſe two Doctrines of *Predetermination and Irreſiſtibility*, with the common notions of Morality and Chriſtianity, and you cannot find any means to doe it; and I fully conſent to you in it, and cannot but add, that the very being of all future *judgment*, and ſo of Heaven and Hell, conſidered as rewards of what is here *done in our bodies, whether good or bad*, nay the whole œconomy of the Goſpel, of *giving*, and *giving more*, and withholding and withdrawing Grace, and the difference betwixt the Grace of *Converſion* and *Perſeverance*, and the force of exhortations, promiſes, threats, commands (and what not?) depends immediately and unavoidably on the truth of the Catholick Doctrine of all ages, as in theſe points of Predetermination and Irreſiſtibility, it ſtands in oppoſition to the Calviniſts. The ſhewing this diffuſedly, according to the merit of the matter, through the ſeveral ſteps, were the work of a volume, of which I ſhall hope there can be no need, after ſo many have been written on the ſubject.

Sect. 79. Your next reflexion is on the Arminians, of whom you ſay,

Of Arminians attributing too little to Grace.

On the other ſide, me thinks, the Arminians aſcribe leſs to the Grace of God, and more to the Free-will of man, than they ought, in this, That according to their Doctrine, why of two perſons (as Peter *and* Judas*) ſuppoſed to have all outward means of converſion equally applied, yet one ſhould be effectually converted, the other not, the diſcriminating power is by them placed in the will of man, which* (you ſay) *you ſhould rather aſcribe to the work of Grace*] If this be the right ſtating of the caſe between the Arminians and their oppoſites, I am then without conſulting the Authours, aſſured by you that I am no Arminian, for I deem it impoſſible (I ſay not for any man, not knowing what miracles the magick of ſome mens paſſions may enable them to work, but) for you that have written what I have now ſet down from you, to imagine you aſcribe more to the Grace of God, and leſs to the will of man, than I have thought my ſelf obliged to doe, making it my challenge and intereſt, and requiring it to be granted me (and not my conceſſion onely) that all that any man is enabled to doe, is by Chriſt *ſtrengthening* him.

Sect. 80. But not to queſtion what others doe, or to accuſe or apologize for any, let us conſider the caſe you ſet, and allow the truth to be judged of, in this whole queſtion, by what this particular caſe ſhall exact.

Of Judas whether he were not converted.

Sect. 81. But 1. in the ſetting of it, I cannot but mark two things, 1. That the perſons made uſe of to ſet the caſe in, are *Judas* and *Peter*. 2. That to the word [*converted*] is prefixed [*effectually.*] This would make it probable that you think a man may be converted, and yet not *effectually converted*, or however that *Judas* was not effectually converted. That *Judas* was converted, and, as far as concerned the preſent ſtate, abſtracted from perſeverance, effectually converted, I offer but this one teſtimo-

* John 17. 12.

ny, the words of Chriſt to his Father, * [*Of thoſe whom thou gaveſt me I have loſt none, ſave onely the ſon of perdition*] That whoſoever is by the Father *given to Chriſt*, is converted, and that effectually, is concluded from Chriſt's univerſal propoſition, *All that my Father giveth me, ſhall come to me, John.* 6. 37. and here it is expreſly ſaid that *Judas* (though by his apoſtaſie now become the *ſon of perdition*) was by *God given to Chriſt*, and *therefore he came to Chriſt*, i. e. was converted, which alſo his being *loſt*, his very *Apoſtaſie* teſtifies, for how could he Apoſtatize from Chriſt, that was never come to him? From hence it ſeems to me neceſſary either to interpret your ſpeech of final perſeverance, as if none were *effectually converted*, but ſuch who perſevere, (which as it belongs to another queſtion, that of perſeverance, to which you after proceed, and not to this of reconciling *irreſiſtibility* and *free will*, ſo it would ſeem to ſtate it otherwiſe, than I perceive you afterwards doe) or, to avoid that, to underſtand no more by *Judas* and *Peter* than any other two names, ſuppoſe *Robert* and *Richard*, *John at Noke and John at Style*, (as you ſince tell me your meaning was) the one converted effectually, *i. e.* really, the other not, when both are ſuppoſed to have the ſame outward means of converſion equally applied to them.

Whence Diſcrimination comes.

Sect. 82. Now to the queſtion thus ſet of any two, and ſuppoſing what hath been granted between you and me, that the outward means are accompanied to both with a ſufficient meaſure of inward Grace, My anſwer you diſcern already, that the Diſcrimination comes immediately from one man's reſiſting ſufficient Grace, which the other doth not reſiſt, but makes uſe of: In this ſhould I add no more, there could be no difficulty, becauſe as it is from corruption, and liberty to doe evil, (that meeting with the reſiſtibility of this ſufficient grace) that one reſiſts it, ſo it is wholly from the work of grace upon an obedient heart, that the other is converted; And ſo this ſtating aſcribes all the good to

For man's liberty to reſiſt.

the work of grace, *i. e.* to that power, which by ſupernatural grace is given him, and all the ill to man and his liberty, or ability to reſiſt.

From God's Preventions.

Sect. 83. But from what hath been ſaid, there is yet more to be added, *viz.* that the obedience of the one to the call of grace, when the other, ſuppoſed to have ſufficient, if not an equal meaſure, obeys not, may reaſonably be imputed to the humble, malleable, melting temper, (which the other wanted) and that again owing to the preventing graces of God, and not to the natural probity, or free-will of Man, whereas the other, having reſiſted thoſe preparing graces, or not made uſe of them, lieth under ſome degree of obduration, pride, ſloth, voluptuouſneſs, *&c.* and that makes the diſcrimination on his

Nothing imputed to man but power of reſiſting.

ſide, *i. e.* renders him unqualified and uncapable to be wrought on by ſufficient grace, and ſo ſtill, if it be attentively weighed, this attributes nothing to free-will, conſidered by it ſelf, but the power of reſiſting and fruſtrating God's methods (which I ſhould think, they that are ſuch aſſertours of the corruption of our nature, ſhould make no difficulty to yield him, but that they alſo aſſert irreſiſtibility of

The whole work of converſion to Grace.

grace, and that is not reconcileable with it) yielding the glory of all the work of converſion, and all the firſt preparations to it, to his ſole grace, by which the will is firſt ſet free, then fitted and cultivated, and then the ſeed of eternal life ſucceſsfully ſowed in it.

Sect. 84.

Sect. 84. If the Remonſtrants yield not this, you ſee my profeſſion of diſſent from them; if they do, as for ought I ever heard or read (which indeed hath been but little in their works, that I might reſerve my ſelf to judge of theſe things, without prepoſſeſſion) they doubt not to doe, you ſee you have had them miſ-repreſented to you. But this, either way, is extrinſecal and unconcernant to the merit of the cauſe, which is not to be defended or patronized by names (but arguments) much leſs to be prejudged or blaſted by them.

Sect. 85. You now add, as a reaſon to inforce your laſt propoſition, *That although the Grace of God work not by any phyſical determination of the will, but by way of moral ſuaſion onely, and therefore in what degree ſoever ſuppoſed, muſt needs be granted* ex natura rei *poſſible to be reſiſted, yet God by his infinite wiſedom can ſo ſweetly order and attemper the outward means in ſuch a congruous manner, and make ſuch gracious inward applications and inſinuations, by the ſecret imperceptible operation of his holy Spirit, into the hearts of his choſen, as that* de facto *the will ſhall not finally reſiſt. That* (you ſay) *of the ſon of* Syrach, Fortiter & Suaviter, *is an excellent Motto, and fit to be affixed, as to all the ways of God's Providence in general, ſo to this of the effectual working of his Grace in particular.*] Of the congruous manner, &c. making Grace effectual.

Sect. 86. This for the ſubſtance falls in with the laſt of thoſe which you ſo cautiouſly ſet down for mere conjectures, ſeeming to you not improbable. And ſo here you continue to propoſe it, 1. as that, *which God can doe,* (and thus no Chriſtian can doubt of it) 2. by the one teſtimony which you tender for the proof of it, the words of *Eccleſiaſticus* [*ſtrongly but ſweetly*;] which though it be there moſt probably interpreted of the works of God's Providence, not particularly of his Grace, ſo if it were, moſt fully expreſſes their thoughts, who building on the Promiſe of ſufficient Grace, and the way of the working of that by moral ſuaſion, will apply the *fortiter* to the ſufficiency, and the *ſuaviter* to the ſuaſion, and yet reſolve (what frequent experience tells us) that thoſe that are thus wrought on, *ſtrongly* and *ſweetly* too, and as *ſtrongly* and *ſweetly* (if not ſometimes more ſo) as they that are converted by it, are yet very (very) many times, not converted. This a member of the former Conjecture. *Fortiter & ſuaviter.*

Sect. 87. Here therefore the point lies, not whether God *can* thus effectually work upon all that he tenders ſufficient grace unto, nor again, whether ſometimes (and whenſoever he pleaſeth) he doth thus work, (for as this is the moſt that you demand, ſo this is moſt evident, and readily granted) but 1. Whether all are effectually converted and perſevere, and ſo are finally ſaved, on whom God doth work thus ſweetly and powerfully, attempering the outward and inward means, applications and inſinuations, by the ſecret imperceptible operations of his Spirit, and that in a congruous manner (I add time alſo) 2. Whether this doing thus is ſuch an act of his Election, as that all to whom this is not done, ſhall be ſaid in Scripture to be left, paſt by, and reprobated. What is the onely queſtion here.

Sect. 88. If thus it is, (not onely can be) and if it may be convincingly teſtified by any text of Scripture, that this really is the *Scripture Election*, it ſhall be moſt willingly and gladly yielded to: But till this be done, 1. that other Scheme, which I ſo lately ſet down, may be allowed to maintain its competition againſt this, and 2. it is to be remembred from the premiſſes, that the glory of God's grace in every one's converſion is abundantly taken care of, and ſecured, without the aſſiſtence of this: 3. that the ground of the Antiremonſtrants exception to the Arminian occurs in this way of ſtating too, for ſince 'tis here affirmed, that grace even thus applied is poſſible to be reſiſted, why may not the accepting this higher degree be as imputable to man's will, as of the other barely ſufficient grace the objecter ſuppoſes it to be?

Sect. 89. Laſtly, the ſaying of our Saviour, *Matth.* 11. 21. is of no ſmall moment in the caſe, and yields a ſubſtantial prejudice to this way. For 1. it is expreſly affirmed, *ver.* 20. of thoſe Cities wherein were *wrought* αἱ πλείσται δυνάμεις αὐτοῦ *his moſt abundant powers* or *miracles*, that ὐ μετενόησαν *they repented not*: His miracles, I ſuppoſe, had his grace annexed to them, and it is hard to believe that where his moſt numerous miracles were afforded, they ſhould all want the advantage of the *congruous* timings to give them their due weight of efficacy: However there is no pretence of believing it here, where it is ſaid, Chriſt ἤρξατο ὀνειδίζειν *began to reproach and upbraid them*, that the miracles had been ſo ſucceſsleſs among them, which he could with no propriety doe, if any circumſtance needfull to their efficacy had been wanting to them: and *ver.* 22. the more intolerable meaſure of damnation, which is denounced againſt them, puts this beyond queſtion, that theſe wanted not the more *ſuperabundant* advantages of Grace. Secondly, it is alſo as explicitly pronounced by Chriſt, that thoſe miracles and that grace which were not effectual to the converſion of thoſe Jewiſh Cities, *Chorazin* and *Bethſaida*, would have been ſucceſsfull to the converſion of others, and made them Proſelytes and Penitents of the ſevereſt kind, *in ſackcloth and aſhes*. Whereupon I demand, Had thoſe means, thoſe *miracles* (the inſtruments and vehicles of Grace, that were then uſed to *Chorazin* and *Bethſaida*) the timings and other advantageous circumſtances, which the opinion, now under conſideration, pretends to be the infallible means of the ſalvation of the Elect, or had they not? If they had, then it ſeems theſe may fail of converting, and ſo have not that ſpecial *efficacy*, which is pretended, it being expreſly affirmed, that here they ſucceeded not to converſion. But if they had not the timings, *&c.* then it remains as undeniable, as the affirmation of Chriſt can render it, that thoſe means, that Grace, which hath not thoſe advantageous circumſtances, may be, nay, if granted to *Tyre and Sydon*, heathen Cities, would actually have been ſucceſsfull to them. And what can be more effectual to the prejudice of a conjecture, than this double force of the words of Chriſt confronted expreſly to both branches of it? And then I hope I may with modeſty conclude, that there remains no viſible advantage of this way, to recommend it, in caſe the Scripture be not found to own, and more than favour it in ſome other paſſages. *Matth.* 11. 21. a ſpecial prejudice to the conjecture.

Sect. 90. Your laſt Propoſition on this Theme is, that *Sith the Conſiſtence of Grace and Free-will is a Myſtery ſo tranſcending our weak underſtandings, that it hath for many years exerciſed and puzzled the wits of the acuteſt Schoolmen to find it out, inſomuch as hundreds of volumes have been written and daily are* de concurſu Gratiæ & liberi arbitrii, *and yet no accord hath hitherto followed*, you ſay, *you have ever held, and ſtill do hold it the more pious and ſafe way, to place the Grace of God in the throne, where we think it ſhould ſtand, and ſo to leave the will of man to ſhift for the maintenance of its own freedom, as well as it can, than to eſtabliſh the power and liberty*

liberty of free will at the height, and then to be at a loſs how to maintain the power and efficacy of God's Grace.]

Sect. 91. But if what hath been clearly laid down, for the attributing all our ſpiritual good to the work of Grace, and aſſuming nothing of this kind to the innate power of free will, but a liberty to reſiſt Grace, the reſt being humbly acknowledged to be due to a ſupernaturally conferred freedom, or emancipation, whereby we are enabled to make uſe of Grace, and by the power thereof to cooperate with it, Then 1. the *conſiſtence of grace and free will* in this ſenſe, is no ſuch tranſcending Myſtery, and I think there is no text in Scripture that ſounds any thing towards the making it ſo. 2. 'Tis evident, that the difficulties that have exerciſed the *Schools* in this matter ariſe from their endeavouring to ſtate it otherwiſe, ſome by maintaining *Predetermination and Irreſiſtibility*, which all the powers of nature cannot reconcile with *Man's free will ad oppoſitum*; And ſome few that go another milder way, are yet afraid of departing too far from the former, and inſtead of *irreſiſtibility* ſubſtitute *efficacy*, as that ſignifies *infallibility* of the event to the Elect, and ſo find difficulty to extricate themſelves; whereas *Grace ſufficient*, but *reſiſtible*, given together with the word to all, to whom Chriſt is revealed, hath 1. it ſelf nothing of difficulty in the conception, and 2. being underſtood, utterly removes all farther difficulty in this matter. For hereby we *place the Grace of God in the throne*, to rule and reign in the whole work of converſion, perſeverance and ſalvation, (and what can be more demanded, that we have not aſſerted? certainly nothing by you, who in ſetting down the conſent of all parties, expreſt it by no more than its having the main ſtroke and chiefeſt operation) and need not put the *will of man to ſhift for the maintenance of its own freedom*, as long as we can do it with much more ſafety and temper, than either by ſetting it at the height with the *Pelagians*, or endangering to convert it into a mere trunk, or leaving men to the duct of their own humours, either to advance it above its due, and grow inſolent, or depreſs it below what is meet, and ſo give up themſelves to ſloth, and indifferency.

Conſiſtence of Grace and free will.

The difficulties in the Schoolmens way whence.

How eaſily ſuperſeded.

Sect. 92. On the third or laſt head concerning *Grace* and *Perſeverance*, your propoſitions are three, the two former I ſhall ſet down together, becauſe the firſt is but a preparative to, or one way of proof of the ſecond, which onely concerns our purpoſe.

Of falling from Grace.

I. *That Faith and all holy Graces inherent in us, Love, Patience and Humility,* &c. *are the gifts of God wrought in us by his Grace and holy Spirit, none will deny, But that they are wrought in us by infuſion and* in inſtanti *(as Philoſophers teach forms to be introduced into the matter by natural generation* in inſtanti,) *at leaſt that they are always or ordinarily ſo infuſed, you ſee no neceſſity of believing, or why it may not be ſaid of theſe χαρίσματα (ſpiritual Graces) notwithſtanding they be acknowledged the gifts of God, as well as of thoſe χαρίσματα (ſpiritual gifts, as we tranſlate them) which are certainly the gifts of God as well as the other, and ſo acknowledged; that they are (after the manner of other habits) ordinarily acquirable by induſtry and frequented acts, and the bleſſing of God upon our prayers and endeavours. To what purpoſe elſe were it for Miniſters in their Sermons uſually to preſs motives to ſtir up men to labour to get Faith, Love,* &c. *and to propoſe means for their better direction how to get them?*

II. *Whence* (you ſay) *it ſeemeth to you farther probable, that Faith and all other inherent Graces, as they may be with God's bleſſing attain'd, may be alſo loſt again by ſloth, negligence and carnal ſecurity, and therefore you cannot but doubt of the truth of that aſſertion which the Contraremonſtrants do yet aver with great confidence, That Faith once had, cannot be loſt, and other the like. The diſtinction that they uſe, as a ſalvo in this Queſtion, of a true and temporary Faith, ſignifieth* (ſay you) *little or nothing, for it at once both beggeth and yieldeth the whole Queſtion: It* 1. *beggeth the Queſtion, when it denieth that Faith that may be loſt, to be true Faith; and withall* 2. *yieldeth the Queſtion, when it granteth a temporary Faith, which term is capable of no other conſtruction, than of ſuch a Faith, as being once had is afterwards loſt. It is one of the Articles of our Church, that after we have received the holy Ghoſt, we may depart from Grace given.*]

Our Article.

Sect. 93. In theſe two there is nothing for me to queſtion, and as little to add to them, unleſs I annex, what I ſuppoſe you did not think needfull, the expreſs conſent of Scriptures and Fathers, whereon our Churches Article muſt be reſolved to have been founded. In the old Teſtament the examples of the *Angels* in Heaven, of *Adam* in Paradiſe, and in a remarkable manner of two to whom God had given eminent teſtimony, 1. *David*, in the matter of *Uriah*, an odious murther added to adultery, and continued in impenitently, till after the birth of the child, the blemiſh whereof ſtill ſticks to him, and remains upon record, as an allay to all his excellencies, now that he is in heaven. 2. *Solomon*, whoſe heart was by his multitude of wives and concubines taken off from God, and debauched to Idols, no way being left us to diſcern whether ever he returned or no, unleſs his *Eccleſiaſtes* be a declaration and fruit of his Repentance. And as theſe and many other examples, even of that whole Old-Teſtament-Church, the *Jews*, make this evident, ſo the words of *Ezekiel* are expreſs both for *total and final falling away. If the righteous turn from his righteouſneſs, in his unrighteouſneſs ſhall he die.*

Grounds of it in Scripture.

In the Old Teſtament.

Ch. 3. 20. & 18. 24.

Sect. 94. The New alſo is parallel, in the example of *Peter*, thrice, with time of deliberation between, and after expreſs warning from Chriſt, and his reſolute promiſe to the contrary, denying and abjuring of Chriſt, whoſe return from this fall with bitter tears, is called by Chriſt *Converſion*, and the ſin upbraided to him thrice after his reſurrection, *Simon, ſon of Jonas, loveſt thou me more than theſe?* in reference to his confident undertaking, *though all men ſhould deny thee, or be offended, yet will not I.* And if the argument from Chriſt's expreſs words, formerly produced, be of force, then is *Judas* (one of thoſe that was *by God given to Chriſt, and came unto,* and *believed* on *him)* an example of the blackeſt ſort, teſtifying to this ſad truth, That a Believer and Diſciple of Chriſt may betray him to his Crucifixion, and die in deſperation.

In the New.

Luke 22. 32.

John 21. 25.

Mark 14. 29, 31.

John 17. 12. & 6. 37.

Sect. 95. To theſe two inſtances, the former greatly aggravated with circumſtances, the latter *final*, and of the higheſt degree imaginable, It is not needfull to add more, elſe it is obvious to encreaſe the catalogue with thoſe that were polluted by the Gnoſticks, by name, *Hymenæus* and *Alexander*, who *putting away a good conſcience, concerning Faith made ſhipwreck*, and again *Hymenæus* and *Philetus*, who fell off ſo far, as to the *denial* of any future *Reſurrection*, of whom the Apoſtle there ſpeaking, ſaith, *If God peradventure will give them repentance, and they may recover themſelves out of the ſnare of the Devil*] looking on their eſtate as that of lapſed believers, and though not utterly hopeleſs, yet extremely dangerous, And this exemplified in whole Churches, *Apoc.* 2. and 3. which are therefore threatned preſent deſtruction, if they do not ſpeedily return.

1 Tim. 1. 20.

2 Tim. 2. 17.

Sect. 96.

Sect. 96. To which purpoſe the Texts in the ſixth and tenth to the *Hebrews* are unanſwerable; In the ſixth, that it is *impoſſible*, i. e. extremely difficult, for thoſe that were *once enlightned*, &c. *if they fall away, to renew them again unto repentance*, adding the ſimilitude of the *reprobate* earth, *whoſe end is to be burned.* From which how diſtant is the Doctrine of thoſe, that either imagine it impoſſible for ſuch to *fall away totally*, or if they are fallen away, not to be *renewed again to repentance?* In the *tenth* alſo, 'twere vain to make ſo ſevere interminations againſt thoſe who *ſin wilfully after receiving the knowledge of the truth*, (as we reade, *ver.* 26.) if there were no poſſibility of ſo ſinning, but eſpecially the 38 verſe is remarkable, *The juſt ſhall live by faith,* ὑ ἐὰν ὑποστείληται, *And if he* (the juſt) *ſhall draw back, my ſoul hath no pleaſure in him*] explicating verſe 39. what *drawing back* he ſpeaks of, even *drawing back unto perdition*, and that is final, as well as total, and both, it ſeems, very poſſible, as every where appears by the exhortations to *him that thinketh he ſtandeth, to take heed leſt he fall*, when if he do, *It had been better never to have known the way of righteouſneſs, than after he hath known it, to turn from the holy Commandment*, and this in ſuch a degree, as is expreſt by *returning to the vomit*, and *wallowing in the mire*, the acts and habits of the foulest ſins, in forſaking of which their converſion conſiſted. 1 Cor. 10. 12. 2 Pet. 2. 21.

Sect. 97. The Teſtimonies of the Fathers are too long to be ſet down, and indeed unneceſſary to the confirmation of that, to which the Scripture hath teſtified ſo plentifully, eſpecially ſince it is not (it cannot be) denied by the contrary-minded, that S. *Auguſtine*, the onely fautor of their cauſe in the point of Decrees, and effectual Grace, granteth poſſibility of falling, both totally and finally, from a juſtified eſtate, and uſeth it as a means to prove his *abſolute Decrees.* S. *Auguſtine.*

I now proceed to your third and laſt Propoſition in theſe words,

Sect. 98. *Yet I believe we may ſecurely admit the doctrine of perſeverance of God's elect, and the certainty thereof, ſo as it be underſtood,* 1. *Of their final perſeverance onely, leaving room for great (perhaps total) interruptions and interciſions in the mean time.* 2. *Of the certainty of the thing*, (certitudo objecti,) *in regard of the knowledge, and purpoſe of God, but, not of any undoubted aſſurance, that the elect themſelves have thereof*, (certitudo ſubjecti, *as we uſe to diſtinguiſh them,) there being a great deal of difference between theſe two Propoſitions, It is certain that the elect ſhall not fall away finally, and, The elect are certain that they ſhall not fall away finally.*] Of perſeverance of the elect.

Sect. 99. In this Propoſition I can fully yield my concurrence, if by rendring my reaſons for my conſent, I may be allowed to expreſs what I mean by it. This I ſhall doe through the ſeveral branches of it.

1. I believe not onely that ſecurely we may, but that of neceſſity (and under the pain of contradiction *in adjecto,)* we muſt admit the Doctrine of *Perſeverance of God's Elect*, and the *certainty*, (moſt unqueſtionable certainty) thereof, God's Election of any perſon to the reward of the Covenant, being undoubtedly founded in the *perſeverance* of that perſon in the faith, this perſeverance being the expreſs condition of the Covenant, *He that endureth to the end, the ſame ſhall be ſaved*, he and none but he, but *if he draw back, God's ſoul hath no pleaſure in him.* Matth. 24. 30. Heb. 10. 30.

Sect. 100. Which that it is nothing available toward concluding that they which can fall totally from their juſtified eſtate, may not yet fall finally alſo, I infer to be your ſenſe from your great diſlike of the *Calviniſts Salvo*, taken from the *diſtinction of a true and temporary faith*, which aſſures me, you take that faith for *true*, which yet is but *temporary*, than which nothing is more contrary to the eſtabliſhing the perſeverance of all the faithfull, unleſs there be ſome promiſe that all temporaries ſhall ſo recover again before their death, as finally to perſevere, (which as I think, 'twill not be pretended, ſo if it be, they are no longer temporaries,) or unleſs it ceaſe to be in their power to continue in their ſins, into which they are fallen, which ſure it cannot, unleſs the grace of *perſeverance* be *irreſiſtible*, which if it were, there is no reaſon, why that of *converſion*, to all that are converted, ſhould not be irreſiſtible alſo. Temporary faith may be true.

Sect. 101. 2. For their great, (perhaps total) interruptions and interciſions in the mean time, I can no way doubt, but thoſe are ſubject to them, who yet upon God's foreſight of their return, and perſevering conſtancy at length, are elected to ſalvation. It is certain, which the *Article* of our Church ſaith, that as they *which have received the holy Ghoſt may depart from grace given and fall away*, ſo by the *ſame grace of God they may return again*, and then returning they may no doubt perſevere, and then 'tis certain they are elected to ſalvation, the mercy and pardon in Chriſt extending not onely to the ſins of an unregenerate ſtate, and the infirmities and frailties of the regenerate; but alſo to all the wilfull ſins and falls of thoſe that do timely return again by repentance, as *David* and *Peter* did (but *Judas* certainly, *Solomon* poſſibly did not,) and then continue ſtedfaſt unto the end. And ſo 'tis onely the final perſeverance that is required indiſpenſably of the elect, which is reconcileable with their great, perhaps total interciſions. The elect ſubject to interciſions.

Sect. 102. But 'tis not amiſs here to advert, that this doth no more ſuppoſe or include the reconciliation or favour of God, to thoſe that have been once regenerate, when they are fallen into groſs ſins, than to the unregenerate remaining in the ſame or greater ſins, it being as poſſible in reſpect of us, (perhaps more probable in reſpect of God,) that the unregenerate may convert and perſevere, (and then they are approved to be the elect,) as that they that were once regenerate, but now fallen, may return again. It is as certain from before *Paul's* birth, and from all eternity, that he was elected, as that *David* or *Peter* was, and then either his blaſphemous perſecuting the name of Chriſt muſt have been at the time when he was guilty of that, reconcileable with God's favour, *viz.* before his converſion (and then for the gaining of God's favour what needed his converſion?) or elſe *Peter's* denying and abjuring of Chriſt, *David's* adultery and murther muſt not be reconcileable, notwithſtanding their ſuppoſed *election.* For as to the ſonſhip of *their* former life, that will no more excuſe their contrary waſting ſins, than the future ſonſhip of the other, nay it will ſet the advantage on the other ſide, the unconverted *Saul obtains mercy, becauſe he did it ignorantly, in unbelief*, Whilſt their ſins have the aggravation of being ſins againſt Grace, and *forſaking* and *departing* from God, which reſpect makes the ſtate of Apoſtates as the moſt unexcuſable, ſo the moſt deſperately dangerous ſtate. The falls of thoſe that have been once regenerate no more reconcileable with God's favour than of the unregenerate. Nay the advantage is on the unregenerates part, 1 Tim. 1. 13.

Sect. 103. 3. That there is a *Certitudo objecti* to all the *elect*, cannot be doubted, for if they be elected to ſalvation, they will finally perſevere, if they perſevere not, they were not elected. Again this certainty of the object, is a certainty in regard of the knowledge and purpoſe of God. 1. Of his knowledge Certainty of the object.

that

that either they will not fall, or if they do, that they will riſe again, and then finally perſevere. 2. Of his purpoſe or decree of election, that every ſuch, finally perſevering, though formerly lapſed Chriſtian, ſhall be ſaved.

Certainty of the ſubject.

Sect. 104. 4. For the *Certitudo ſubjecti*; as I conſent to you fully in diſclaiming any neceſſity of that, ſo I ſuppoſe it is wholly extrinſecal to this ſubject, devolving to this other queſtion, not whether every one that is elect, be ſure he ſhall not fall away, but whether every believer be or ought to be ſure of his election? Of which if he were ſure, I could not reſiſt his being obliged to believe himſelf certain of his final *Perſeverance*; Election and final falling being incompetible.

Sect. 105. Having given you this interpretation of my ſenſe, and ſo conſent to each branch of your Propoſition, I have no more to add, but that if you mean it in a farther ſenſe, proportionable to your former conjecture on the head of decrees, or Biſhop *Overal*'s opinion, I ſhall no otherwiſe debate or queſtion it, than I did that, and ſo the fate of this and that are folded up the one in the other, and if the Scripture ſhall be found favourable to the one, it ſhall be yielded, and then there will be no controverſie of the other.

The great need of caution in handling this ſubject of Perſeverance.

Sect. 106. Onely I deſire to add, that it will deſerve our ſpecial care and warineſs, ſo to deliver our thoughts in this matter, that we leave no man any ground of hope, that in caſe he depart from his duty, and ſo fall from Grace, or into any wilfull act or habit of ſin, he ſhall yet be ſo preſerved, whether by God's Grace, or by his power, and providence, that he ſhall not finally die without repentance: for as there is no promiſe of God to found that hope, ſo in time of temptation to any pleaſurable, tranſporting ſin, *&c.* it will be in danger to betray and ruine him, that hath a good opinion of himſelf, eſpecially if he hath been taught, that faith is a *full aſſurance* of his *Election*.

Of God's favour to rebellious children.

Sect. 107. The ſame I ſay of *Grace*, as it ſignifies the paternal favour of God to his elect children, which is thought by ſome to be onely *clouded*, and, as to their ſenſe and preſent experience and comfort, darkned by their moſt wilfull ſins, ſo as God may be highly diſpleaſed with them, as *David* with his ſon *Abſalom*, and yet continue his paternal Love and favour to them, as *David* did his to that ungracious ſon, in the height of his Rebellion.

Sect. 108. 'Tis poſſible this Example of *David* may have ſome Rhetorical Energy in it, to perſwade and deceive ſome. If it have, then 1. I may not unfitly ask this queſtion, whether they think God had then that kindneſs to *Abſalom* that *David* had? If he had not, how can it be drawn into example to God? If he had, how then can it agree with it, to cut him off in the midſt of his Rebellion, which 'tis manifeſt *David* would not have done. But omitting that, I anſwer 2. that 'tis viſible, that this in *David* was paſſionate indulgence, ſuch as men (as *Joab* tells him) diſliked, and to this kind of humane paſſionate, I oppoſe that other kind of divine diſpaſſionate love, producing in God bowels of pity, frequent admonitions and warnings, powerfull meſſages, ſtrong and earneſt calls, and propoſition of all rational motives to repentance. But if thoſe prevail not, the *juſt* ſtill continuing to *draw back*, *God's ſoul hath no pleaſure in him*, and the greater obligations of Love and Grace they are, againſt which he hath ſinn'd, the greater the provocations are in the ſight of God, and nothing conſequently but the greater degree of puniſhment to be expected. How God is affected toward *rebellious* ſons is ſet down, *Iſa.* 1.2,10,11,12, *&c.*

Sect. 109. And then to put any man in hope, that what is not ordinarily revealed in the Goſpel, may yet be laid up for him in the cabinet of God's ſecret counſels with this ſeal upon it, *The Lord knoweth thoſe that are his*, as if they might be his ſtill in God's acceptation, which walk moſt contrarily to him, this may prove a moſt dangerous ſnare of ſouls, and it is ſtrange it ſhould ſeek ſhelter in that Text, 2 *Tim.* 2. 19. which was moſt expreſly deſigned to the contrary, as is evident both by the notation of the στερέωμα in the beginning of the verſe, which in all probability ſignifies the *Covenant* of God, the βεβαίωσις *ſtability* whereof, there preſt, muſt aſſure us that there is no ſalvation to be expected, but according to the contents of that great indenture, once for all ſealed in the bloud of Chriſt, of which as that indeed is one part, which is inſcribed on one ſide of the ſeal [*The Lord knoweth thoſe that are his*] *i. e.* he will never fail to own thoſe that continue faithfull to him; ſo the other, on the other ſide, is moſt emphatical, [*Let every one that nameth the name of Chriſt, depart from iniquity*] which if he do not, he hath forfeited all the Privileges of his Chriſtianity.

No comfort for ſuch from 2 Tim. 2. 19.

The *Marcuſians* hereſie in this point, a good warning.

Sect. 110. The *Gnoſtick* hereſie, one branch of it eſpecially, noted in *Marcus*'s Scholars, in *Irenæus*, is a ſeaſonable warning to all ſober Chriſtians in this matter; He told them of an ἀπολύτρωσις, a *redemption*, or kind of Baptiſm, which rendred them φύσει πνευματικὰς, *naturally* and immutably *ſpiritual*, no more to be *polluted by ſin*, than *gold by lying in the mire*, or the *Sun-beams* by lighting on a *dunghill*, and that whatever they did, they ſhould (as with the helmet of the mother of the Gods) be rendred ἀόρατοι τῷ κριτῇ, *inviſible to the Judge*. The effects whereof, as to all carnality, *&c.* were ſo deteſtable, that it becomes every man moſt ſolicitouſly to guard and ſecure his Schemes of *Election* and Doctrine of *perſeverance of the Elect*, from all probability, if not poſſibility, of miniſtring to the like, and that cannot well be by any other method of reſolution, but this, that thoſe *that perſevere unto the end ſhall be ſaved*, and none elſe, our tenure in all the privileges of Election, 1. God's favour, 2. the continual aſſiſtence of his Grace, and 3. the inheritance of ſons, being inſeparably relative and annext to the conſtant filial obedience, which he indiſpenſably requires of us, under the Goſpel of conditional promiſes.

The concluſion

Sect. 111. Thus have I paſt through all your Letter and given my ſelf the liberty of theſe ſtrictures, by way of reflexion on all and every paſſage therein, which belonged to this ſubject of God's *Decrees* and his *Grace*; And without the addition of any unneceſſary recapitulation of the ſeverals, it is already evident, how perfect the agreement is between us in all that you in any degree poſitively aſſert, or own as your *opinion*: And if in one particular which you are ſo carefull to propoſe, as a bare *conjecture*, and not allow it your favour in any other quality, it ſhould happen that we finally diſſent (though in propriety of ſpeech *conjectures* are not *ſentiments*) yet it were ſtrange the diſpute betwixt us ſhould be of any length. And ſo you diſcern the utmoſt of uneaſineſs, which is likely to be given you by this addreſs of,

Dear Sir,

Your moſt affectionate brother and ſervant,

H. HAMMOND.

A Second LETTER,

BEING

A View of two Emergent Difficulties.

Dear Sir,

Sect. 1. THE very friendly reception which my larger trouble found from you, is my full encouragement to proceed to the concluſion of my importunity and your exerciſe, which cannot now be far off, if I may judge by your Letter.

Sect. 2. Two difficulties, you ſay, you have ſprung by farther entring into the conſideration of this matter, *the firſt occaſioned by my diſtinction betwixt the work of Grace and of Providence*, the ſecond ariſing from the *Conceſſions of Scripture of God's withdrawing his grace from thoſe that reject it.* Two difficulties.

Sect. 3. To thoſe I ſhall make theſe returns, which I doubt not will prove ſatisfactory. The firſt ſeemeth to favour an ἐποχὴ or *ſuſpence*, and to avert all defining in theſe points: For, ſay you, *ſince the efficacy of Divine grace followeth the acts of his Providence, ſo as it may ſeem in a manner to depend chiefly thereupon, and the ways of his providence are* abyſſus multa, *deep and unfathomable, it ſeemeth to you to conclude ſtrongly that the manner how God effectually worketh by his grace to the converſion of a ſinner is alſo to our underſtandings incomprehenſible.*] To this you cannot but foreſee my reply, that the propoſal of that diſtinction was by me deſigned as a prejudice to Biſhop *Overal*'s way, which you had then mentioned as your *conjecture*. And if it ſhall have indeed that influence upon you or any man, as you ſpeak of, to encreaſe the difficulty, and to conclude ſtrongly, that *the manner of God's working*, &c. *is incomprehenſible*; yet you know this cannot in juſtice be applied farther than to that particular Scheme, againſt which peculiarly this diſadvantage was propoſed, and then the onely regular concluſion is, that this which you propoſed but as a *conjecture*, ſhould now grow lower in your eſteem, and ſcarce be thought worthy to be own'd as ſuch. An argument from the unfathomableneſs of God's providence. The diſtinction between providence and grace. The force thereof againſt the forementioned conjecture.

Sect. 4. And the more force there is in this one conſideration, thus to incline you, the leſs ſhall I deſpair, that two more conſiderations, which then encompaſſed this, and the ſuperadded tender of another way, that the Scripture-grounds, eſpecially *Chriſt's parables* in the Goſpel, ſuggeſted, will in ſome degree prevail with you, to depoſite this conjecture, which (beſide other prejudices againſt it,) hath no grounds of Scripture to pretend to, in exchange for that other, that hath, and pretends no farther, than it ſhall approve it ſelf to be thus founded. Other conſiderations to prejudice it.

Sect. 5. This is all that I may ſay to an objection which I was to cheriſh and ſtrengthen, (rather than anſwer.) But I ſhall not think that needfull, onely I leave it to have that force with you, which you ſhall ſee fit to give it, remembring onely that it ought not to have force with him, that accepts not that Scheme, that alone is concerned in it.

Sect. 6. Which Scheme having been propoſed by you with perfect warineſs, and profeſſion of allowing it to be no more than a *conjecture*, one ſuch difficulty as this, is, I acknowledge, ſufficient to remove you from it, and in that caſe it will not be unſeaſonable again to tender that which you may find better qualified for your acceptance, having without queſtion an advantage, from the *parable of the ſower*, to recommend it. I ſhall endeavour to make this clear to you. Your ſuppoſed intricacy, or unfathomable queſtion, is, what it is that makes *ſufficient grace* to be *effectual* to any? I ſay the *parable* of the *ſower* was intended by Chriſt on purpoſe to anſwer that queſtion, which it hath competently performed, for here we ſee, the *ſeed* being the ſame, (whether that were the *word*, or *grace*, it matters not, as long as 'tis remembred that *the word is the vehicle of grace*, and the inſtrument of conveying it to the heart,) all the difference taken notice of, is onely in the ſoil, *viz.* ſome *trodden down*, and cruſted; ſome *ſtony*; ſome *thorny*; ſome *good*, and mellow. Proportionably to this four-fold difference of the ground, the ſeveral fates of the ſeed are deſcribed, and your own queſtion divided into four, and anſwer exactly accommodated to each. The other way confirmed from the parable of the ſower. The queſtion, what makes ſufficient grace effectual? Punctually anſwered by Chriſt. The fourfold difference of ſoil.

Sect. 7. The *firſt* queſtion is this, what is it that makes *ſufficient grace, uneffectual*, to ſome men, ſo that though it be on God's part freely afforded them, and as freely as to any other, yet it hath not the leaſt effect upon them? And the anſwer is evident in the explanation of that parable, *Matth.* 13. 19. becauſe he is ἀκούων τὸν λόγον καὶ μὴ συνιείς, *one that hears the word*, to which that grace is annexed, but either *underſtands* it *not*, or *minds* it *not*; and ſo the *Devil comes and catcheth away that which was ſown*, (and in that caſe there is no great need of that *Devil* towards the obſtructing effectualneſs, let the ſeed lie there never ſo long, if it be not *minded*, it can ſignifie nothing toward an harveſt.) The one queſtion divided into four. The firſt.

Sect. 8. The *ſecond* queſtion is, what is it that makes ſufficient Grace, after it is *received*, and that *with joy*, (great forwardneſs and alacrity at the firſt) to become ſo uneffectual to the ſupporting a man in time of *temptation*, that rather than endure any ſmart for piety, he falls into any the groſſeſt ſins? And the anſwer follows, *ver.* 21. becauſe ſuch a man is of a temper that yields not Grace any *depth* to *root* in, he hath ſome *ſtonineſs* at the bottom, ſome pleaſure, or paſſion, or other remains of reſiſtence rooted in him, which he hath not deveſted himſelf of, and when duty begins any way to check that, he is impa- The ſecond.

tient, and throws off piety, of which he made very fair profeſſions, and ſuch as had, as far as his trials formerly went, reality in them, till this laſt ſignal trial was made of him, for which, it ſeems by the effect, he was not qualified.

The third. *Sect.* 9. The *third* queſtion is, what is the reaſon that ſufficient Grace, once received and bringing forth fruits, though it come not to combat with any ſharp trials, doth yet many times decay and periſh *after a while?* And the anſwer is, *ver.* 22. that there remained in the heart of ſuch ſome piece of ill temper unreformed, which in time prolified, and ſent out great and waſting ſins (though not ſo generally decryed in the World) *viz. worldly ſolicitudes*, and ſuch as the wealth of the World is apt to beget in them that have or ſeek it, and theſe being permitted to thrive in the ſoul, 'tis regular that Grace, which cannot conſiſt with ſuch *(you cannot ſerve God and Mammon)* ſhould be overrun, and *choaked*, and at length deſtroyed by that means, which had it not been for this cauſe of abortion, as it was ſufficient, and effectual for a while, ſo it would have proſper'd to perſeverance.

The fourth. *Sect.* 10. And this introduceth the *fourth* and laſt queſtion, What then is it that renders ſufficient Grace Effectual both to Converſion and Perſeverance? And the Anſwer is, *ver.* 23. the *goodneſs* of the ſoul, *probity* of the *heart*, wherein that ſufficient Grace is received, and what that is, is beſt diſcerned by

The Character of the honeſt heart. the oppoſition of all the former three, 1. it is a ſincerely, pliable, ductile temper, that neglects not to make uſe of any grain of Grace, 2. it hath an uniform Courage to combat with difficulties, and is not enſlaved to pleaſures, 3. it utterly deſpiſes the World, the allurements and the terrours of it, and uſes it as if it uſed it not. The former part of this temper renders it effectual to converſion, the two latter to perſeverance alſo. And conſidering that parable is ſet down by Chriſt to give account of the various ſucceſſes of the *word of the kingdom*, i. e. of the Goſpel, among all thoſe to whom it is made known, who with you are the adequate object of the *Scripture-election*, and *reprobation*, what can be farther required to the clear ſatisfaction of your whole difficulty?

The Conjecture compared with this other way. *Sect.* 11. And then remembring that the onely remaining queſtion, viz. *whence is this probity?* hath been fully anſwered in the former papers, I appeal to no other than your ſelf, whether this be not both a perſpicuous, and authoriſed ſtating, having ſo weighty a paſſage of Goſpel to found it, and therefore in all juſtice preferrable to your bare Conjecture, which, beſides that it is preſſed with difficulties (as your ſelf acknowledge) which to you ſeem unanſwerable, is not provided of any pretence of a foundation, hath no authority from holy Scripture to recommend it.

One pretenſion for the Conjecture. From the finding the hidden treaſure. *Sect.* 12. If it have any, it is moſt probably that other ſhort parable in the ſame Chapter, *ver.* 44. where the *kingdom of God is compared to a treaſure hid in the field, the which when a man hath found, he hideth*, &c. There the man, which found the treaſure, is not ſuppoſed to *ſeek* it (for that makes another parable, *ver.* 45.) but by the mere *providence* of God (which the heathen Philoſophers were wont to ſtyle *chance*, and commonly give this very inſtance of it *the treaſure found in the field,)* happily to fall upon it, when he paſſeth by on ſome other errand; And this indeed is matter of frequent obſervation. *Auguſtine* is converted by S. *Ambroſe*'s Sermon, when he came to it on no ſuch deſign; *Saul* is called to from Heaven, and converted to Chriſtianity, when he was going to *Damaſcus* on the moſt diſtant deſign of perſecuting it. And to omit the many more examples of thoſe of whom it hath been literally true, that they have *found* God, *when they ſought him not, asked not after him*, one eminent ſtory our books give us, of two young children brought to a City to be ſold, at a time when a devout *Nun* had vowed, to take ſome young child, and beſtow her whole life, and utmoſt induſtry to bring it up in ſtrict piety, and accordingly came and bought one of them, and as ſoon as ſhe had bought her, a Bawd came in her preſence and bought the other, by which means theſe two, which were ſo lately in the very ſame indifferent condition, by this act of Divine providence (to which this was to be attributed) were ſtrangely *diſcriminated*, the one brought up and early engaged, and ſo perſevering to the lives end in all piety, and the other by the contrary diſcipline debauched, and educated to the trade of harlotry, wherein ſhe lived and perſevered. In which it is viſible how ſignal an influence this one act of Divine *Providence* had on ſo diſtant eternal fates of theſe two, and how eminent an ingredient it was in the ſaving the one and damning the other.

The converſion of *Auguſtine*. Of *Saul*.

The diſtant fate of two children.

Anſwered. *Sect.* 13. But from all theſe and innumerable the like, (which are freely granted, and allowed to be competent to confirm your main concluſion, that the *Providence of God is Abyſſus multa)* you will ſoon diſcern, that there comes in no leaſt advantage to that *Learned Biſhop's Scheme*, which is the matter of your Conjecture, and our onely preſent enquiry. The whole weight of that (as far as I, or any man queſtions it) being laid, not on the ſuperabundance afforded to one above the other, (which is willingly granted) but on the foreſeen *univerſal inefficaciouſneſs* of the barely *ſufficient Grace*, acknowledged to be given to all, till that ſuperadded advantage adminiſtred by *God's providence* in the choice of the *congruous timing*, come in, as the work of *God's Election*, to make the diſcrimination.

The point of the difficulty. Whether the barely ſufficient Grace be univerſally inefficacious.

No pretence for this. *Sect.* 14. Now ſeeing in all theſe examples, and in that parable, nothing like this is to be found, no evidence, or intimation of God's foreſeeing, 1. that that man that found the treaſure, would never have been wrought on by that meaſure of *ſufficient Grace*, which that opinion allows God formerly to have afforded him, unleſs by that ſeaſonable act of *Providence* he had thus faln on the treaſure in the parable, or 2. that *Auguſtine* would never have been converted, if he had not been ſurpriſed by S. *Ambroſe*'s Sermon, or 3. that *Saul* would not have been converted at another time, without, or even with that viſion, and voice from Heaven, or laſtly that that fortunate child, that fell into the *Nun*'s, inſtead of the *Bawd*'s hands, would never have been brought to Heaven any other way, and could not have miſcarried under this method: Through all theſe inſtances, I ſay, it is ſtill apparent, that nothing is gained toward the approving the Conjecture, theſe advantageous turns of providence afforded one man and not another, and the ſignal efficacy of ſuch, being moſt freely granted by thoſe who deem the *Conjecture* improbable.

Sect. 15. And indeed, if it be well conſidered, all that theſe, and a myriad of the like inſtances infer, is no more than this, the great and admirable *variety* of *God's providential acts*, not as thoſe are all one with, but as in his hands they are inſtrumental and ſubſervient to his *Grace*, whereby in divers manners

manners *grace* is advantageously assisted by *providence*, to one in this wise, and admirable manner, to another in that; No man, who is allowed the *sufficient Grace*, being denied some benefit or other of *Providence* to assist *Grace*, and make it more than probable to become effectual to him, if he doth not betray and frustrate the *opportunities* of the one, as well as the *power* and efficacy of the other. Providence allowed to assist Grace.

Sect. 16. So that still acknowledging most willingly, and admiring the *abyss of Providence*, this no way obstructs the comprehending the manner (or perplexes the doctrine) of the *cooperation* of the *Grace of God* with the *will* of *man*, but leaves it where the Parable of the Sower set it, that the *efficacy* of *Grace*, and successfulness, whether to *conversion*, or *perseverance* proceeds from the mellowness, and preparedness of the soil, from the advantages which it meets with in the *honest heart*, as that again is wholly due to God's preventing Graces, which have thus fitted the soil for the kindly seeds-time, planted pliableness, humility in the heart, where Grace may be deeply and durably rooted, but this still *resistibly* in both parts, as hath formerly been expresst. But is of no force to the Question.

Sect. 17. One fancy I know there is, which hath pleased some men in this matter, that God gives *sufficient Grace* to those who do not make use of it, but resist it, and yet more than so, the power of using, or accepting, or not resisting it, but gives to the Elect and onely to the *Elect*, *ipsam non-resistentiam*, *the very not resisting*, and this they will have to be the signal *discriminating Grace*. A Fancy of God's giving the Elect *ipsam non-resistentiam*.

Sect. 18. Of these I shall demand, 1. Whether in those which have not this *ipsam non-resistentiam* given them, this be an effect of God's Decree, which hath determined the certain infallible giving it to some peculiar persons, and so the not giving it to all others? If it be not, then this is no foundation of *discriminating Grace*, or consequently fruit of *Election* and *Reprobation*, and so is still impertinent to the matter for which it is brought. Examined and found weak.

Sect. 19. But if it be the effect of God's Decree, determining the giving it to some, and denying it to others, I then 2. demand, whether all they to whom it is not given, do therefore infallibly *receive the grace of God in vain*, because they have not this *ipsa non-resistentia* (which is more than the power of not resisting) given them?

Sect. 20. If this be not affirmed, then, as before, this comes not home to *discriminating Grace*, nor consequently to the business of *Election* and *Reprobation*, which it was meant to assist. But if it shall be said, that they therefore infallibly resist, or *receive in vain*, because this *ipsa non-resistentia* is not given them, then it seems this gift of *ipsa non-resistentia* is such, as that they who have it not, want somewhat which is necessary to their effectual receiving, or not resisting Grace, and if this be the condition of the far greatest part of the World, then how can it with any sincerity be affirmed (as by those that make use of this expedient, it is profest) that God hath to all mankind given *Christ*, and *in him all things*, and particularly *Grace sufficient*, and the power of not-resisting Grace, which according to this fancy, none can chuse, but resist, who have not the *ipsam non-resistentiam* given them, which yet they affirm to be given but to a few, *i. e.* to none but the *elect*?

Sect. 21. This were (by interpretation, and in effect) for God to give to all men a power to an act, which yet the greatest part of those which have it given them, can never make use of to that act, for want of somewhat else which is not given them, which to all them which have not that somewhat else given (and those the far greatest number of men for whom *Christ died*) is not a power to that act, *viz.* of not-resisting, which what is it other than a direct *contradiction*, a power and not a power to the same act? and withall so far from being a favour to them, that it is in event infallibly and inevitably the greatest curse, that could have befaln them, *viz.* the heightning and extremely aggravating of their guilt and punishment, proportionably to their sin of resisting such sufficient grace, of standing out against Christ, which as it is the height of guilt, (and awarded the dregs of God's wrath,) now under the Gospel, and makes their condition in the world to come, much worse, than it would have been, if Christ had never been born, or preached to them, so it had never been thus direfully charged upon them, if they had not had the *power of not-resisting* given them by *Christ*.

Sect. 22. This is a competent prejudice and discouragement to this fancy, of founding discriminating grace and the doctrine of unconditionate decrees in this difference betwixt the *power of resisting*, and the *ipsa non-resistentia*, the latter given onely to the *Elect*. Considered in relation to this fancy.

Sect. 23. But it will farther be defeated, if we reflect on that place of Scripture, wherein God's giving the *ipsa non-resistentia* chiefly seems to be mentioned, *Phil.* 2. 13. under the style of ἐνεργῶν τὸ θέλειν καὶ ἐνεργεῖν, *working in us to doe*, or *work*, which that it tends not to the support or advantage of this fancy may be evident by these three considerations. Phil. 2. 13.

Sect. 24. *First*, By the importance of the phrase, [*working in us to doe*, as before *to will*,] which (as was formerly noted, in passing,) will best be understood by other parallel phrases, as δοῦναι λατρεύειν, *God's giving to serve*, *Luke* 1. 72. Which is evidently his *giving* grace, or power, or supernatural abilities *to serve*, not onely furnishing him with a remote, and fundamental power, or faculty, but withall having a particular immediate influence on the effect, actuating that power, when it is actuated, and so properly causing, or making him actually to serve, yet so as to leave him power also to neglect, and *receive* that power *in vain*, as the *Scripture* elsewhere saith; Thus *Revel.* 11. 3. *I will give*, we render, *I will give power*, *viz.* power to the subsequent act, *prophesying* there, as in *Luke*, *serving in holiness*. By which analogy it is evident, that God's *working in us* to doe, or *work*, is not interpretable to any more, than his giving supernatural power, or sufficient grace to doe, or work, and causing him *actually*, though not *irresistibly* to work, and then here is no pretence whereon to found the foresaid difference between God's *giving the power of not-resisting*, and the *ipsa non-resistentia*, these two being equivalent in this Text.

Sect. 25. *Secondly*, The same appeareth by the Apostle's exhortation foregoing in this Text, *to work* and *work out our own salvation with fear and trembling*, for the inforcing whereof this reason is given, *for it is God that worketh*, &c. Here our own *working* is under the Apostolical exhortation and precept, we are commanded to work, as elsewhere συνεργεῖν *to cooperate*, and *work together with God*, which could not have place, if God alone (and not we,) *did work* in us the *very working*, whereas interpreting it of God's *giving* us the *power* of *working*, or doing, as well as of *willing*, and withall engaging us to make use of that power,

and cooperating with us in the very *act*, and ſo cauſing us *actually* to work, yet ſo as to leave us a power of *reſiſting*, and fruſtrating, and *receiving* this power or *grace in vain*, this is a moſt proper and effectual inforcement of the exhortation addreſt to us, *to work and work out our own ſalvation.*

Sect. 26. *Thirdly*, This farther and moſt irrefragably appears by the *perſons*, to whom both the exhortation, and this inforcement thereof is tendred, *viz.* the *brethren* indefinitely, or *beloved*, *verſe* 12. the whole Church of *Profeſſours* at *Philippi* to whom he writes, which being not made up wholly of the Elect, ſincere, and perſevering Chriſtians, but like the Net, in Chriſt's Parable, that *caught both good and bad*, and had no doubt ſome inſincere perſons, hypocrites and temporaries in it, the affirmation notwithſtanding is indiſcriminately of all, *God worketh in* them *to work*, which could not hold, if by this phraſe were meant his giving the *ipſa non-reſiſtentia*, and that as an evidence of *diſcriminating grace*, and an effect of his *Election*, for this is not ſuppoſable to have belonged to that *whole* Church, any more than it then did, or now is believed to do to *all* Chriſtians.

Sect. 27. I have enlarged thus far, becauſe I was not willing to omit, but rather to prevent whatſoever I could foreſee might probably be objected in this buſineſs. And ſo this may ſuffice to have returned to your firſt difficulty.

The ſecond difficulty. Concerning God's withdrawing ſufficient Grace.

Sect. 28. The ſecond difficulty you thus propoſe; *Whereas it is ſaid, and that, (as you conceive) moſt truly and agreeably to plain evidence of Scripture, that God withdraweth his grace from ſuch as rejecting it when it is offered to them by the preaching of the Goſpel, do thereby fruſtrate the Counſel of God againſt themſelves, it ſeemeth hard to conceive how the grace of God ſhould be ſo withdrawn from them, that ſo doe, but that, ſo long as they are not deprived of the outward means, the ſame ſufficient grace that was offered to them at the firſt hearing of the Goſpel, is offered to them ſtill; which if it was then ſufficient on God's part, to doe the work, is alſo ſtill ſufficient, and that in the ſame degree, and how then can it be ſaid to be withdrawn? It is true that the converſion of ſuch a perſon, after ſo long obſtinacy and refuſal is more difficult than before, which may ariſe from the greater indiſpoſition of the perſon to be wrought upon, but how it can be imputed in the leaſt, to the withdrawing of the divine grace, (to which yet undoubtedly it may and ought to be imputed,) upon the former ſuppoſal on the like ſufficiency remaining, I muſt profeſs my ſelf not able to underſtand.*]

The ſeveral ways of God's withdrawing Grace.

Sect. 29. To this I ſhall not doubt to apply a ſatisfactory anſwer, and ſuch as you will acknowledge to be ſuch, by diſtinguiſhing of *God's withdrawing his grace.* For 1. it being God's method to *give more grace* to thoſe that walk worthy of it, the humble obedient children of grace, when he on our provocations ſtops that current, this may be called *withdrawing*. God's ſmitings are his admonitions, *(hear ye the Rod,)* his admonitions, as any other diſpenſation of his Word, are *vehicles of grace*, and when theſe prevail not, they are thus withdrawn, *i. e.* not farther encreaſed, *why ſhould ye be ſmitten any more*, &c. *Iſa.* 1.) Yet is this *withdrawing* conſiſtent with God's affording *ſufficient grace*, either by inſtruments of ſome other kind, or even of the ſame kind, the continuance of that proportion, which was formerly afforded; as he that gives a competency, and would if he ſaw it well uſed, daily make additions to it, though he ſee cauſe to withhold thoſe additions, yet he may continue that competency. But in propriety of ſpeech, (the truth is,) this is rather *withholding*, than *withdrawing*, yet becauſe the not giving what was promiſed to be given is tantamount to *withdrawing*, I therefore place this in the firſt rank, ſuppoſing it clear, that this doth not onely leave ſufficient grace; but is it ſelf deſigned to awaken and quicken thoſe that did not formerly make good uſe of it, *leſt a worſe thing yet befall* them.

The firſt rather withholding.

Conſiſts with his affording ſufficient.

The ſecond. Not total.

Sect. 30. *Secondly*, Then *withdrawing* being taken in the proper ſenſe, for *taking away* from and diminiſhing the ſtock, before afforded, that may yet be but in *part*, not *total*, and there being a latitude in *ſufficient grace*, ſome degrees of that may be taken away, and yet that which remains be ſufficient, an image of which is that degree of *Church-cenſures*, which cutting off from the participation of the Euchariſt, or ſuſpending from it, allows the hearing of the Word, and partaking in the prayers of the faithfull. And this act of *God's withdrawing*, again is ſo far from denying *ſufficient grace*, that it is purpoſely uſed and deſigned, as the moſt probable means to make that *ſufficient grace* effectual, which formerly had not been ſo.

The third total, but onely for the time, and neither ſimply total.

Sect. 31. There may yet be a *third*, and yet farther degree of *withdrawing*, which at the preſent, and as to *ſufficient grace*, may be ſaid to be *total*, *i. e.* ſuch a withdrawing of grace at the preſent, that it ſhall truly be ſaid ſuch a man is not now allowed ſufficient for his neceſſities, whether it be that his neceſſities are grown greater, and ſo the former competency will not ſuffice, or be it alſo, that ſome of that which he had is *withdrawn*, as when he that for ſome time had no violent temptations, and was furniſhed with ſtrength proportionable to what he had, upon his betraying this ſtrength, and ſinning wilfully againſt it, is by God called out to ſharper Combats, having been foiled with the weaker, and perhaps ſome part of his former ſtrength *withdrawn* from him alſo, when he hath moſt need of ſuccours, and ſhould certainly have had them, had he not thus provoked the withholding them. In this caſe the aim of this puniſhment of God's is yet moſt wiſe and mercifull, thus to convince ſuch a man of his guilts, and impotence, (the effect of them,) and ſo as by turning *Nebuchadnezzar* into the field, thoroughly to humble him, to excite ardency of prayers, both for *pardon*, and *grace*, which God in that caſe fails not to give, and ſo to reſtore ſuch a man to a greater ſtability of his former ſtate.

Sect. 32. And ſo ſtill this is neither *final*, nor ſimply *total*, as that ſignifies *withdrawing all grace*, but onely total for a time in the ſenſe declared, as it ſignified the withdrawing what was neceſſary to their preſent ſtate.

Sect. 33. And I need not ſhew you how far this is reconcileable with *ſufficient grace*, any farther than thus, that ſuch an one though ſeverely mulcted hath yet time for repentance and grace to make ſome uſe of it, which if he fails not in, he hath aſſurance of *more grace*, and this demonſtrated to be ſo, by his not being cut off in his ſins, (God's *long-ſuffering leading him to repentance,*) and by the light of God's word, and articulation of his calls daily continued to him, which are not void of that *grace*, which is ſufficient to work conviction, and hath the promiſe of *more*, (upon asking,) made to him that is thus qualified for it.

Rom. 2. 4.

Sect. 34. *Fourthly*, There is the *removing the Candlestick*, the withdrawing all the outward ordinary means of Grace, the preaching of the Word and Sacraments, which if it be done by the censures of the *Church*, is called the *delivering up to Satan*, or if it be done by God's judgments, invasion of Barbarians, &c. it is yet to those persons that are thus punished, perfectly proportionable to that of the *Church-censures*. And yet of those it is said expresly by the *Apostle*, that the end of inflicting them is *for admonition, that they may be disciplined, taught not to blaspheme*. This supposes continuance of Grace to them that are thus punished, and that sufficient to make use of this punishment to their amendment, nay the punishment, though it be the *withdrawing* of *one* instrument of *Grace*, is it self *another*, and therefore purposely chosen and allowed in exchange for the former, because it is looked on as the more probable to produce the Effect. The fourth total, yet it self designed as a Grace, most effectual of any. 2 Cor. 13. 10. 1 Tim. 1. 20.

Sect. 35. They that see so great a benefit withdrawn from them for their unworthiness, will be thereby excited to reflect on their provocations, and bewail them, and contend by all regular means to regain what they have forfeited, and to repair their defects some other way, and this being the very end to which this punishment is by God designed, it is not imaginable, he doth yet (till *this* method also be despised) withhold that degree of *Grace* from such which is necessary for the producing of the Effect.

Sect. 36. All the Ordinances of God, we know (and such are the *Censures*) yea and all the wise dispensations of his *providence*, particularly his *punishments* of this life (and therefore this, as the last, beside excision) are instruments of *Grace* in the hands of his *wisedom*, as well as the preaching of the Word is, and therefore in all reason to be resolved to be the *vehicles* of *Grace* also, and so neither is this any objection against God's giving *sufficient Grace* to those, whom he thus punishes, in case they begin to make use of it. If they do not, but continue still obstinate, 'tis just it should at length be withdrawn from them. God's punishments instruments of his Grace.

Sect. 37. But this must be understood onely of those persons to whom the light of the *Gospel* had formerly shined, not to their distant posterity, which never have had any gleams of it, though their Ancestours had the fullest Sunshine. These are to be reckon'd with the *Heathen*, with whom you know we undertook not to meddle, treating onely of the *Scripture-Election*, terminated in those to whom the *Scripture* is revealed.

Sect. 38. *Fifthly*, There is a *total* and *final withdrawing* of all *Grace*, as well as the means of it, which is visible in the cutting off such an one in his sins, and when this comes, our former supposal of *sufficient Grace*, as of the preaching of the Word, and God's calls, are utterly at an end, but this breeds no shew of difficulty, that man having enjoyed and mispent his time of *sufficient Grace*, and now the *store-houses are shut up*. The fifth total and final withdrawing of all Grace by excision.

Sect. 39. But there is yet possibly a *sixth* state of *withdrawing*, when before either cutting off, or withdrawing God's *outward calls*, whilst life, and the preaching of the word is continued, the obdurate sinner, that hath long hardned his own heart against God, thereby provokes him *totally* to *withdraw* all inward Grace from him, as much as if he were already in hell; This seems to be *Pharaoh*'s case after the sixth judgment, and was designed by God to very excellent ends, to make him an example to all those that should be inclined *to harden their hearts against God*; And though we know not that God thus deals with any others, yet it is sure he justly may with all whom he may justly cut off in their sins. And in this case I acknowledge the *non-conversion* of such a man is not onely imputable to the *indisposition of the person to be wrought on*, but also to the *withdrawing of the divine grace*, for then, as I said, the former supposal (of the like sufficiency remaining) ceaseth, and is out-dated. The sixth before excision.

Sect. 40. What fresh difficulties can arises from this concession, I cannot divine, unless, 1. it should be objected, that then, it seems, the word is not always the vehicle of Grace, and then, 2. who knows when it is so, when not? And how then is this reconcileable with the doctrine of *sufficient grace* always accompanying the word? And to these the answers are obvious, 1. that it is granted that the Word is not the vehicle of Grace to the *Devils who believe and tremble*, to the damned who have received their sentence, nay nor to those that are thus arrived to the highest degree of obduration in this life, and have, as *Pharaoh*, this exterminating sentence passed upon them. It is sufficient if it be so to them that are in a capacity to make use of it, and have not utterly *hardned* themselves against it, the Scripture-expression being, that the Gospel is *the power of God to salvation to every one that believes it*, and this is enough to establish our pretensions, the doctrine of *sufficient grace*. There is a competent time allowed every man, and 'tis certain, death is the conclusion of it, 'tis possible some space before death. The word is not accompanied with Grace to the damned, or the highest degree of obduration. Rom. 1. 16.

Sect. 41. As for the *second*, if it were on the premised grounds granted, that sometimes it cannot be known whether or no the preaching of the Word do then bring this Grace with it, yet the one regular consequence would be that we should all be the more carefull to make use of *Grace*, when it is afforded: But when to this is added, that this barren season is always the reward of *obstinate* obduration (and of nothing less than that) As long as we have any *softness* left, that is our assurance that this sad time is not yet come upon us. They that go on in their obdurate course, have reason to expect this fatal period every hour, but they that have *remorse*, and any degree of sincere relenting, may know by this, that this state of spiritual death hath not yet seised them, and that is sufficient to guard this doctrine from all noxious consequences, having provided that none shall hereby think his state *desperate*, that is willing to reform it. Where any softness, none of that.

Sect. 42. But then it is farther to be remembred, that there appears not in the word of God, any other example of this *total* spiritual dereliction finally inflicted, *before death*, but onely that of *Pharaoh*, after the time that *God* is said to have *hardned his heart*; and the reason of this is set down, God *keeps him alive*, after the time due to his excision, that he *might shew in him his power*. And such singular examples ought no farther to be taken into consideration by us at this distance from them, than to warn us, that we keep as far as it is possible from the like provocations. And then there remains not, that I discern, any farther appearance of difficulty in this matter. *Pharaoh* the onely example of it in Scripture. Rom. 9. 17.

Sect. 43.

Sect. 43. As for any others that shall be apt to occur, when men set themselves to consider of these points, not divining what they are, I may not pretend to speak to them, any farther than thus, that in all probability they may be measured by these, which you have chosen to mention, and by nearer approach to them be likewise found not to be so deep, as at the distance they are conceited to be. This then concludes your trouble; It remains that according to my promise I now onely annex the *Letters of Presience*, and hasten to subscribe my self,

Your most affectionate brother and servant,

H. HAMMOND.

THE EXTRACTS OF Three LETTERS

Concerning God's Presience reconciled with Liberty and Contingency, referred to, and promised in the first Letter to D. Sanderson, *Sect.* 8.

The First LETTER.

Sect. 1. AS to the distinction betwixt *inevitably* and *infallibly*, (of which you desire my sense) it is certain you must understand no more by the *infallibility*, than is vulgarly meant by *Necessitas ex Hypothesi*, which is no more than that whatsoever is, cannot not be, or, *omne quod est, eo ipso quod est, necessario est*. For so whatsoever is *seen*, or (which is all one in an infinite Deity) *foreseen* by *God*, is thereby supposed to have, in that science of his, an *objective* Being; If it were not, or did not come to pass, it should have no such *objective Being*, if it have, it is thereby evidenced to be seen by him, who *was, is, and is to come*, and so (being infinite) is equally present to all, and equally sees, and knows all from all eternity. What therefore you conclude (as it is most agreeable to this, so it) is most true, that *God knows all things as they are*, such as come to pass contingently, he knows to come contingently, and from thence I undeniably conclude, therefore they are *contingent*. As for *Socinus*'s resolution that he foresees onely what are foreseeable, and that contingents are not such, but onely those that come to pass by his decree, I conceive it as dangerous as Mr. *Calvin*'s, that he *predetermines* all things, and it is visibly as false. For it is evident by the prophecies of *Judas*, &c. that God long (before) foresees sins, which are as certainly contingent, and not decreed or decreeable by God. If therefore any that writes against the Remonstrants go about to retort their arguments, and conclude from their acknowledgments of *God's presience*, what is charged on their adversaries doctrine of *predetermination*, I conceive it is but a boast, that hath no least force in it, *predetermination* having a visible influence and causality on the object, but eternal *vision*, or prevision being so far from imposing necessity on the thing to be, that it supposes it to be already, from the free choice of the Agent, and that being of it is, in order of nature, before its being seen. God's seeing, or foreseeing hath no more operation or causality of any kind on the object, than my seeing your letter hath caused your letter. You wrote freely, and now I see it, and that being supposed, it is infallibly certain that you have written, and that you cannot not have written. And just so it is in respect of God. Onely I am *finite*, and so is my sight, I see few things, and those onely which are present, but God being infinite sees all *ab infinito*, that are never so long hence future.—At *Cambridge* they have lately printed *Origen contra Celsum*, and *Philocalia Gr. & Lat.* (which were rarely had and dear) the latter of which hath good Chapters on this subject.

Necessitas ex Hypothesi.

Objective Being.

Socinus's doctrine.

Calvin's.

God's foresight of sins.

Difference between Predetermination and Prevision.

Sect. 2. This Letter met with some prepossessions, so far advanced, as to cause a Reply of some length, and that necessitated my larger endeavours to remove them, which I shall here add also; His Reply to which this refers, is none of my goods, and therefore I may not take that liberty in disposing of that, but you will discern the force of it, in my returns which were as follows.

The

The Second LETTER.

SIR,

Sect. 3. I Received your Letter, and in it your ſenſe of that difficult point, which I cannot approve of, but on the contrary aſſure my ſelf, that as *Omnipotence* is not onely the power of doing all things that any or all creatures can doe, but more than ſo, the doing all things that imply not a *contradiction*, (as the ſame thing at once to be and not to be, the doing of thoſe being as impoſſible to God, as it is to lie,) ſo the *Omniſcience* of God is the knowing all things which any creature can know, and not onely ſo, but the knowing all things which imply not a *contradiction* to be known, and then that will be extenſible to all things that are paſt, preſent, or to come, of what ſort ſoever they are; what is paſt, or preſent, or being future is decreed by him, or comes to paſs by ſome neceſſary cauſe in nature, which he decrees not to hinder, God's knowledge of theſe will not, I ſuppoſe, be doubted of. All the queſtion will be of *future contingents*, which before they are done, are poſſible to be, or not to be, but whenſoever they come to paſs, are as determinately in being, as is any thing elſe, (the moſt neceſſary,) that is already done. Unleſs then, what by being future, is out of my reach, is alſo by being future, out of God's reach, there can be no pretence that any ſuch future contingent ſhould not be objicible to God's all-ſeeing knowledge.

Omniſcience proportionable to Omnipotence.

Future contingents within God's reach.

Sect. 4. And that nothing that ever ſhall be, or will come to paſs, is thus out of God's reach, muſt ſure be yielded to *God's immenſity*, which relating to time, as well as place, it will be equally derogatory to it to limit it to the preſent *time*, in oppoſition to the future, * and to the preſent, (be it whatſoever finite,) *place*. This therefore I take to be the one thing fit to be conſidered in this matter, whether God's *immenſity* comprehend not a commenſuration to all time, and ſomewhat beyond that, as much as *infinite* is beyond *finite*.

Proved by God's immenſity.

* as

Sect. 5. This I ſuppoſe cannot be denied to the Notion which is due to a Deity; and if ſo, then God was immenſe from all eternity, and cannot be imagined to advance or arrive to this by any *vel nam proficiency*, or improvement, by continuing or enduring from the beginning to this time, or to the end of the world, but in every imaginable point of time, even before time was, he was thus *immenſe*; and if ſo, his *knowledge* being as *immenſe* as himſelf, all that he was from eternity preſent to, (*i. e.* all things that ever were or ſhall be,) muſt needs be objected to his knowledge.

Sect. 6. Againſt this, your prime argument is, *that it is no more derogatory to his omniſcience not to know that which is in nature unintelligible, than to his Omnipotence, not to doe things impoſſible.*] This is expreſly *Socinus*'s grand argument, and to it I anſwer. 1. That the phraſe (*in nature unintelligible*,) may be ſet to ſignifie no more than what no natural, *i. e.* created power can *know*, and then there is no truth in the propoſition, unleſs proportionably [*impoſſible*] ſignifie what no finite natural created power can *doe*: and if both thoſe phraſes be meant ſo, there is nothing gain'd by it, becauſe a Deity may both doe and know more, than any creature can. But then *ſecondly*, the phraſe [*in nature unintelligible*] may alſo ſignifie that which in the nature of things, whether finite or infinite, created or uncreated, is not poſſible to be underſtood; And thus I ſuppoſe you mean it, and then the interpretation of the phraſe muſt be, that for ſuch a thing to be objicible to any, though infinite, underſtanding, implies a *contradiction*, (for nothing elſe is ſimply impoſſible:) And this being your meaning, I abſolutely deny, that for God to be by his immenſity preſent to all time, (and all that he is preſent to, he may ſee,) implies a *contradiction*, or hath any appearance, (to him that conſiders what infinite is,) of ſo implying. And if you will make trial and attempt to prove it doth, it muſt be by proceeding on the known definition of *contradictories*, a repugnance *in terminis*, as *idem eodem reſpectu eſſe & non eſſe*, and then you will ſoon diſcern the unqueſtionable truth of my denial. For God's ſeeing all future contingents, will neither imply God to be, and not to be, to ſee, and not to ſee, to ſee certainly, and not to ſee certainly, nor the future contingent to be, and not to be, or to be neceſſarily and not to be neceſſarily, or to be future, and not to be future. For the thing being future and contingent now, and ſo continuing till it comes to paſs, and when it comes to paſs, coming to paſs contingently, and ſo as it might not come to paſs alſo, but when it actually is done, it implying a contradiction, (and ſo being impoſſible,) not to be done, and ſo being neceſſary *neceſſitate hypotheticâ*, *i. e. ſuppoſing that it is*, all this God ſees and knows by the ſeveral acts of his intellect, anſwerable to the ſeveral notions of the thing.

Socinus's argument anſwered.

Of the contradiction.

Sect. 7. From all eternity, and ſo in every point of time, before it comes to paſs, God ſees it both as *future*, and as *contingent*, and ſo, as that, which till it is, may be or may not be; and when it comes to paſs, *in ipſo fieri*, he ſees the man that does it, act *freely*, having power to the contrary, and the thing never *neceſſary*, but as being done, and that onely by that *neceſſity*, whereof that propoſition in logick is to be underſtood, *Omne quod eſt, eo quod eſt, neceſſario eſt*. All which is very obvious to be conceived, and there is not the leaſt contradiction, or ſhew thereof in it.

Sect. 8. This one would think you readily granted, when you ſay, *God infallibly knows all that is paſt, preſent, or poſſible to be*, (for no man demands any more,) yet you deny it again in theſe words, [*mere contingents which with equal poſſibility may be, or may not be, have no being in act, and therefore can caſt no reflexion, or objective being into the mind of God.*] To which I reply, Firſt, that you ought to advert, 1. That what may be, or may not be, may be; 2. What may be, is poſſible, and 3. You your ſelf confeſs that God knows all that is *poſſible*. Secondly, that the *having no being in act*, (which ſeems to be your ſtumbling block,) is a phraſe proportioned to the thing, and to our finite underſtandings, to which the thing is *future* onely, and ſo hath no being yet: but when God is conſidered as *infinite*, then whatſoever ſhall ever be in act, that actual being of it, is the object of God's ſight, and hath been ſo from all eternity, and is

no

no more removed from him, than that is removed from me, which is preſent with me; And if you ſay, *God ſees before, what in after time ſhall hang in the balance of humane indetermination, i.e.* what he may doe, deliberates, and is free to doe, or not to doe, but hath not yet done, I demand, why may he not alſo foreſee which end of the balance doth at length overpoiſe? (is not one of theſe as truly *future*, as the other, when the man is not yet born?) And ſo again, which end doth not overpoiſe, and never will, although he ſee it might, if the man ſhould chuſe ſo, and that the man may ſo chuſe, but ſtill that he doth not. This is it, wherein you ſay the *contradiction* is, and now it is viſible there is none, nor the leaſt approach towards any.

A ſecond objection.

Sect. 9. Here you add, (which is your ſecond main objection,) *that it is a miſtake to call that poſſible, which God foreſees ſhall never be, for if God foreſees the contrary, (i.e. that it ſhall never be,) it is indeed impoſſible.* But, 1. I pray, is nothing *poſſible* to come to paſs, but what *actually* comes to paſs? If ſo, nothing that is, is *contingent*. But if ſome things be *poſſible* to come to paſs, which yet do not come to paſs, why may not God ſee they will not come to paſs? And if he can, then that is no miſtake, which you ſay is. 2. Do but change the word foreſight into (which is the ſame,) ſeeing from all eternity, and then it is plain, that God from all eternity, may ſee that thing will never actually be, which yet is free for the agent to doe, or not to doe, (and God ſees that too,) and ſo is *poſſible* every way, ſave onely *ex hypotheſi, on ſuppoſition* that it will never be; And as the bare *hypothetical neceſſity* is no *abſolute neceſſity*, ſo the bare *hypothetical impoſſibility* is no *abſolute impoſſibility*. 3. God ſees every thing as it is, and its being or not being ſuch, is in order of nature antecedent to God's *ſeeing* it; Therefore it infallibly follows, that if it be *poſſible* to be, though it ſhall never be, God ſees it is *poſſible* to be, and if God ſees it *poſſible*, it unavoidably follows that it is poſſible.

Sect. 10. And it is not fit here to interpoſe, that *though it ſeem to us poſſible, in reſpect of ſecond cauſes, yet if God foreſee the contrary, it is indeed impoſſible*;] For what I am by God left free to doe, or not to doe, that, not onely ſeems, but is indeed poſſible, and ſo it is, though in event I never doe it, and being ſo in it ſelf, God's ſeeing, it will never be, hath no leaſt influence upon it, ſo as to make the leaſt change in it, (for that is the work of his *will*, not of his *knowledge*,) and ſo it cannot from *poſſible* convert it into *impoſſibe*.

Sect. 11. When therefore you ſay, *no cauſe can effect that which God ſees ſhall never be*, this is onely true *in ſenſu compoſito*, that, in caſe it ſhall never be, and ſo God ſees it ſhall never be, no cauſe ſhall effect it; but *in ſenſu diviſo* it is moſt falſe, for I am truly able to write more lines to you than I ſhall ever write, or conſequently than God foreſees I ſhall write, and even this, that I am thus able, God equally *foreſees*.

Sect. 12. By this you ſee how far I am from being convinced, or by any reaſon forced to grant, that *future determinations of free agents are not foreſeeable*, and what the inconvenience is of affirming they are not, even no leſs than derogating from *God's Immenſity*, and *Infinity*, and judging the perceptions of an infinite Creatour by our finite, created meaſures, his more than unfathom'd Ocean by my ſpan, and feigning *contradictions*, where there are none.

Inconveniences enumerated and anſwered. The firſt.

Sect. 13. Now to the *Inconveniences* which you enumerate, I ſhall reply alſo, as oft as I perceive I have not prevented, or anſwered them already. The firſt is, that *the ſight can be no more certain than the things are which are ſeen, and therefore there cannot be a certain knowledge of thoſe things, which in their cauſes are uncertain*,] I anſwer that all the *certainty* of the knowledge of any thing depends upon its *being* firſt, and then of its being *known* to be, and not onely upon the *certainty* of its *cauſes*; I do now as certainly know that I have written nine pages to you, as I know that the fire burns, therefore that may be *known certainly*, which is not *certain in its cauſes*. And as that which is preſent to me is certainly known by me, ſo are all things to come from all eternity, preſent to an *immenſe* Creatour, be they contingent, or not. And in this caſe there is not *more in the effect than in the cauſe*, for what is contingently come to paſs, being done, is certain, and cannot be undone, and God ſees it, as it is, therefore he ſees it as done, and ſo certain, yet as done contingently, and ſo as that which might not have been, the *being*, certain, the *manner* of its coming to act, *uncertain*. The *being* then being the cauſe of the ſeeing, or in nature antecedent to it, and the ſeeing, the effect or conſequent of the being, the certainty of the effect is but proportionable to, and *exceedeth not the cauſe*.

The ſecond.

Sect. 14. The *ſecond inconvenience* is, that of *ſaying that every thing that happens was certain to be, before it happens*] But I ſay not ſo, unleſs by certain you mean *ex hypotheſi*, certain to be, in caſe it be; for in caſe it ſhould not be, God ſhould ſee it would not be, and then it ſhould be as *certainly* otherwiſe.

The third.

Sect. 15. The ſhort is, All *Exhortations, Induſtry, Preaching, &c* are founded in the *liberty* of our actions, and if they be free till they be actually determined, and then are paſt freedom, and become neceſſary, ſo conſequently muſt *Exhortations, &c.* be all uſefull, till the thing be done, (and then indeed, as to the doing, or not doing that, they are not uſefull, but their ſecond ſeaſon of uſefulneſs comes in, in caſe it were a ſin, *Exhortation to Repentance, &c.*) and that is as much, as can be or need be pretended to, and this is fully competible with God's ſeeing certainly from all eternity, whatſoever ſhall come to paſs in time; His ſeeing it ſuppoſing it done, though for the manner of its being done, that were *contingent*, and if ſo, then it is not certain to be, before it happens, but it is certain to be, when it is, and it firſt *is*, in order of nature, before it is *ſeen*, and its being already ſeen, before it be done, depends onely on the *immenſity* of God's preſence, and ſight, which reacheth out to all that ever ſhall be; ſo that that which is future to us, he is preſent to it, and in that ſenſe, though he ſees it future, 'tis yet preſent to him.

Sect. 16. Your *third inconvenience* is, that, *by this the damnation of ſuch or ſuch men is as fixed and unalterable, as though they were reprobated from all eternity, and it is as ill in reſpect of me, if I muſt inevitably be damned by my own free will, as if I had been ſentenced to Hell by God's decree, and in reſpect of God worſe, for he muſt be deprived of the free exerciſe of his omnipotence, (becauſe he cannot make that not to be which he foreſees will be) and brought under a Stoical Fatality, and ſo be an helpleſs ſpectator of what anothers will is pleaſed to effect.*] I anſwer if by [*ſuch and ſuch men*] you mean ſuch or ſuch individual entities, without reſpect to their qualifications or demeanures, then all your conſequence, as it is *inconvenient*, ſo it is falſe; for from God's ſeeing

ab

ab æterno, that *Judas* will be reprobated, it follows not, that he ſees he will be reprobated, but for his wilfull Treaſon. But if you mean by [*ſuch or ſuch men*] men ſo or ſo qualified, *i. e.* finally impenitent, then 'tis true, but not *inconvenient*, that final impenitents ſhould from all eternity be reprobated. And ſpeaking of theſe in this ſenſe, 'tis true, which you add, that it is as ill in reſpect of the perſon, *i. e.* final impenitents, meaning by [*as ill*] as ſad and penal, nay 'tis more ſad, and penal to be reprobated for final impenitence, which I am guilty of by my own *free will*, than it would be to be onely by God's *decree* involved in it, my wilfull culpable guilt being ſome addition to my miſery, and (as long as God is juſt) it being expectable that thoſe puniſhments will be ſharper, which I bring on my ſelf, by the exerciſe of my free will, than what comes on me by a decree grounded no way in my actions. And ſo ſtill this is no *Inconvenience*. But if you mean by [*as ill*] that which hath as little mixture of God's goodneſs towards me, then your conſequence is falſe, for to God's ſeeing *Judas* reprobated, and his ſeeing it *ab æterno*, if is no way conſequent, that he gives him no power to eſcape Damnation, *viz.* Grace to be able to ſtand and not fall, or Grace to recover if he will make uſe of it, but the contrary rather follows; For how can God ſee him damned for the *betraying Chriſt*, and not repenting and returning, unleſs this were done wilfully by him (ſins of *weakneſs* and *ignorance* finding mercy, as in the caſe of *Saul, perſecuting the Church*) and unleſs he were firſt a *Diſciple of Chriſt*, and ſo were illuminated, and aſſiſted by Chriſt, and if he were ſo, then he had this power and grace, or might have had it, if he were not wanting to himſelf, and if ſo, then this was not ſo *ill to him* (in this ſenſe, of which now I ſpeak) as to have been irreſpectively reprobated, and never vouchſafed this Grace.

Sect. 17. So when you ſay, *It is worſe in reſpect of God, and prove* that, *becauſe he muſt be deprived of the free exerciſe of his omnipotence*] there is no truth in that conſequence, or the reaſon of it. For God's *omnipotence* conſiſts not in being able to make both parts of a *contradiction* true, that were in the very attempt a departing from veracity, a falſeneſs, a ſin, and ſo the greateſt *impotence*, and ſo moſt contrary to *omnipotence*. And ſuch is that, which alone your conſequence, and the reaſon of that ſuppoſes, making that not to be, which he foreſees will be, for by the latter part of that expreſſion you mean that which from eternity he ſees to be done, and then to be done and not to be done, is *in terminis contradictory*. And this impotence or not being able to cauſe the ſame thing at once to be and not to be, is far from all notions of *Stoical fatality*, that I ever heard of (elſe ſure all rational creatures muſt be *Stoicks*, for they all reſolve that what is, cannot not be) and as far from making *God an idle helpleſs ſpectatour of what anothers will is pleaſed to effect*: for his *providence*, and *aſſiſtence*, and *efficacy* belong to other things, not to the making that not to be, when it is, but to the preventing it before it came, giving Grace ſufficent, preventing, reſtraining, exciting, *&c.* ordering it and diſpoſing of it to his own wiſe ends, when it is done, and puniſhing the doer juſtly, if he repent not, to which he is alſo ready to give Grace, if he humbly *aſk*, and *ſeek* and *knock* for it: All this is ſuppoſed to be done by God, and ſo God is no *helpleſs ſpectatour*, and all this is reconcileable with the effects being wrought by our free will, as long as *God's grace* works not irreſiſtibly.

Sect. 18. Here I remember that of St. *Auguſt in. de Civ. l.* 5 *c.* 10. *Nullo modo cogimur, aut retenta præſcientia Dei, tollere voluntatis arbitrium, aut retento voluntatis arbitrio, Deum, quod nefas eſt, negare præſcium futurorum*, (this is expreſly contrary both to the *Calviniſts* pretenſion on the one ſide, and the *Socinians* on the other.)

Sect. 19. Your *fourth inconvenience* is, that *then God never purpoſed to ſave all mankind.*] If by purpoſing you mean decreeing, and by ſaving, actually beſtowing heaven upon them, then that conſequence is true, but not in the leaſt wiſe inconvenient, for God never decreed to ſave final impenitents, and ſuch are many of mankind, after the giving of Chriſt, but on the contrary, hath *ſworn* ſuch *ſhall not enter into his reſt*. The ſaving of mankind which God decreed is the redeeming them, and giving them Chriſt, and Grace, and making them *ſalvable*, and being deficient in nothing toward that end to thoſe, that will make uſe of it. As for the other notion of Salvation, it is no where ſaid that God *purpoſed* that in the notion of *decreeing*, but onely that he ſo *will'd* as to *deſire* it, and to give ſufficient means of effecting it, but thoſe means proportioned to rational agents, and ſo not violent or *irreſiſtible*, or ſuch as ſhould, by being contrary to freedom, exclude rewardableneſs. So when you ſay, *Chriſt could not have an intention to die for them who he foreſees would be nothing advantaged by it*] if by *dying for them*] you mean ſo dying, that they ſhould actually be ſaved, ſo 'tis true, he intended not to die for thoſe that are finally impenitent, and ſo are not advantaged by it, for ſure it is no part of his Covenant or intention in dying, to ſave ſuch: but if by *dying for them* you mean purchaſing pardon, upon ſuppoſition of repentance, then that he intended thus to die for them, that make not this advantage of it, (and ſo he ſees make it not) appears evidently by many texts, which tell us of his *redeeming thoſe that deny him, that periſh, &c.* and is intimated by the very ſtyle you uſe of their *being nothing advantaged by it*, for if he did not purchaſe thoſe advantages for them, why is that phraſe uſed? The fourth.

Sect. 20. Your fifth Inconvenience is, *that on this ſuppoſition, God could not ſeriouſly call upon ſuch, whom his preſcience points out for Damnation to repent, more than I could bid him take heed that he fall not, whom by tumbling down I ſaw mortally bruiſed already.*] I anſwer, 1. that if you mean any more by that phraſe [*his preſcience points out to Damnation*] than [*he ſees* ab æterno, *that they will not repent, but die in their ſins,*] I reject the phraſe, as not belonging to the queſtion, my *hypotheſis* being far from yielding, that preſcience doth any other way, but this, or in any other ſenſe, *point out* any *to damnation*. And therefore changing that obſcurer for this other more perſpicuous phraſe, I ſay that God's preſcience of mens not making uſe of his call, is very reconcileable with the *ſeriouſneſs of his call*, which I infer from God's own words, and oath, *as I live ſaith the Lord, I deſire not the death of him that dies, turn ye, turn ye, for why will ye die?* what can be more ſerious than this ſpeech, directed to thoſe that die, and he ſees, obſtinately *will die?* But this differs widely from my *warning him to take heed of falling, whom I ſee actually fall'n*, becauſe whenſoever God thus calls not to fall, the man is not fall'n: when he calls him to ariſe again, being fall'n, he is not irreverſibly fall'n, and therefore accordingly he calls him (not, not to fall, but) to riſe again. And what God doeth thus in time, God *ab æterno* decreed to doe, and his foreſeeing it would not produce the deſired effect, was in order of nature after the decree of doing it, and therefore is in no reaſon to The fifth.

have any influence on (ſo as to change) the decree, and if not ſo, then the decree ſtanding ſtill in force, it is moſt neceſſary that it ſhould be performed, and ſo that God ſhould in time call thus ſeriouſly to repentance.

Sect. 21. And indeed, for God to *foreſee* (as he doth, or elſe would not puniſh for it,) that his moſt *ſerious* call will be *rejected*, and yet not to ſuppoſe his call is moſt *ſerious*, is an abſolute contradiction, and ſo cannot poſſibly be ſuppoſed or imagined.

The foreſeeing of *Judas*'s ſin.

Sect. 22. To my argument of *Judas*'s ſin being *foreſeen*, and *foretold* by God, (from whence I conclude that that is *foreſeen* which is not *cauſed* by God, or to which the man is not *determined* by any act of God's will) which you ſay is *very preſſing*, you anſwer by *referring to my judgment* 1. *whether the Prophecies could not have been fulfilled, had* Judas *never been born*: 2. *whether by liſtning to his Maſter he could not have repented, &c.*] To the firſt I anſwer, that the prophecy, as it was terminated in *him*, could not poſſibly have been *fulfilled*, had *he never been born*, and that the πλήρωσις, or utmoſt completion of the prophecy *Pſal.* 41. 9. was terminated in him, the holy Ghoſt by St. *Peter* tells us, *Act.* 1. To the ſecond, that I doubt not but by liſtning to Chriſt, he might have repented, and then God foreſaw that he might, yet foreſaw he would not doe what he might, and ſo *foretold* this; whereas if he would have done otherwiſe, it is as undoubted, that God ſhould have foreſeen that, and, might, if he had pleaſed, have foretold it alſo, as Chriſt did not onely his treaſon, but alſo, St. *Peter's denial*, and repentance alſo. As for that which you ſuggeſt, *that the prophecy of him might be like that of Jonah, conditional*] 1. there is little probability for it, when the event hath ſo much otherwiſe interpreted it, which if it had not done, I ſhould not have reſiſted your ſuggeſtion, as far as concerned his *periſhing*. But then 2. you know my Argument was founded in God's foreſeeing his *ſin* (and not his *periſhing*) and to that his *conditional foreſight*, exemplified in *Jonas* to *Nineveh*, is not appliable.

The argument from thence defended.

Hom. 83. in Mat. *Sect.* 23. That which you cite from *Chryſoſtome, who gives for a reaſon why Chriſt admitted Judas to the Sacrament, that nothing might be omitted that might conduce to his amendment*] belongs not to your *firſt*, but *ſecond* queſtion, and ſo I allowed of it, as you ſee, and am not prejudiced by it. For to your concluding queſtion I anſwer expreſſly, Chriſt look'd on *Judas*'s *not ſinning*, or *repenting*, as *poſſible*, till by his repudiating all the means of Grace, and his *meaſure of iniquity fill'd up*, he withdrew his Grace from him, which whether he did before, or not till his death, I have no means of defining. Onely this I reſolve, that Chriſt's foreſeeing what he would doe, had no leaſt influence on the effect, any more than the *effect* hath on the *cauſe*, or the *ſenſe* on the *object*, God's foreſight being in nature conſequent to, and cauſed by his doing it, not the cauſe of it. And when you ſay, that *if it were poſſible, then the contrary was not certain*, I grant it was not certain, till it was done; and when you infer, *then it could not be foreſeen*, I deny the conſequence, for thoſe things which are not *certain*, till they are done, may by an *immenſe Deity* be *ab æterno* ſeen to come to paſs in time, and ſo that ſight or foreſight be as certain, as a foreſight of what is moſt neceſſary in its cauſes: and the reaſon is clear, becauſe, of that which is done, it is as certain that it is done, as of that which is *in cauſis*, it is certain, that it is *in cauſis*, and being ſo, it may caſt a reflexion on the underſtanding of him that is preſent to it, and ſo is God to *futures*, as well as to the *preſent*.

Sect. 24. And when you ſay in your Poſtſcript, that *it is a contradiction to ſay that things paſt or future* are preſent, *and therefore all things are not, nay cannot be preſent to God*;] I anſwer, 1. that you uſe not the right definition of a *Contradiction*, in ſaying thus, for *future* doth not contradict *preſent*, but *preſent and not preſent* is a contradiction, and ſo *future and not future*; 2. although it be granted of any finite thing, that it cannot be both preſent and future, yet God being *immenſe*, may and muſt be preſent to that which is future, or elſe he is bounded and limited. Yet this doth not infer God to *ſee what is future as preſent* (which you ſay *is to be deceived*) but to ſee what is future as future, which though indeed it be future, yet he by his *immenſity* may be preſent to it. And none of the inconveniences, which you add, follow on this; onely let me tell you (on ſtrength of that Propoſition, *Quicqnid eſt, neceſſario eſt id quod eſt,*) that as God cannot change what is *paſt*, ſo he cannot change that which is preſent, ſo as to make it, when it is *preſent*, not preſent, and then no more can he change that which is *future*, ſo as to make it not future. All that can be done is, either 1. to make that which is *contingent* (and ſo may be or may not be) to become *neceſſary*, by decreeing it; or 2. to come to paſs really, though but *contingently*, or elſe 3. not to come to paſs, or finally to leave it ſtill free, yet to foreſee what will be *freely* done, as much as what will *neceſſarily* be done.

Sect. 25. So that you ſee the maxime which you miſlike, is not ſo much, that *all things are preſent to God, i.e.* repreſented to him *ſub ratione præſentis*, as this, that God by his *immenſity* is preſent to all things, and his ſight being as infinite as his being, this is as eaſie to be underſtood, as the other, or as any *infinite* is comprehenſible by our *finite* underſtandings, which you call *duller apprehenſions*, for ſo ſure are all ours, when we employ them upon *infinites*. You ſee into what a length I am run, indeed much above mine own intentions, but ſhall not repent of it, if it contribute to the diſabuſing you, and ſhewing you the way out of this intricacy.

Sect. 26. This ſecond Letter having ſome enforcements of the old, and addition of new ſcruples, returned to it, by the ſame hand, which I accounted it my duty to anſwer at Large, by a third Letter, (which I ſuppoſe will conclude this controverſie) I ſhall here alſo ſubjoin it. It was as followeth.

The

The Third LETTER.

SIR,

Sect. 27. THough yours of---made haste to me, yet I found no leisure to afford it any serious reflexions, till this---and therefore being already guilty of too long delays, I shall not now encrease them by proeme, but fall immediately to the view of your reply. And in it, what you first lay down, partly by way of *concession*, partly by way of *apology* for your own Notion, partly by way of opposition to mine, I must confess I see not what propriety of application it hath to that which was the ground-work of my Paper, *viz. that whatsoever hath a being, or ever shall have a being, (which though by being future 'tis out of my reach, yet by being future, is not removed out of God's reach,) is objicible to God's all-seeing eye of knowledge*, and this upon the grounds of his *infinite unlimited immensity*, by you and by all Christians acknowledged, and the *no contradiction*, (which alone renders it impossible to God,) which it implies, for God thus to reach out immensly, and see all *ab æterno*, which (and in the manner as it) in time comes to pass.

The ground of our assertion God's immensity, and the no implicancy of a contradiction. God's immensity extends to the knowledge of all things possible.

Sect. 28. Instead of shewing this *implicancy of a contradiction*, (which alone was to have been done,) you have tendred a reason to prove, [*that God's knowledge is not properly said to be immense, in regard he knows all things possible,*] *viz. because they* conjunctim *are not absolutely infinite.* But sure this hath no force against my position, which doth not prove God's immensity of knowledge, by this argument of his *knowing all things possible*, or by any other, but takes that for granted, and needing no proof, and from thence infers and concludes the other, *viz. his knowing all things past, present, or future*, and against this concluding 'tis visible your reason is of no kind of force, [*for that these* conjunctim *are not infinite,*] for an *immense* knowledge may and must see all *finites*, though it self be *infinite*.

An objection against that answered. God's immensity supposed not proved.

Sect. 29. So again, when you say *his immensity cannot relate to time, and place, which are both finite, and you cannot see how any quantitative extension should be subjected in a purely spiritual essence*, and press this with *absurdities*, and *strange consequences*, (as if it were maintained by them, against whom your debates lie,) if you consider again, you will see, there was no cause for it, I am sure in my papers there was none, which when they proposed to your consideration, whether *God's immensity* comprehend not a *commensuration to all time*, immediately added, *and somewhat beyond that, as much as infinite is beyond finite. By comprehending a commensuration to all time,* if when it had that immediate addition to explain it, it can be misunderstood, I must then farther express my self, that I meant, no *quantitative extention*, or indeed any more than this, *that God is, was, and shall be*, from, and to all *eternity*, and as his Essence, so is his Immensity, Omnipresence, Omniscience; he sees and knows all things, not onely that are or have been, but that ever shall or will be, *i. e.* shall ever have an actual being, objicible to knowledge, and even for *possibles*, that yet never come to pass, he sees and knows both parts, 1. That they are possible to be, 2. That they will never be.

A second objection. What is meant by commensuration to all time.

Sect. 30. This I have added in relation to those words of yours, on which you seem to lay weight, [*The time to come is now no time, as the things which merely be possible are now no things, and therefore to apprehend that God is in such time, or that such things are present with him, is to conceive that that is not.*

A third objection.

Sect. 31. Here, First, let me tell you, your comparison, or proportion holds not, being laid betwixt the *time to come*, which is really future, and the things *merely possible*, which shall never be; But passing that, 'tis certain Secondly, that though the *time to come*, according to our finite measures, is now to us no time, *i. e.* is not the *present* time, (which holds equally of the *time past*, which being past is now to us not present,) yet in respect of *God's Immensity* this cannot be said, for that were to incumber him with our *finite rules*, and measure infinite by our span of time, which with me you profess to avert, and abhor.

Answered. What is future is objicible to God.

Sect. 32. So though the things *merely possible* are now no things, (I shall add, nor ever shall be,) yet even these are objicible to him as they are, *i. e.* as things *merely possible*; which yet never shall actually be, for he may and doth see that they are *possible*, and also that they shall not come to pass.

So what is merely possible.

Sect. 33. And when against this you argue, *that this is to conceive that which is not,*] If you mean by it, that which is not *actually*, I grant it, but find no inconvenience in affirming, that God sees or conceives that to be *possible*, which he sees is not, nay shall never be; But if you mean, that if so, *then God conceives contrary to truth*, there is then no shew of truth in that consequence, for his *conceiving* that to be *merely possible*, which is *merely possible*, is to see *according*, (and that is not contrary,) *to truth.* *Nazianzen's* speech that God ἔστιν αἰεί, *always is*, but neither properly ἦν *was*, nor ἔσται, *shall be*, and that eternity is neither χρόνος *time*, nor χρόνου μέρος, *part of time*, is so far from having any unkind aspect on my notions, that it is the very thing that I contend, that we must not go about to fathom eternity by our finite lines of time, but lay all that is done in time, or ever shall be, γυμὰ ὂν καὶ πεπεγχυσιωμένον, *naked and bare* before him, and still acknowledge that beyond this there is an *infinite abysse*, which we cannot fathom.

A fourth objection answered. *Orat.* 42. No proportion between our finite and God's infinite.

Sect. 34. On this what you build, and apply equally to that which is *past*, and *future*, [*that which is past vanishing*, say you, *into nothing, and before it was, being nothing,*] might (methinks) by being reflected on, extricate you out of your labyrinth. For can you doubt that God knows what is now *past?* I presume you do not, can not: And then why may he not as well know what is *future?* When the onely objection to that, being [*because it is not, and he must then know that, that is not,*] you have equally resolved, that *that which is past, is not*, as that that is *future*; and so that your objection either holds against both, or neither; I pray consider this.

A fifth objection answered. God may know that which actually is not.

Sect. 35. Next when you insist, *that the acts of his infinite understanding, in relation to the creature, must needs be finite, as the creatures are finite.*] I cannot apprehend, how you can reap any the least advantage by it, meaning, as the words import, *that God sees things as they are*, for this you know and acknowledge is *my ground* also, and to this it is consequent, (and so not strange,) that whatsoever he sees *ab æterno*, he must

A sixth objection answered.

God ſeeing every thing as it is.

must *ſee, as it is, i. e.* as it is done in time, whether *neceſſarily*, or *contingently*, but no way conſequent, that he can ſee nothing *ab æterno*, becauſe it is in time that it comes to paſs, for that which comes to paſs in time, he that is *eternal*, and *immenſe*, and omniſcient, may (ſeeing it *implies no contradiction*,) *ſee ab æterno*, though I who am *finite*, and whoſe ſight is limited, and finite, cannot.

A ſeventh objection anſwered.

Sect. 36. When therefore you argue, *that it is no more derogatory to his eternal wiſedom, to ſay that he ſees or knows this or that in time, and not* ab æterno, *than it is to his infinite power, to ſay that it works in a finite manner,*] *Me thinks* the fallacy ſhould be too groſs to impoſe on you, upon a ſecond view: The former member of your compariſon expreſly denying his *ſeeing or knowing ab æterno*, which is the greateſt derogation to *immenſity*, and *omniſcience* and *eternity*, when the latter hath no ſuch negation of his *power of working*, but affirms onely that he *works in a finite manner*, (which he may do ſometimes, when there is no need of interpoſing his *infinite* power,) but not that he *works not ab æterno*, which the proportion, if it were obſerved, would exact, and then that would be as *derogatory to his power* alſo.

An eighth objection anſwered.

Sect. 37. The obſerving of this will I hope clear to you that which you ſay is ſo *ſtrange, it being but* the ſame fallacy again in another dreſs (which therefore I ſhall no farther purſue,) or if the reaſon which you add, from the *temporarineſs of the creature, which* ab æterno *had no being, ſave onely in mere poſſibility*] have ſtill any force with you, I hope it will ceaſe to have ſo, when 1. you conſider that an *objective being* is ſufficient to cauſe *knowledge*, and that its being in time is no hindrance to an *immenſe* Deity to ſee it *ab æterno*, for if he may ſee it a day before it come to paſs, why may he not equally *ab æterno?* 2. That *futures*, though contingent, differ from *mere poſſibilities*, that which is *merely poſſible* never coming to an actual being, and ſo being not *future*, and of ſuch I ſhould err indeed ſtrangely, if I thought God did *foreſee* them as *future*, or ſee them as having an *actual* being. It ſuffices that he ſees them as they are, *i. e.* as *merely poſſible*, and why that which is poſſible, though it never be, God may not ſee *ab æterno* to be *poſſible*, I neither ſee, nor am offered by you any ſhew of reaſon. How you come to conceive it ſaid by your adverſaries that *the acts of God's underſtanding are all neceſſarily eternal*, (you mean I ſuppoſe by your whole diſcourſe *ab æterno*) I gueſs not, when he that ſaith *God ſees ab æterno*, what now I doe, muſt alſo grant that he now, *i. e.* in time ſees me doe it, or elſe could not believe him *Omniſcient*. 'Tis the part of *immenſity* to doe both, and of *Omniſcience* to know all things both future, and preſent, and the affirming one of theſe is very far from denying the other.

Difference between poſſible and future.

All God's acts are not *ab æterno*.

A ninth objection anſwered.

Sect. 38. You ſay this *is no convincing argument, God's underſtanding was infinite* ab æterno, *therefore whatever he knows, he knew* ab æterno; *more than this, God's power, &c. was infinite* ab æterno, *ergo, what he does now, he does* ab æterno.] But 1. Who urged that former argument in that form? Not I ſurely. 2. If I now ſhall, your parallel bears no proportion with it, unleſs the antecedent and conſequent be better ſuited than they are; For in your antecedent you ſpeak of *power*, in the conſequent of *doing*, which belongs to God's *will*, not to his *power*, (for ſure God *does* onely what he *wills*, not whatſoever he hath *power* to doe, or to will.) But ſet both to the ſame, *viz.* to his *power*, and then it will follow inevitably thus, God's power and ability of doing whatſoever he pleaſed was infinite *ab æterno, ergo*, Whatſoever he now does he had *power* to doe *ab æterno*, And this is the argument which alone is ſuitable to the former, *God's underſtanding was infinite* ab æterno, *ergo, Whatſoever he knows*, (or now ſees,) *he knew or ſaw* ab æterno, *i. e.* Whatſoever now is, or ever ſhall be done. Both theſe are apparently true, though one of thoſe which you had ſuited amiſs, were falſe, the other remaining true.

God's knowledge ſuitable to his power.

God's coexiſtence to all that ever is, not to what never ſhall be.

Sect. 39. Having removed theſe rubs, which you ſay thus hinder your conſent, I ſhall hope you will yield to as much as I pretend, which is not, you ſee, *that God coexiſts to things that neither are, nor ever will be, i. e.* to things onely *poſſible*, but not *future*, but that God's immenſity is ſuch, as that he reacheth out and is preſent, *ab æterno*, to all that is done in time, and ſo that all that ever ſhall be, is *ab æterno* objected to his knowledge; Againſt this nothing that you have ſaid in your five firſt pages hath any ſemblance of force, and therefore I hope this now will be granted by you, and then I have it under your hand at the bottom of your fifth page, that moſt of your objections will be eaſily anſwered, which therefore I might leave your ſelf to doe; but having a little more leaſure than ordinary, I will a while accompany you in the view of every of them; and begin with your defence of your *firſt objection*.

The enforcements of the former objections anſwered.

The firſt enforcement of the firſt.

Sect. 40. And there Firſt, when to prove it to imply a *contradiction that a thing* that is not, (as, ſay you, *all mere poſſibles are,*) *ſhould be intelligible*, you thus argue, *its being intelligible implies that it is, ſo it is, and it is not, (which is a contradiction,)* the fallacy is two fold, 1. You confound *futures* that are (by being ſuch) ſuppoſed to have an *objective* being, though not as yet an actual, with *mere poſſibles*, which never ſhall be, and ſo are not *future*, but onely *poſſible* to be, and agreeably are ſeen and known onely to be *poſſible*, but not to be *future*; and 2. You confound an *objective* being, which alone is implyed in being *intelligible*, with *preſent*, or *actual* being; and now take it out of theſe ambiguities, and ſet it as it is, that *God* ab æterno *did or now doth ſee that which to day is not, but to morrow ſhall be*, and then what is become of that, [*is and is not,*] *i. e.* of the *contradiction?* or conſequently of your whole cauſe? Nothing being impoſſible to God, but what implies a *contradiction*; which therefore again I preſs; ſhew the *contradiction*, or yield the cauſe.

The ſecond.

Sect. 41. Secondly, when to your ſaying that *all things paſt, preſent, or poſſible, are known to the divine wiſedom, I returned a* parentheſis, [*No man demands any more,*] and you now reply, *that I did not fully apprehend your meaning, which was that God knew all things poſſible, not as future*, my rejoynder is, that I well diſcerned the difference betwixt *poſſible* and *future*, all things being not future, which are poſſible; Yet becauſe all futures are poſſible, (though all poſſibles are not future,) I could not miſapprehend your words, which ſpake of *all things poſſible*,] in concluding that all futures were comprehended under that ſtyle of *all things poſſible*, for ſure *futures* are in that number, and then if all futures were intelligible to God, and by you granted to be infallibly known by him, this as I ſaid, was all I demanded. There is difference I conceive, betwixt *poſſible* and *merely poſſible*, all futures are *poſſible*, but what is *merely poſſible* excludes futurity. Sometimes you ſpeak of *mere poſſibilities*, and then I never apprehend you to mean *futures*, as when you ſpeak of *all that is poſſible*, I am obliged to do.

Poſſible and merely poſſible differ.

Sect. 42. Now then if you ſpake, or ſpeak of *mere poſſibilities*, and ſay that God knew all things merely poſſible, as merely poſſible, and not as future, you ſay moſt truly, but then your example of *A. B's future marriage* is nothing to your purpoſe, for if it be conſidered as future, then though it be yet poſſible to be, or not to be, yet it is not *merely poſſible*, for by being ſuppoſed *future*, it is conſequent that it ſhall be, whereas what is *merely poſſible*, ſhall never be. When therefore you ſay, *both are known by God as poſſible*, (viz. *that he ſhall marry, and that he ſhall not,*) *neither as future*, you deceive your ſelf, for though he ſees both as *poſſible*, yet he ſees one as *future*, *viz.* as contingently future, future when it might be otherwiſe, and the other as *merely poſſible*, *i. e.* not future, ſees it, I ſay, as future, not by conſequences, or *per ſcientiam mediam* onely, in the ordinary notion of that, *viz.* if this be, that will follow (for which ſcience there is place ſometimes in things *merely poſſible*, and not *future*, as in the example of the Oracle concerning the men of *Keilah*, that if *David* truſted them, they would deliver him up, when yet he not truſting himſelf to them, they did not, could not deliver him,) but by reaching out ſo far as to ſee it done, in that other notion of *Scientia media*, whereby God ſees what man *will freely doe* and not onely *conditionally* what he might or would doe. *Scientia media.*

Sect. 43. Your following objections againſt this, *that what is known as future, is certainly known will be, but* A. B's *marriage is altogether uncertain*,] is of no more force than the anſwer of the double neceſſity, *ſimplex*, and *ex hypotheſi*, evacuates, for what is *certainly known will be*, may be alſo in reſpect of the agent uncertain, as being free for him to doe, or not to doe, which notwithſtanding when he hath done, it is then certainly what it is, and as ſo, it is ſeen by God from all eternity.

Sect. 44. Thirdly, when I ſaid that the *having no being in act, is a phraſe proportioned to the thing, and to our finite underſtandings*, 'tis viſible, 1. That I ſpake of the *phraſe*, and nothing elſe. 2. That my meaning is, *that to our finite underſtandings* that is not preſent, or in act, which is ſtill future, but yet God by his *immenſity* may reach out, and be preſent to it, or ſee it, as we do that which is before our eyes.

Sect. 45. And when againſt my words you argue thus, [*if it be proportionable to the thing, then it is alſo to God's underſtanding which depends thereon*,] 'tis plain again, that you miſapprehend me, for I oppoſe God's *infinite*, to our *finite* underſtandings, and not *God's underſtanding* the thing, to the *reality* of it; God underſtands it, as it is, and ſo ſees that future, and contingent, which is truly ſo, (as *Cicero* ſaith, *Ut præterita ea vera dicimus quorum ſuperiori tempore vera fuerunt inſtantia, ſic futura, quorum conſequenti tempore vera erunt inſtantia, ea vera dicemus*) but till it actually be, God ſees it by his *infinite ſcience*, which by our *finite* we cannot reach. The third. *De Fato.*

Sect. 46. Let it then be granted that *God's underſtanding depends on the thing*, what follows thence? No more but this, that future contingents having yet no being in act, and therefore being not viſible to our finite faculties, have yet a being objective, as being really, though contingently future, *and God's knowledge being proportioned to the things*, and depending on them as ſuch, *i. e.* as future contingents, and not as actually being, theſe he knows by his infinite knowledge.

Sect. 47. But ſay you, *his underſtanding can be no more actual than the thing is from whence he derives that underſtanding*,] what truth is there in this? I know what is paſt, my knowledge is *actual*, but the thing *paſt* is not ſo; I know if the courſe of nature be not altered, or, (which as to this matter, is equivalent, I believe,) the Sun will riſe to morrow, here my *knowledge* or belief is *actual*, but the *object* is *future*, not yet actual, ſave onely that it is now actually true, that the Sun will riſe then. And then why may not *God's knowledge* be *actual* either of what is *paſt*, or *future*, (and ſo now actually is not,) and yet he ſee it as it is, *i. e.* what is paſt as paſt, what future as future,

Sect. 48. Fourthly, when to my queſtion, *Why, if God ſees before, that which in after time hangs in the balance of humane indetermination, he may not alſo foreſee which end of the balance will at length overpoiſe?*] You anſwer, *that the foreſight of the former is the foreſight of poſſibles, but the foreſight of the other is the foreſight of a contingent future, and that the one is not as truly future, as the other*,] you cannot but ſee, you do not render any anſwer to the queſtion, *i. e.* any reaſon why he may not ſee what is *really*, though *contingently future*, as well as that which is *merely poſſible?* It is true, one is not as truly *future*, as the other, but what ſhew is there of reaſon, that what is leſs future, or not future at all, ſhall be ſeen, and that which is *future*, and ſhall really be, ſhall yet not be ſeen by him that is *Omniſcient?* can its no kind of being, not ſo much as in *futurition*, ſet the advantage on that ſide, and make that moſt intelligible, which hath no being, and that leaſt, which hath? If it do, yet ſure it ſhall be no ground of reſolving that the really future is not at all, even to God *foreſeeable*, or that there is any contradiction in this, which if you remember was incumbent on you to prove, by that of *hanging in the balance*, &c. but is not now attempted by you.

Sect. 49. I proceed to your defence of your *ſecond objection*. And firſt when you grant *that many things are poſſible, which will never be brought to act*,] how could you ſay before, *that it was a miſtake to call that poſſible which God foreſees ſhall never be?* Is that a miſtake which is perfectly true? Or is not God's *foreſight* agreeable to what is? The firſt inforcement of the ſecond.

Sect. 50. But ſay you now, *God that ſees all things as they are, ſees them as poſſible, not the one ſide of a contradictory propoſition as determinately true, and the other as aſſuredly falſe, for ſo he ſhould ſee them as they will be hereafter, but not as they are now*,] I anſwer, 1. God that ſees them as they are, ſees them not onely as *poſſible*, but as *future*, for they are not onely *poſſible*, but *future*. 2. Of contradictory propoſitions, as, that I ſhall kill my ſelf to morrow, and I ſhall not kill my ſelf to morrow,] one is determinately true, I mean not by *determinately true*, that God hath decreed it ſhall be, but it is true on the one ſide, and not on the other; for if I kill my ſelf to morrow, then it is true to day, that I will kill my ſelf to morrow, and if ſo, then it is falſe, that I ſhall not kill my ſelf to morrow. What then is determinately true, God ſees as determinately true, and ſo *ſees it as it is*. 3. If he ſees them as they will be hereafter, ſure this is ſufficient, who would deſire any more? Nay this is to ſee them as they now are, for now they are *future*, i. e. things that now are not, but ſhall hereafter be.

Sect. 51. In your reply to my ſecond anſwer, it is no way pertinent which you ſay of a *bare ſuppoſition proving nothing, yet being granted proving any thing that is neceſſarily deducible from it*. For, 1. when I ſpeak of a *bare hypothetical neceſſity*, you ſpeak of a bare *hypotheſis* or ſuppoſition, which is quite another thing, The ſecond.

thing, your bare ſuppoſition is a ſuppoſing, (though no more than ſuppoſing) that to be, which is not, but our bare *hypothetical neceſſity* is a conditional, as that is oppoſed to an abſolute neceſſity. How wide are theſe one from the other? 2. Then if you review that my ſecond anſwer, to which you make this reply, you ſhall ſee how little propriety it hath to it. It was this, *Change the foreſight into ſeeing from all eternity, and then it is plain, that God from all eternity may ſee that will never actually be, which yet is free for the agent to doe or not to doe, (and God ſees that too,) and ſo is poſſible every way, ſave onely* ex hypotheſi *that it will never be, and as the bare hypothetical neceſſity is no abſolute neceſſity, ſo this bare hypothetical impoſſibility is no abſolute impoſſibility.* To this your reply is, *that though a bare ſuppoſition prove nothing, yet it being granted, it infallibly proves any thing neceſſarily concluſible from it.*] You ſee now how little this is *ad Iphicli boves*; and yet, 3. If it were pertinent, it would not be for your advantage; for ſuppoſing, (as I alſo do,) that God ſees the thing as *contingently future*, free for the agent to doe or not to doe, it muſt by your rule neceſſarily follow, that the thing is *contingent*, and ſo not abſolutely neceſſary, or any other ways, than that when it is, it cannot be, which was all I had to make good in that anſwer.

The third.

Sect. 52. In my *third anſwer* you grant all I ask, onely you interpoſe, *that to our purpoſe it is all one whether God's preſcience render the object certain, or preſuppoſe and find it certain*; and; as if this were, upon the mere ſaying it, preſently granted, as a Maxime clear by its own light, you add no word of proof to it.

Great difference betwixt rendring and finding certain.

Which how far from reaſonable it is, you will now diſcover. And 1. to *render*, and to *find*, are as far from all one, as to cauſe and not to cauſe, for ſure what I *render certain*, I cauſe to be ſo, *what I find certain* is cauſed by another and not by me. And being thus diſtant in themſelves, it is ſtrange they ſhould *to our purpoſe be all one.* Is it all one to our purpoſe, whether I commit ſin freely, when I had grace to abſtain from it, or God cauſe or work it in me? What two things can be leſs all one than theſe? and this the *one purpoſe*, for which the men, with whom you diſpute, do inſiſt on this ſubject, and diſtinguiſh betwixt God's *foreſight* and his *decree*. And therefore as you are very ſolicitous that your opinion ſhould be freed from the imputation of derogating from the *Divine immenſity*, and *Omniſcience*, ſo at this time, it concerns you to be as carefull, leſt you offend againſt God's *purity*, and other attributes, when you make

The great conſequence of this difference.

it all one for his preſcience to *find* and to *render* the object certain; *i. e.* to ſee all the ſins that we commit, and to cauſe them. I pray conſider this, and it will force you either to acknowledge that God *foreſees certainly* what we doe freely and contingently, or to deny our ſins, (*i. e.* voluntary actions,) to be *free*, or to deny that Chriſt foreſaw that *Peter* would deny, or *Judas* betray him, both which he foretold to his Diſciples.

The defence of the objected inconveniences, anſwered. The firſt.

Sect. 53. I proceed to your defence of the *objected inconveniences* againſt my anſwers to them. And firſt, it breaks no ſquare, whether [*in themſelves*] be inſerted, or omitted, 1. becauſe what is in its *cauſes* utterly uncertain, is ſo in *it ſelf*; 2. becauſe you yield to all I ſaid on this head as rational and convincing, and onely queſtion the truth of my *principle*, which you know I was not again to prove in that place, when I was anſwering the *objections*, or *inconveniences*.

The ſecond.

Sect. 54. Your ſecond inconvenience I underſtood before in the very ſenſe that your inſtance now ſets it, and accordingly I rendred anſwer to it, and ſhewed wherein it was that *Exhortations*, &c. were founded, viz. *in the liberty of our actions, ſo long as till they be actually committed, and no longer.* And to this you give no anſwer at all, nor to ought I ſay on that head, but onely ſay over in another Scheme the ſame thing to which I anſwered.

Preſcience makes not exhortations vain.

Sect. 55. In this your new Scheme you ſay, that *had it been known aforehand, that* A. B. *would obſtinately have continued in his wickedneſs, it had been vain to have uſed exhortations, and ſo for God (ſuppoſing his preſcience,) it were vain to enjoyn them.*] Here the word [*vain*] in the obvious notion imports unprofitable, or uſeleſs, and then, 1. I pray conſider, whether it be fit to ſpeak thus of God. It is certain Chriſt ſaw *Peter* would fall, *Judas* would betray him, yet he told them both of it before, and that telling them was a timely admonition, and equivalent to an exhortation, adding of *Judas* a terrible threat, or denunciation, *that it was better for him that he had never been born.* Would you think it tolerable for any Chriſtian to ſay hereupon, it was vain for Chriſt to doe all this? I trow you would not, and therefore will your ſelf think fit to avoid it.

The example of *Pharaoh.*

Sect. 56. Should you have any ſcruple in this, the ſtory of *Pharaoh*, and the paſſages, *Rom.* 9. referring to it, would *à multò majori & fortiori*, ſuperſede or anſwer it. God had there foretold *Moſes*, that he *would harden Pharaoh's heart*, which I hope is much more toward inferring a neceſſity, than Chriſt's *foretelling Peter*, or *Judas* of the fall of the one, and treaſon of the other. And yet God exhorts *Pharaoh* after that, and he that objects againſt his doing ſo, *Rom.* 9. that ſaith τί ἔτι μέμφεται; *Why doth he yet*, after that ſixth judgment, when God himſelf hath *ſent his plagues on his heart, why doth he ſtill, or yet) find fault*, is anſwered, *Nay but O man, who art thou, that diſputeſt againſt God?*

Sect. 57. In the former part of that ſtory, when it was not come to that height, yet it is moſt evident that from the beginning of *Moſes*'s miſſion to *Pharaoh*, *God had foretold that Pharaoh* would *harden his own heart*, and that (alone) is perfectly parallel to our caſe, which is of *preſcience* of future contingent acts of Man's will, yet are all God's meſſages and ſigns by *Moſes* purpoſely ſent to melt, and perſwade him to *let the people go.* Doth any man now want a perſpective to diſcern that theſe meſſages of heaven

Acts of God's wiſedom not ſubmitted to our cenſure.

were not *vain?* Or that ſuch acts of Divine wiſedom, *(his ways that are not like ours,)* are not to be ſubmitted to our tribunal, but adored and reverenced, and no otherwiſe approached by us? But then,

Sect. 58. Secondly, if by *vain* you mean no more, than that which doth not finally obtain the effect principally deſigned, ſo there will be no difficulty in affirming with S. *Paul*, that *God's grace* and ſo his exhortations, *&c.* may be *received in vain*, for ſo God knows it is too frequent for us to doe; mean while, what thorough our default becomes fruitleſs to us, doth not return ſo to God, but ſerves God's

God's antecedent and conſequent will.

ſubſequent (though it reſiſts his *antecedent) will*, which is alſo God's will, *viz.* to puniſh the obdurate, as well as his antecedent is to ſave the humble and tractable, and the more frequent the exhortations are, ſuppoſing grace annext to enable to make uſe of them, (as you know we ſuppoſe,) the more culpable is the obſtinacy againſt ſuch means, and the more culpable, the more juſtly puniſhed, and ſo God's juſtice vindicated from all aſperſion, and Man's freedom aſſerted: And the exhortations, that have contributed

to all

to all this, will not be deemed vain, though they attain not the fruit primarily intended, the ſalvifick effect or deſign of them.

Sect. 59. And whereas you compare this to a *Phyſician preſcribing a medicine, which he foreſees will doe him no good.*] I muſt ask by what means it comes to paſs that that medicine will doe him no good? By its own inſufficiency or impropriety to the diſeaſe, or by the obſtinacy of the patient, that he will not take it? If by the former, I then acknowledge with you that *Phyſician* were *vain*; but that is no way appliable to God, whoſe medicaments are ſufficient, being *the power of God to ſalvation to all that believe.* But if it be by the ſecond onely, then the *Phyſician* is far from *vain*, as doing all that the wit of man can doe, or wiſh toward the recovering of his patient. For he that will not uſe his *Recipe's*, ſeems bent on his own death, and as guilty of it, as he that cuts his own throat, and 'tis no diſparagement to the *Phyſician*, that when he is preſcribing remedies for his fever or conſumption, he doth not cure his *obſtinacy*, or that he preſcribes to him, as to a wiſe man he would preſcribe, (though indeed the event be much other, than it would be in a wiſe man, but that is not the Phyſicians fault,) and as little can the vanity be imputed to God's operations, when by our defaults onely they prove uneffectual; God himſelf, *Iſa.* 5. appealing to us in the like caſe, *what could he have done more to his vineyard which he hath not done*, when yet *pro uvis labruſcas, inſtead of grapes it brought forth nothing but wild grapes.* The uneffectualneſs of God's acts not chargeable on him.

Sect. 60. In that place no doubt it was poſſible for God to have done ſomewhat which he did not, *viz.* to have forced the ground to bring forth good grapes, but to a Vineyard interpreted there to be the houſe of *Iſrael*, to a *rational Vineyard*, and to that which was to be left in a ſtate of rewardableneſs, of doing and not doing, of freedom, the dowry of the will of men and Angels, with which they were created, this was not competible, and therefore 'tis truly ſaid, *God could doe no more, than he did*, or doth, (whatſoever the event be and be foreſeen by him,) and that is as contrary as is poſſible to the objection of *vainneſs.* Force not competible to a rational vineyard.

Sect. 61. For the enforcing the *third inconvenience, you ſay, it ſeems hard that final impenitents ſhould from all eternity be reprobated, unleſs conditionally,*] never conſidering, what was moſt conſpicuous in my anſwer, that *final impenitence* it ſelf is that onely *condition.* When therefore you ſay, *It were, as if a perſon ſhould be ſentenced to death for a fact before it be committed*, you fall back into the two miſtakes, which my anſwer, if adverted to, had prevented. 1. You ſpeak of a perſon ſimply, and abſtracted from guilt, when I ſpeak of a *final impenitent, i. e.* a perſon ſo very ill qualified, and ſouly guilty. 2. I ſuppoſe his ſentence to be founded in his guilt, and his guilt in order before his ſentence, but both of them in the mind of God, (who ſeeing his guilt, awards that puniſhment, adapts his revenge to that fact,) ſeen as paſt, before ever that ſentence goes out againſt him. The third.

Sect. 62. Here you ſay, *A. B's Salvation was* ab æterno *poſſible*, (which I grant,) *and thence infer, that God did not* ab æterno *ſee his damnation as certain, but onely as poſſible.* But I deny the conſequence, for he may ſee both his ſalvation and damnation as poſſible, and yet ſee one of them as onely poſſible, the other being alſo future, which is ſomewhat more, than *onely* or *barely poſſible.* Mean while nothing hinders, but what is, (and God ſees,) thus future, *he might by his omnipotent power have prevented*, (which yet, you ſay, by my reaſon he could not,) onely then, he had not ſeen it as future, but as that which would have been, if he had not prevented it.

Sect. 63. Again you ſay, *that if God had infallibly foreſeen that* A. B. *living longer would unavoidably have fallen into ſin, and therein have perſevered till death, you verily believe, in regard of his goodneſs and love to mankind, not onely in general,* 1 Tim. 2. 4. 2 Pet. 3. 9. *but to* A. B. *himſelf,* Ez. 18. 32. *that God would take him away in his infancy, as ſoon as baptized, when he was in the ſtate of grace and ſalvation.*] In this proceſs of yours, I wonder whence the word *unavoidably* came. For I that according to your ſuppoſition, look on *A. B.* as one *baptized*, and in the *ſtate of grace, and ſalvation*, can never grant that he *unavoidably falls* and finally perſeveres in ſuch ſin, as brings damnation; I grant he may fall, and that finally, but ſure not *unavoidably*, for by that grace he was enabled to ſtand, and if he fall, he falls *wilfully*, but that is not *unavoidably.* Wilfull falls are not unavoidable.

Sect. 64. And what if *God ſees from all eternity that he will* thus *fall*, doth that render his *fall unavoidable?* No, but God's foreſeeing that he would fall wilfully, when he had grace to ſtand, (which circumſtance he foreſaw, as well as the fall it ſelf,) muſt inſer the quite contrary, that when he falls he might have ſtood, and ſo fell not *unavoidably.* Nor made ſo by God's preſcience.

Sect. 65. But then leaving out that unſeaſonable word, [*unavoidably*,] which in all reaſon you might have done, when in relation to the certitude of God's preſcience you had ſaid, [*infallibly foreſees*,] there will then be no ground of truth in that propoſition, no ſhew of proof of it from the *goodneſs* and φιλανθρωπία *of God to all*, or to any particular, as thoſe texts or any other expreſs it, for from none of thoſe it is rendred probable in any degree, that they which are baptized, and have *ſufficient* grace given them, and promiſe of *abundance*, if they make uſe of it, ſhall have violent reſtraints, or be taken out of the World, rather than they ſhall *fall into wilfull ſin.* Conſult the places again and you will ſoon find there is no propriety in them for the proof of this. God's love to mankind engages him not to prevent them by death, whoſe fall he foreſees.

Sect. 66. And yet if even this alſo were true, it would no way incommodate our pretenſions, for in that caſe of God's taking away ſuch a man, in his infancy, it would follow by our doctrine, that God foreſaw that from all eternity, and ſo that he foreſaw not *A. B.* a final impenitent, which is the deſtroying and voiding your whole ſuppoſition. If it did, it is nothing to the caſe of preſcience here.

Sect. 67. How then this ſeeming advantage could reaſonably incline you, to profeſs it your *thought, that the doctrine of preſcience is very much inconſiſtent with the omnipotence and goodneſs of God*, &c. and that 'tis *ſwallowed without examination*, I now leave you candidly to conſider, by your reflexions on the ſtrength of that reed you laid this weight on. Judge I pray, might not God, if he would, have created a world of men, taken them up into Heaven, and crowned them, (if crowning it could be called,) with everlaſting bliſs, and ſo left none of them in the hazards of this World? Yet did not (it is evident by the fact,) his love of mankind oblige him to this, but men are left to vaſt dangers, and multitudes fall under them. Muſt all this now be imputed to God's ignorance how all things would frame in the world in this other courſe, which yet it appears he hath choſen? The conſequences are too horrid to inſiſt on.

Let

Adam's ſin foreſeen by God, yet not prevented.

Let us inſtance once for all in *Adam*, 'tis certain he fell, and in him all his poſterity, did not God foreſee and know this, till the effect told it him? Then how was Chriſt given *in decreto divino*, before the creation of the World? I hope you will not ſay he was not ſo given, when the Scripture is in many places ſo expreſs for it, eſpecially, *Epheſ.* 1. 4. and when God's decrees are *ab æterno*, and ſo eſpecially this, the foundation of all the reſt, of thoſe that concern our ſalvation. Yet can I as little imagine what elſe you can ſay, unleſs you will forſake your hypotheſis.

Evidence that it was foreſeen. The ſame of all other ſins.

Sect. 68. For if he decreed Chriſt before the creation, then he foreſaw there would be need of him, if ſo, then he foreſaw *Adam*'s fall, and then why may he not have foreſeen all other mens ſins, all contingent future events, of which he is no more the authour, and of which there is no more neceſſity that the free agents ſhould act them, than there was that *Adam* ſhould ſin before he was created. I pray conſider this, and it will doe your whole buſineſs.

That preſcience derogates not from omnipotence.

Sect. 69. But let us examine your reaſons, by which you will approve your affirmation, that *preſcience* ab æterno *derogates from omnipotence*. You inſtance in *King Charles's death*, and you might have done the like in the death of Chriſt, whereof the ſacred writ teſtifies, that it was *by the determinate counſel and foreknowledge of God*. Now *preſcience being admitted*, ſay you, *it was as certain that* King Charles *ſhould die*, Jan. 30. *as now it is that he did die that day, and to that it is conſequent, that it could not have been prevented by omnipotence it ſelf.*] Your conſequence I deny, *ſub hâc formâ*, becauſe he that ſaw it would be that day, equally ſaw, both that he might, and that he would not prevent it. By his *omnipotence* it is certain, he might, by his *will* and *wiſedom*, (now revealed,) that he would not prevent it, by his *omniſcience*, that from all eternity he knew he would not, by his very mercy to him, and for other moſt wiſe ends, that he would actually deliver him up to the wills of the malicious, *able to deſtroy the body*, but no more, which again is founded in his foreſight of their malice, and muſt ſuppoſe it. All which makes it as infallible, that God might have prevented it, as that he would not, did not, therefore this is far from *derogating from his omnipotence*, in this of his not being able to prevent it, the contrary to which is by this our Scheme expreſly eſtabliſhed.

Sect. 70. This περὶ ὑποτων, for my poſitive anſwer, you cannot but know already, all the neceſſity conſequent to preſcience is the *neceſſity ex hypotheſi*, it is neceſſary to be while it is, and becauſe it will be, therefore God foreſees it will be, and if men would have done otherwiſe, God would have foreſeen otherwiſe.

Sect. 71. When you take it for mine *acknowledgment* then, that *God cannot change that which is future, ſo as to make it not future*, I anſwer, that *ſenſu diviſo* it is moſt falſe, for whatſoever is future, God can change, and make it not future, and then foreſee it not future. But if you meant *Conjunctim*, that remaining future, he could not make it not future, 1. That is a great impropriety of ſpeech, and moſt unreaſonable, that he that ſpeaks of *changing*, ſhould mean keeping it ſtill as it is, *unchanged*, and 2. You ſee the fallacy, that moſt palpable one, of *à benè diviſis ad malè conjuncta*, which I hope will no longer impoſe upon you. The *ill conſequences* you fear and exaggerate, ſhould *God be thought not to have been able to have prevented it*, I ſhall not need inſiſt on, deteſting the thought, as much as is poſſible, and having ſo far ſecured our Scheme from it, that if God foreſees not that he *could prevent any future* whatſoever, I ſhall not think he foreſees any thing.

God's preſcience derogates not from his goodneſs.

Sect. 72. So likewiſe for his *goodneſs*, you cannot doubt but I acknowledge that as fully as you, in relation to our ſalvation: Let us ſee then how I am obliged to deny this again by admitting his *preſcience*. Why, ſay you, *if God willingly ſuffer ſo many to be damned, whom he might have ſaved, where is his* φιλανθρωπια? &c. I anſwer, juſt where you your ſelf will, and muſt place it, unleſs you believe many ſhall not be damned finally. For 'tis moſt certain, God by his abſolute power might have ſaved all them, that yet are now damned, and the ſhew of inconvenience is exactly the ſame, whether God be believed to *foreſee all things ab æterno*, or no. For ſuppoſe we, that God foreſaw not, but ſaw in time as we do every thing that happens in our preſence, and ſuppoſe we a wicked man *filling up the meaſure of his iniquities*, or ready to die in his ſins, I demand might not God, if he would, reſcue him out of that ſtate, convert him into a *Saint*, and aſſume him, as he did *Elias* in the ſanctified ſtate? Queſtionleſs he might, yet without all controverſie he doth not thus to every wicked man, for if he did, none ſhould be damned; Do you now reconcile this with God's φιλανθρωπια, his words and many vehement aſſeverations, (as I doubt not but you are well able to doe,) and then review your own Queſtion, [*if God willingly ſuffer ſo many to be damned whom he might have ſaved, where is his* φιλανθρωπια?] 'Tis not poſſible you ſhould need more words to diſintangle this ſnarle, and in my former papers I ſhew'd you in this place to what God's φιλανθρωπια belongs, giving ſufficient grace, *&c.* to which you reply nothing, and therefore I ſuppoſe conſent to the truth of it, though 'tis ſure both that God by his abſolute power might doe more than he doeth, (and therefore I like not your expreſſion, that he *does what omnipotence could perform*, citing, *Iſa. ver.* 4. In place of it, I ſhould have ſaid, what his *Covenant* promiſe, mercy, juſtice, equity, wiſedom, obliged him to doe, or what was reconcileable with all theſe, without intereſting his *abſolute power*, or *omnipotence* in it,) and that obſtinate ſinners do actually reſiſt, and fruſtrate all the methods that are uſed by him.

Saint *Auguſtine* and *Lud. Vives* their ſenſe of preſcience.

Sect. 73. Of the manner of Saint *Auſtine*'s aſſerting *preſcience* I need not farther inſiſt, than that by the expreſs words of that period I produced, he will have it reconciled with the *free will of man*, which if all would doe, there were little more to be required of them. Yet becauſe you have endeavoured to take off the force of Saint *Auſtine*'s words, and from *Ludov. Vives*'s words on Chapter IX. *Quod ſi indignum, &c. Dicamus à providentia voluntatèque Dei cognitionem ejus proficiſci, voluntatem ſtatuere quod futurum ſit, ſcientiam quod voluntas ſtatuerit, noſſe,)* to draw him to *Calvin*'s ſenſe, I ſhall reade over that IX. Chapter, both Text, and Comment, and give you ſome paſſages out of it; In the Text, 1. That *they are much more tolerable that bring in* Syderea Fata, *a fatality depending on the ſtars, than they which take away* præſcientiam futurorum, *foreknowledge of futures: and that it is a moſt open madneſs*, confiteri Deum & negare præſcium futurorum, *to confeſs God, and to deny his preſcience.* 2. *Nos ut confitemur ſummum & verum Deum, ita voluntatem ſummámque poteſtatem & præſcientiam ejus confitemur, nec timemus ne ideò voluntate non faciamus quod voluntate*

luntate facimus, quia id nos facturos eſſe præſcivit cujus præſcientia falli non poteſt, As we confeſs the ſupreme and true God, ſo we confeſs his will, and ſupreme power and preſcience, neither do we fear leſt we ſhould not doe voluntarily, what we doe voluntarily, becauſe he foreſaw it, whoſe preſcience cannot be deceived, making it the heathen fear of *Cicero*, which now is yours, leſt the *infallibility of the preſcience ſhould impoſe neceſſity, and fruſtrate Laws, exhortations*, &c. 3. *Nos adverſus ſacrilegos auſus & Deum dicimus omnia ſcire, antequam fiant* (mark *omnia*) *& voluntate nos facere*, &c. Contrary to the darings of ſacrilegious men, we both affirm that God knows all things before they are done, and that we doe them voluntarily. 4. *Novit incommutabiliter omnia quæ futura ſunt, & quæ ipſe facturus eſt*, he knows unchangeably all things which are to come, and which he will doe, not onely the latter, but the former, and all of one as well as the other. 5. *He that foreknew all the cauſes of things, among them could not be ignorant of our wills,* quas noſtrorum operum cauſas eſſe præſcivit, *which he foreſaw to be the cauſes of our works.* 6. *Qui non eſt præſcius omnium futurorum non eſt utique Deus*, he that foreſees not things to come, is not God. 7. Of our liberty, *Voluntates noſtræ tantum valent, quantum Deus eas valere voluit, & præſcivit, & ideo quicquid valent, certiſſimè valent, & quod facturæ ſunt ipſæ, omnino facturæ ſunt, quia valituras atque facturas eſſe præſcivit cujus præſcientia falli non poteſt*, Our wills can doe as much as God will'd and foreknew they were able, and therefore whatſoever they can doe, they moſt certainly can doe, and what they will doe, they altogether will doe, becauſe he foreſaw they could and would doe it, whoſe preſcience cannot be deceived. Next in *Vives*'s Comments you have, *Non res futuræ ex ſcientia Dei manant, ſed ſcientia potius Dei ex illis, quæ tamen futuræ non ſunt Deo, ut eſt error multorum, ſed præſentes. Quocirca non rectè dicitur præſcire, niſi relatione ad actiones noſtras, dicendus eſt ſcire, videre, cernere. Quod ſi indignum videtur*, &c. *Things future do not flow from God's ſcience, but rather God's ſcience from them, which yet are not future to God as the errour of many is, but preſent, wherefore he is not rightly ſaid to foreſee, unleſs it be in relation to our actions, he muſt be ſaid to know, to ſee, to perceive, which if it appear unworthy*, &c. There come in the words by you recited, *of God's ſcience coming from his will*, which you ſay is *Calviniſm*, but is not ſet by *Vives* to interpret Saint *Auguſtine*'s ſenſe that way, no nor to aſſert it as his own, but to recite another opinion, that hath leſs impiety in it, than the denying of preſcience would have. Thus you ſee what that Chapter in the Father, or his Commentatour gains you. Mean while I take you at your word that you *grant with S.* Auguſtine *the preſcience of God*, and if you *grant it with him*, you muſt grant it not onely in things which come to paſs neceſſarily, (as all that God decrees do,) but ſimply in all things, and particularly in thoſe, wherein *voluntatis arbitrium retentum, freedom of will retained* is concerned, for to thoſe you ſee he thoroughout the IX. and X. Chapters applies it, and if you grant preſcience in them, you grant as much as I deſire, if not, you deny it (which yet you again ſay you do not,) *more than* Saint *Auguſtine*.

Sect. 74. What you here add as your concluſion from Saint *Auguſtine* in his *confeſſions*, lib. 2. c. 18. *videri non poſſunt ſed prædici poſſunt ex præſentibus quæ jam ſunt & videntur*, they cannot be ſeen but they may be foretold from thoſe things that are preſent, and are now ſeen; and from *Origen*, ἐκ τῶν νῦν τῶν ὄντων, viz. *That God's knowledge of future contingents is merely hypothetical, this being ſuppoſed, that will follow*, &c.] I ſhall now proceed to examine, 1. By a view of your two Teſtimonies, then of your concluſion from them. And firſt for Saint *Auguſtine*'s words, they are not ſpoken of *God's preſcience* or predictions, but of *ours*, and that of things coming from natural cauſes, *Intueor auroram*, ſaith he, *orturum ſolem pronuncio*, &c. *I behold the morning, I pronounce the Sun will riſe.* Look, and you will ſee it manifeſtly; ſo then it is nothing to *God's preſcience* of future contingents, and you can conclude nothing from it. *Philocal.* c. 23.

Sect. 75. And for the Chapter in *Origen's Philocalia*, it cannot be, but you muſt have noted in it, the weight that he lays on the prediction of *Judas*'s treaſon, the general reſolution, that ἕκαστον τῶν ἐσομένων περὶ πολλοῦ οἶδεν ὁ Θεὸς γινησόμενον, *every thing that is future, God ſees it will come to paſs*, (and yet, ὁ προγνὺς πάντων αἴτιος προεγνωσμένων, *the foreknower is not cauſe of all that are foreknown,*) citing from *Suſanna*, 42, 43. *That God is* κρυπτῶν γνώστης, ὁ εἰδὼς τὰ πάντα πρὶν γενέσεως αὐτῶν, *the knower of ſecrets, that knows all things before they are*, then he propoſes the queſtion, Πῶς προγνωστὸν ὄντος ἐξ αἰῶνος τοῦ θεοῦ περὶ τῶν ὑφ' ἑκάστου προαιρέσει νομιζομένων, τὸ ἐφ' ἡμῖν σώζεσθαι, *how God from all eternity foreknowing thoſe things that are thought to be done by every man, our free will may be retained.* Which he treats againſt the *heathen that ſay God's foreknowledge takes away all praiſe and diſpraiſe*, &c. and maintain it juſt as you do, as you will ſee, if you compare your, and their arguing. Now to theſe his anſwer is, *that God from the beginning of the creation of the World, nothing being without a cauſe*, ἐπιπορεύεται τῷ νῷ ἕκαστον τῶν ἐσομένων ὁρῶν, *by the progreſs of his mind thorough all things that are future, ſees them, that if this be, that will follow*, &c. and ſo μέχρι τέλους πραγμάτων, *proceeding to the end of things, he knows what ſhall be.* Which he doth expreſs, to ſhew that he ſees the dependence of all things, not from his *own will, who by knowing them*, as it follows, *cauſes them not, but in a concatenation of humane acts and choices, as when by temerity one walks inconſiderately, and meeting with a ſlippery place falls, which he that ſees, is no way the cauſe of his fall*, ſaith he, adding that *God foreſeeing* ὁποῖος ἕκαστος, *how qualified every one will be, ſees alſo the cauſes that he will be ſo, mean while his foreſeeing is not the cauſe of their being what they are, but though ſtrange*, ſaith he, *yet 'tis true*, τὸ ἐσόμενον αἴτιον τῷ ταῦτά πῃ * περὶ αὐτῶν προγνῶναι, *the thing future is the cauſe that ſuch a foreknowledge is had of it, for it doth not becauſe it was known come to paſs, but becauſe*, (ἐπειδὴ ἔσται δηλ.) *it was to come to paſs, it was known.* Then he comes to a diſtinction in what ſenſe it is true, that *what is foreſeen* πάντως ἔσται *ſhall altogether be*, and ſtates it juſt as we do all along. From all which, (that I may now follow you to your inferences,) you can with no reaſon conclude, that it was his and the reſt of *the Fathers doctrine, that God's foreknowledge of future contingents is merely hypothetical.* You ſee moſt evidently from their ſayings, every where ſcattered, (competently by thoſe which I have now ſet down,) that this was not their doctrine. And this one paſſage, if it were favourable to your conceit, (as it is not,) yet could in no reaſon evacuate all others. *Origen's* teſtimony. c. 21. p. 72. p. 73. Ibid. Ibid. Ibid.

Sect. 76. In your concluſion that which I miſlike is not the word [*hypothetical*] but [*merely*] for that ſignifies God to have no other foreknowledge but that. I doubt not but of all things that are, God foreſees, as *Origen*'s words were, *that if this be, that will follow*, and ſo I deny not *hypothetical foreknowledge.* But I cannot confine God's foreknowledge to this one head, for why may he not alſo ſee, (and as eaſily,) that this, and that will both be? The principal uſe of *hypothetical foreknowledge*, is in things Hypothetical foreknowledge.

merely poſſible, which come not to paſs, (as before I applied the example of *Keilah*, which you now mention.) But what can that have to doe with thoſe things, which do actually come to paſs, and that merely by the free will of man, and by no neceſſity of conſequences? Though, (as I ſaid,) even in thoſe, God that ſees them as they are, both in their cauſes, and moſt caſual, or voluntary mutations, and progreſſion, and all circumſtances concomitant, ſees one thing following (though but freely, not neceſſarily,) out of another, firſt this, and then that, and becauſe this, or upon this motive, therefore that; Which as it is far from aſſerting any neceſſary chain of cauſes, contrary to the freedom of man's will, which in that very place *Origen* largely eſtabliſhes, ſo it is far from a knowledge *merely hypothetical*, for that is not the knowledge of what is, but what will be, if ſomewhat elſe make way for it, which being uncertain, whether it will be or not, there can be no determinate knowledge, that the other will be, which is quite contrary to his inſtances of *Judas's betraying Chriſt*, &c. Which were as really and determinately foreſeen and foretold, as they were really acted. And therefore I muſt deſire you not to think this favourable to the *Socinians* opinion of *God's foreknowledge of future contingents being onely or merely hypothetical*, (though God foreſee *hypothetically*, yet not *onely* ſo,) or that this key will fit all places of Scripture, which foretell things to come, becauſe it fits the caſe of *Keilah*, and *Jer.* 38. 17. and ſome few others.

Sect. 77. I have the more largely inſiſted on this, becauſe it ſeemed ſo likely to miſlead you, there being ſome examples of foreknowledge merely hypothetical, from whence yet to infer that *God's foreknowledge* indefinitely, is merely ſuch, *i. e.* that he hath no other, is the ſame errour as from particular premiſſes, or from one or two examples to make an univerſal concluſion.

The fourth.

Sect. 78. On view of your fourth objected inconvenience, you grant all I ſaid in anſwer to it, onely, ſay you, *the former difficulty ſeems to recurr, how* A. B. *may be truly ſalvable, when if abſolute preſcience be granted, his damnation was as certain before he was born, as it will be when he is in Hell.*] I anſwer, 1. That in anſwer to objected inconveniences all that can be required of any man is, to ſhew that that inconvenience doth not follow, not to eſtabliſh the principal doctrine again, (which before had been done by the no implicancy of contradiction, which left it poſſible for God to foreſee future contingents, and then by conſideration of his omniſcience, which qualifies him to know every thing which is *ſcibile*, or the knowing of which implies no *contradiction*, and then by the teſtimonies of the *Prophets*, who from God's preſcience foretold ſuch futures,) having therefore done all that was incumbent on me, I had hoped the difficulty would not ſtill have remained, when all I ſaid was granted. But ſeeing it doth, I anſwer, 2. That ſuppoſing *God's eternal preſcience*, it cannot but as clearly appear, that *A. B.* not onely may be, but is truly ſalvable, whilſt he is *in via*, as that he is damned, or no longer ſalvable, when he is in Hell. For ſuppoſing *A. B. in via*, to be one, for whom in God's decree Chriſt died, and ſuppoſing God's eternal preſcience of all that is, (unqueſtionably of all that he himſelf will doe, as he ſure will all that is under his *decree*,) It muſt thence neceſſarily follow, that God foreſees him ſalvable, and ſuppoſing that at length he is damned, it doth but follow, that God foreſees him damned; Theſe two things then by force of *preſcience* are equally clear, that he is one while ſalvable, another while damned, and ſo they are equally certain, and if his having been ſalvable do not hinder his being damned, then neither will his being damned hinder his having been ſalvable. He is truly ſalvable who God foreſees will not be ſaved. How ſo? becauſe God truly beſtows upon him all means neceſſary to ſalvation, and that being all that is required to make him *ſalvable*, this is as truly done, when the effect follows not, as when the means are moſt ſucceſsfull. And God's preſcience of the ſucceſsleſneſs, makes no change, hath no influence either on the means, or the man, any more than my ſeeing a thing done hath cauſality in the doing it. Now if he be ſalvable, (though in event he never be ſaved, but damned,) and God's *preſcience* that he is *ſalvable*, be as efficacious to conclude him ſalvable, as his preſcience that he is damned, to infer him damned, what a palpable partiality is it to infer from preſcience, that his damnation is certain before he is born, and yet not to infer from the ſame principle, that his ſalvability was certain before he was born? Nothing can more irrefragably prove the weakneſs of your inference, than that it is ſo obvious to retort it.

Salvability of *Judas* as concluſible from preſcience, as damnation.

Sect. 79. The ſhort is, that which is *future* onely *contingently*, it is certain that it is foreſeen by God, yet till it is, it may be otherwiſe, and if it be otherwiſe, God ſees it to be otherwiſe, and what may be otherwiſe, is not certain to be ſo, and therefore his damnation is not certain before he is born, which is the direct contradictory to your inference; and that method which will equally infer contradictories, of what force it is to eſtabliſh truth, I leave you to judge who propounded the difficulty.

Sect. 80. Here then is the errour, becauſe God cannot err in his foreſight, therefore you conclude from ſuppoſition of his preſcience, that the thing, which you ſpeak of, is certain, when yet it no way appears to you or me, that God ever foreſaw it, but by our ſuppoſing that it comes to paſs. Hence then comes all the ſuppoſed certainty, from ſuppoſing it to come to paſs, which is the *certitudo ex hypotheſi*, a certainty that it is, as long as it is ſuppoſed to be, and then God's preſcience hath nothing to doe with it, but it would be as certain without ſuppoſing God's preſcience, as now it is by ſuppoſing it. And now would you have me ſhew you how *A. B.* is truly ſalvable whilſt you retain your ſuppoſition that he is damned? This, if you mark, is your difficulty, for you have no other ground to ſuppoſe that God foreſees him damned, but becauſe you ſuppoſe him damned, and ſeeing it is, you ſee what a task you have ſet me, even to make two members of a contradiction true together. This I confeſs I cannot doe, and I grant God cannot, yet thus much I will doe for you, I will mind you, that even when *A. B.* is in Hell, the propoſition is ſtill true, that *A. B.* when he was on earth was *ſalvable*, and if it be true when he is in Hell, I appeal to you whether it be not true, when God foreſees he will be in Hell; doth God's foreſeeing him in Hell impede more than his actual being in it? If not, then notwithſtanding God's preſcience, *A. B.* is ſalvable, and ſo now I hope you ſee both that, and how he is ſo.

The fifth. God's ſerious call to thoſe who he ſees will die.

Sect. 81. In your fifth inconvenience, you ſtill adhere that *you think it ſcarcely reconcileable with that determinate preſcience which I hold, for God ſeriouſly to call thoſe whom he foreſees* ab æterno *that they will not repent.* But you take no heed to the place of Scripture, which I demonſtrated it by, *turn you, turn you, why will*

will you die? and, *as I live, I delight not in the death of him that dies*, where it is evident, God ſeriouſly, (if an oath be a note of ſeriouſneſs,) calls thoſe who die and will die. Why do you not lay this to heart, when it is ſo clear, and (you yet give me your leave to ſay,) unanſwerable?

Sect. 82. I ſaid, *when God calls to a man not to fall, he is not fallen*, and, you ſay *true, but he is fallen in God's preſcience.*] I now ask you, how you know he is? Your onely poſſible anſwer is, that if he be fallen, then by the doctrine of preſcience, God muſt foreſee him fallen, and you now by way of ſuppoſition, (which 'tis lawfull for diſputations ſake to make,) take it for granted, *i. e.* ſuppoſe he is fallen. And then, (as even now I ſaid,) to your voluntary ſuppoſition all is due, and with that I cannot reconcile the contradictory, and ſo ſtill what is this to *preſcience?*

Sect. 83. Again you conclude, *that God ſees* A. B. *will never riſe again*, how do you know, or imagine God ſees it, but becauſe you ſuppoſe it true, that he will never riſe again? and if it be true, then it is alſo infallibly true, whether God ſee it or no. And ſo ſtill what have you gained, your ſuppoſing it true is it to which adheres the ſuppoſition of God's foreſeeing, and infallibility conſequent to that, but that adds no weight to that which was before ſuppoſed infallible.

Sect. 84. Again you ask, *can God ſeriouſly call him, who* [*he ſees*] *will never repent, ſeriouſly doe that he ſees uſeleſs, and abſolutely ineffectual?*] I have oft told you, and proved to you, that he may, 'tis certain he called *Pharaoh*, when he had predicted he would not hearken, and he moſt ſeriouſly doeth things to ſalvifick ends, which do not eventually attain thoſe ends, and he foreſees they do not.

Sect. 85. I ſaid that what *God doeth thus in time, he* ab æterno *decreed to doe*, this (as it is apparent by the antecedent, to which the relative [*thus*] belongs,) I ſpake of *God's calling men, ſome not to fall, others to riſe again*, and you reply, that *it ſeems to you utterly improbable that God ſhould doe whatſoever he doeth, by an antecedent decree.*] I have no temptation to leave our preſent task, which is ſufficient for the day, to diſpute that queſtion with you in the latitude, as your, [*whatſoever he doeth,*] importeth. It will ſuffice, if God doeth *any thing* by an antecedent decree, or decree any thing before he doe it, for if *any thing*, then ſure his calls and warnings, which are parts of his covenant of grace, and that is *ſub decreto*, decreed by him. And then what I ſaid before, is ſtill of full force, *God's foreſeeing mens diſobedience to his calls, was in order of nature poſteriour and ſubſequent to his decree of calling and giving them grace*, and being ſo, cannot move him to change what went before, or preſently to diſannull it, and till it be diſannulled, 'tis certain, and exacted by veracity, that he act according to it, *i. e.* that he call thoſe *ſeriouſly*, who yet he foreſees reſiſt him. Why you ſhould here farther inlarge, of the greater *improbability, that God ſhould without conſideration decree what afterward he perceives would be uſeleſs*, I gueſs not, being ſure no words of mine gave you temptation to think that I affixt inconſiderate decrees to our God of all wiſedom, or counted thoſe calls *uſeleſs*, which through our obſtinacy, (onely,) fail of their deſigned good effect.

Sect. 86. No more did I give you cauſe for that harſh-ſounding phraſe of *God's neceſſarily purſuing it, becauſe it was decreed.*] I ſhould rather have ſuggeſted to you theſe words, inſtead of them, that God is *faithfull*, and juſt, and veracious, and ſo performs his part of the covenant of grace with men, howſoever they are, (and he foreſees them,) wanting to their own part.

Sect. 87. What you ſay you underſtand not in my laſt papers, I thus explain; thoſe calls of God which the obdurate reject, are moſt ſeriouſly meant by God to their reformation, elſe he would not puniſh them for rejecting them, as he doth by withdrawing them, *&c.* This God decrees to doe *ab æterno*, which he could not, unleſs he foreſaw their rejection of them, and yet neither could he foreſee their ſo criminal rejecting them, unleſs he foreſaw the ſeriouſneſs of them, and if he foreſaw that, then it is as certain as any thing, that God foreſees that they are ſerious, and although God do not actually inflict puniſhment upon bare foreſight of ſin, yet ſure he may decree to puniſh thoſe whom he foreſees to deſerve it, and that is all that is neceſſary to my arguing. Elſe I might tell you that God that accepts not a temporary faith, will never accept ſuch a man as is anſwerable to the *ſtony*, or *thorny ground*, (who in time of *trial would fall away,*) though he ſhould be taken away before temptations approach.

God's foreſight of man's rejecting his calls and the criminouſneſs thereof, a proof of the ſeriouſneſs of them.

Sect. 88. In that of *Judas*, you grant *that the prophecy, as terminated in him, could not have been fulfilled, had he never been born, but then your Quære remains*, ſay you, *whether it might not have been fulfilled in another?*] I anſwer, 1. it could not have been fulfilled in another, without ſome other diſciples doing what he did, and 'tis certain no other did ſo, and therefore what was foretold muſt have been fulfilled in him, or elſe, (which may not be believed of a divine Oracle,) had not been fulfilled. But then, 2. Chriſt's words to *John* pointing out *Judas* for the Traitour, *he that dippeth*, &c. was a prediction of God perfectly terminated in *Judas*'s perſon, and could not be fulfilled in any other, and ſo your new Quære is anſwered alſo. And that gives you a farther reaſon, (if what was ſaid before to your ſecond Quære were not ſufficient,) that our *Saviour's prediction* was not *conditional*, but categorically enunciative, *verily I ſay unto you that one of you ſhall* or *will betray me*, and he that *dippeth, at that time* when Chriſt ſpake it, deictically, *i. e. Judas*, is that perſon.

The predictions of *Judas* could not be fulfilled in another.

Not conditional.

Sect. 89. In your view of what I ſaid to your ſecond queſtion, you firſt inſiſt on *my* anſwer, that the event proved the denunciation againſt *Judas* was not like that againſt *Niniveh* conditional, but I foreſaw the ſmall force of that, which I uſed onely *εἰς ἴσως*, and therefore added a ſecond, that the prediction of *Judas was of his ſin*, as well as *puniſhment*, and the prediction of his *ſin* could not be *conditional*, nor the prediction of the *Ninivites* puniſhment any way be applicable to it, leaving therefore the weaker, I adhered onely to this, which when you labour alſo to evacuate, by interpreting, [*one of you will betray me,*] by [*unleſs he repent*, &c. *he will betray me,*] You conſider not, 1. that Chriſt's death, as it was from all eternity decreed by God, ſo it was oft predicted by Chriſt, and his reſurrection, and many other things depending on it, and among theſe ſtill the treachery of one of his diſciples is one, and that is not reconcileable with this interpretation. 2. That foreſeeing that he *would be ſo diſpoſed, as unleſs he repented he would betray him*, is the foretelling of a future contingent. 3. That one particular prediction, wherein *Judas* was deictically ſignified, was private to S. *John*, that *lay in Jeſus his boſome*, as appears, *John* 13. 24, 25, 26. And though the words to *Judas* himſelf, *Matth.* 26. 15. may better bear that ſenſe you aſſign, yet the words to *John*, which *Judas* heard not, could be no ſuch admonition to *Judas*, and therefore were

So that of *Peter's* denial.

without queſtion abſolute, and ſo thoſe other to *Peter, Verily I ſay to thee, before the Cock crow twice, thou ſhalt deny me thwice*, when he had profeſſed he would rather *die, than deny him*, are not eaſily healed with this ϑάϱϱιμον, [*unleſs thou repent thou wilt deny me*,] for aſſuredly *Peter* meant not now to deny Chriſt, but reſolved the contrary, and therefore had nothing to *repent* of in this behalf. And when you ſeem to demonſtrate it *could not be abſolute, becauſe* Judas *might confeſſedly have repented, and if he had, then it muſt have been interpreted conditionally*, I anſwer according to my hypotheſis, that if *Judas* had repented, Chriſt had never foreſeen, or declared of him, as he doth, *i. e.* that he ſhould betray him.

Prediction of ſin cannot be conditional.

Sect. 90. But, ſay you, *you ſee not why a conditional prediction may not be appliable as well to the prevention of ſin, as of puniſhment.*] I ſhall ſhew you why it may not, becauſe the puniſhment is God's work, and for the averting of that there is force in the *Ninivites* repentance, which is the *condition* required on their part, on the performance of which God hath generally promiſed to ſuſpend his puniſhments, and therefore the threats are conditional, which in equity will not be inflicted, if the condition be performed. But the *ſin* is Man's work, and to the commiſſion of that no other party contributes but himſelf, and ſo neither is the prediction of it a threat, but a down-right *enunciation*, neither is there any *condition* imaginable to be performed on the other party, anſwerable to the other caſe, unleſs God ſhould forcibly interpoſe to avert it, (and that cannot be imagined to be the meaning, [*except I reſtrain* Judas *he will betray me*] or if it were, it were ſtill an act of God's *abſolute foreknowledge*, that he will doe ſo, if not violently reſtrained) all probable means to his amendment, and particularly the admitting him to the Sacrament, being, ſaith S. *Chryſoſtome*, already uſed to him, and yet, ſaith Chriſt, *he will betray me.*

The iſſue of the whole queſtion whether preſcience of contingents imply a contradiction.

Sect. 91. Now for defence of your Poſtſcript, and the contradiction which that charged on our hypotheſis, I pray mark the Iſſue of it. If you can prove that it implies a contradiction for God to foreſee future contingents, then you certainly prevail; as on the other ſide if you ſucceed not in this attempt, you muſt reſolve your opinion erroneous, becauſe nothing being impoſſible to God but to lie, and ſo to make good both parts of a contradiction, if preſcience bring not this conſequence, it muſt be poſſible to God, how inexplicable or unintelligible ſoever it be to me, who for want of *facultatem analogam*, cannot judge of the actions of an eternal God, and if it be yielded poſſible, then the predictions of Scripture will be proofs beyond queſtion of the truth of it. To this one teſt then let us come. The contradiction you aſſigned was, our ſaying, *that things future are or may be preſent to God.* I ſhewed you the definition of contradictories was not competible to theſe, of which *eſt* and *non eſt* is the known example, and preſent and future are neither preſent and not preſent, nor future and not future. And again in contradictions both parts muſt be conſidered in the *ſame* reſpects, whereas future being enunciated in reſpect of us, and our finite ſight, preſent is expreſt to be in reſpect of God, whoſe ſcience is immenſe, and infinite.

The laws of contradictions.

Sect. 92. Now to this you reply, 1. *That preſent and future, though they are not formal contradictions, yet really and in ſenſe they are, for future is that that is not preſent, but to come, and preſent and not preſent are formally contradictory.* 2. *That my conceſſion that no finite thing can both be preſent and future is enough for you, for God cannot be preſent to that which is not preſent to him.*] I now anſwer to your firſt, that there is nothing ſo falſe, that I cannot make good by this your arguing. In particular, by this the doctrine of the *Trinity* and *Unity* were equally confuted, for *Trinitas* in the wonted notion is not one but three, and one, and not one, are formally contradictory. This is the direct image and tranſcript of your arguing, *mutatis mutandis*, yet I know you deny not the *Tri-unus Deus*, how then can you on no better proof deny *preſcience?* The *Socinians* conformably deny both, but you are partial, and deny but one of them. It is never ſafe to deſpiſe the ordinary rules of art, but ſeldom more dangerous than in this, whereas if Logick were duly revered in its dictates, and nothing thought contradictory in ſenſe, but what is an affirmation, and negation of the ſame thing, this intricacy would be unfolded, and that which is future to me, be preſent to God, without the incumbrance or dread of a contradiction.

The argument holds equally againſt the Trinity, and Unity.

Sect. 93. To the *ſecond* I anſwer, that it cannot ſuffice to your pretenſions, that no finite thing is both preſent and future, meaning, (as it is plain I did,) in the *ſame reſpect*, preſent and future *to me:* When yet what is future to me, may be preſent to one that lives a year hence, and ſo much more to God who liveth for ever. When therefore in your proof you ſeem to ſuppoſe me to *hold, that what is future to me, is not preſent to God*, you did miſtake me, for as I ſaid, that God being immenſe may and muſt be preſent to that which is future, or elſe he is bounded and limited, and ſo not immenſe, infinite, ſo I deemed that, which God is thus preſent to, to be objectively preſent to him, and ſo it was from all eternity, though to us it be not yet preſent, but future. So that the other part of the definition of contradictories, if it had been adverted to, had ſuperſeded this part of your anſwer alſo, *viz.* that it is the *affirmation and negation of the ſame thing in the ſame reſpects*, as here you ſee it was not, and ſo was not uſefull to you.

What is preſent to God, is not eternal.

Sect. 94. But ſay you, *if all future contingents are and* ab æterno *were all preſent to God, then they are all eternal.*] I deny that conſequence; what is finite, and in it ſelf yet future, by its objective preſence to God, is not changed into *eternal*, nay even that which really is, and ſo is really (and not onely objectively,) preſent to him, is yet as far from eternal, as Chriſt's body, by being united to his infinite divinity, is from becoming infinite. This then was but a Sophiſm that you will ſoon ſee thorough.

Sect. 95. And ſo your other part of the ſame paſſage of S. *Auguſtine Confeſs.* l. 2. c. 18. that again you reſort to, was in effect formerly anſwered, by ſhewing that it belonged onely to what is *future, and preſent to us*, and ſo to *our ſight*, not to *God's*. I have now gone thorough your papers and wearied you, and almoſt my ſelf, yet if what is written prove uſefull to you, to the depoſiting that which I cannot but deem an Errour, although I lay no Epithets upon it, it will be far from burthenous to

Your very affectionate friend and ſervant.

H. HAMMOND.

POSTSCRIPT.

Sect. 96. TO extricate you finally out of this difficulty, I ſhall deſire you by way of recapitulation, to conſider apart theſe two propoſitions, the firſt that God's ſcience being as immenſe and infinite, as himſelf, is not limited to things paſt or preſent, or futures, by him decreed, but extends to all that ever ſhall be, or may be; to what may be, ſo as to ſee it may be, though it be not, to what ſhall be, ſo as to ſee it come to paſs, as in time it doth come to paſs, contingent things, contingently, *&c.* Of which propoſition if there can be any doubt to any man, who ſtedfaſtly believes God's immenſity, let the predictions recorded in the Scripture be conſidered, thoſe eſpecially which are of ſins, which it is as impoſſible for God to decree or predetermine, as to cauſe, and yet he foreſees and foretells them, witneſs Chriſt's foretelling *Peter*, that he ſhould deny him thrice, when *Peter* himſelf was ſo far from foreſeeing, or purpoſing it, that he reſolved the contrary. The ſecond propoſition, that there are future contingents, that all the ſins (at leaſt) of men are not decreed, and predetermined by God, or cauſed by any neceſſity. Of which no man can doubt, which believes the Scripture, and therein the procedure of the judgment to come, the difference in reſpect of guilt and puniſhment betwixt voluntary and involuntary actions, (the motions of men and of ſtones,) and again the exhortations and menaces of God in Scripture, and the great ſerioufneſs expreſt, and proteſtations prefixt to them.

Two propoſitions.
The firſt of God's immenſe ſcience.
The proof of it.
The ſecond of contingency and liberty.
The proof of it.

Sect. 97. If taking theſe propoſitions apart, any Chriſtian can doubt of the truth of either of them, he ſees the ſhelves he ſplits upon, and the ſhipwreck of a great part of the Faith, whether on this, or that ſide. But if he cannot but aſſent to theſe truths ſeverally, and onely wants the skill of reconciling the ſeeming difficulties which they beget, when he attempts to put them together, (of which ſort are all the inconveniences, or objections, produced in this matter,) let him on that occaſion conſider, how (more than) credible it is, that he doth not underſtand all things that are, having but *finite* faculties, and *finite* meaſures, which are not proportioned to *infinite* powers, or objects; Which makes it moſt ſeaſonable to ſuperſede all farther enquiries, and to acquieſce in an aſſurance, that God can reconcile his own contradictions, ſuch I mean, as though by the known rules of Logick they appear to be really no contradictions, yet by us are conceived to approach near to ſuch, through prejudice, or thinking (not too little, but rather) too much upon them. In which caſe to reſtrain our farther ſearches is the ſame neceſſary mortification, which it is to reſtrain inordinate appetites, and is a principal piece of duty owing to the Apoſtles precept of φρονεῖν εἰς τὸ σωφρονεῖν, *being wiſe to ſobriety:* God give the world of Chriſtian profeſſours more of it, than is yet diſcernible among them.

The concluſion.

'ΑΞΙΑ

ἈΞΙΑ ΘΕΟΥ ΚΡΙΣΙΣ,

Judgment worthy of God:

Or, an ASSERTION of the

EXISTENCE and DURATION

OF

HELL TORMENTS,

IN TWO

OCCASIONAL LETTERS.

The PREFACE.

So ſervilely diſ-ingenuous is our Nature, *and altogether brutiſh in the purſuit of ſenſual enjoyments, that the propoſal of* rewards *does in no proportion lead us ſo forcibly to our intereſts and duties, as do the threats and menaces of puniſhment. Inſomuch that it may be ſaid with perfect truth, that* God *is far more* gracious *in* ſeverity *than in* mercy; *far more obliging and indulgent in creating of a* Hell, *than in furniſhing a* Heaven. *Whilſt the flaming* ſword *and dreadfull* Cherubim, *ſet at the Entrances of* Paradiſe, *though they ſeem'd meant to* hinder *the return of our firſt* Parents, *prove really both theirs and our beſt* Convoy *thither. We being ſuch, whom* vengeance *onely can* reclaim, terrours allure, *and even* damnation *it ſelf* preſerve *from ruine and damnation.*

Accordingly, it is an Obſervation *verifi'd by full* experience, *that our fears of* Hell *are balanc'd with our hopes of* Heaven; *and our* beliefs *concerning each, anſwer our* Expectations *of either. The* Apoſtle's *aſſertion of mens* heaping to themſelves Teachers according to their luſts, *being as true of their choice of* doctrines: *and however in other things we live not anſwerably to our* Principles, *in this Inſtance we rarely deviate, and by the ſame degrees grow* confident *in* doing ill *at preſent, and* disbelieving *of our future* ſufferings *for it: ſo that it proves a* Contemplation *of great variety to recollect what ſhifts men put themſelves upon, to gain a* truce *and correſpondence with their* vices; *how they ſweat and* labour, *as to* acquire *the real* puniſhments, *ſo to* elude *the anticipated* dreads *and frightfull Expectations attending their miſdoings.*

1. *And firſt of all; how being engag'd in* vitious practice, *they ſtrive to palliate its deformity with the beauteous appearances of neighbouring* vertue; *calling their* angers juſtice, *their* luſts friendſhips, *their* rapines zeal, *and ſo of the reſt. But when this umbrage proves too thin, and the* hypocrite *has the ill fate never long to impoſe on others, and therefore much leſs upon himſelf.*

2. *The next attempt is made to leſſen the regard of* Vertue *and ſhame of* Vice, *by ſuggeſting that both are the production of* opinion: *That* Nature *knew no* Ethicks, *but founding all things in* Community *made no* proprieties *excepting thoſe of* enjoyment *and* poſſeſſion, *whilſt* Law *and* Right *are the mere iſſues of preceding* Wrong, *the uſurping on that freedom, which was the native birthright of mankind; and* honeſty *is nothing but a bondage unto* common *fame, the being a* Fool *to eſcape the ſtyle of* Knave. *But when this* gourd *is wither'd in the day of its appearance* (diſhoneſt practice; *however* faſhionable *and recommended by* Example; *being of ill* mark *and ſeeking* Covert: *never* ſecure *by any* ſtrengths, *nor* ſhelter'd *by* Concealment: *Nay more than this, the partial* ſinner *condemning ſtill in others, the very guilts he flatters in* himſelf, *which makes it evident that naughty practice has an* horrour *in it which in deſpight of intereſt or prepoſſeſſion confeſſes it deteſtible.)*

3. *A freſh* expedient *is ſought, and men are taught to argue, that howſoever Wickedneſs be* ſhamefull *in its* nature, *it will not much import if it at leaſt be* innocent *in its* effects; *and followed by impunity. Which hope is countenanc'd by the indifferent and ſeeming caſual diſpenſation of* ſucceſſes *in the World; where* one event happens to the good and bad, the clean and unclean; him that ſacrifices, and him that ſacrifices not; *whilſt* Providence *is ſo far from* puniſhing *offenders, as to allow to them the moſt ſignal* liberalities; *and* good men *in the interim rarely ſhare in any thing but* miſery. *Yet notwithſtanding this; ſince conſcious* guilt *by ſad miſgiving controlls its moſt aſſur'd enjoyments; and* reaſon *adds her more concluding* ſuffrage, *retorting back the argument, and from the impunity of wicked men at* preſent *demonſtrates that inſtead of peace and ſafety a ſure* arrear *of judgment muſt be look'd for; it being moſt conſequent, that if there be a God, he muſt* be juſt: *and if he be ſo, will puniſh in a* future *world the injuſtices which eſcape and thrive in* this.

4. *Hence it grows needfull for the* vicious *perſon to look out farther for ſecurity; and beaten from the former ſhelters, his next addreſs is to* Religion, *and with the troops of other Criminals he ſeeks for refuge at the* Altar, *which to all purpoſes beſides he ſcorns and deſecrates. And here he boldly claims the* privilege *of* Saintſhip, *of* Faith, Predeſtination, *and thouſands of texts of Scripture, which promiſe* mercy *and forgiveneſs unto* ſinners. *But when theſe flattering expectations are ſilenc'd by the voice of the ſame* Scripture, *which plainly ſays that* no Whoremonger, Adulterer, unclean perſon, *or the like,* ſhall have any inheritance in the Kingdom of Chriſt and of God: *and on the contrary, that* tribulation and anguiſh is on the Soul of every man that doeth evil *whatſoever his opinion be: and as to advantages from outward* profeſſion, *they are but this;* he that knows the Will of God and does not practiſe, *has right unto this one prerogative alone,* to be beaten with more ſtripes than others.

5. *After these frequently repeated misadventures, the* sinner *encourages himself to try a yet unthought of* Artifice; *and since that in all addresses whether to* Nature *or* Religion *he meets with sad abodes of future punishments; he would fain please himself with putting far off* from him the evil day: *suggesting that these punishments both are and likewise will be* future *still; at least are so* remote, *as not to merit our regards, or stand in competition with a* present *satisfaction. But when the hourly* possibilities *of* death *and a succeeding state of* torment, *revenging with severe inflictions the broken minutes of reprieve, intrude upon the* mind; *then this fair* dream *of Comfort likewise vanishes as faithless and as empty as the rest. And now it were to be expected, that the* sensual Man *driven so often from his fastnesses and places of retreat, should yield and be content at last to* part *with ruine.*

6. *But the industry of vice is not so wanting to it self: for though it be made evident that* vertue *is a real* being, *and the demure* pretension *to it will no way satisfie our* interest *or* duty: *also that it appear* Religion *has no* Gospel *for the* wilfull *sinner; and no* impunity *can be expected to transgression, nor advantage in* delay *of suffering: One more, and indeed the onely unattempted* refuge *is laid hold of: to try if that these* punishments *are really so* formidable *as is pretended; or such indeed as a generous and valiant sinner may meet and grapple with. The which is put in practice by framing* easie Characters *of the* inflictions *apportion'd to* transgression, *and likewise shortning the date of their* duration.

And indeed this method *of procedure seems to be the last effort of resolute* Impiety: *when men determin'd not to leave their sin,* rifle *the regions of* darkness *for their shelter, and seek a* refuge *in* perdition: *fulfilling the prophetick strain and high Hyperbole of* making a Covenant with Death and being at an agreement with Hell. *A* method, *which though not perfectly unknown unto precedent* generations, *was rarely ventur'd on; but seems left like to the barbarous Western* World *to be invaded and possest by this our* Age. *Even that, which having attempted* Mischiefs *beyond all common practice, was in reason to look out for* salvo's *and* excuses *no less peculiar. And as if these would not be* authentick *if onely whisper'd in* discourse, *we have liv'd to see them made the Argument of* Books, *and magisterially disputed as sober* truths *and maximes of* Divinity. *For besides the preparatory Doctrine of the* Socinians, *(who teaching men to disbelieve that* Resurrection *which* God *asserts, leave it an easie task to overthrow that which* themselves *contriv'd) We have in our own language been solemnly instructed that the pains of* Hell *are nothing but the* luxuries *of* Earth; *the drudgery of getting* Children, *and* living o'er *again that age which sensual men would live for* ever. *We have been likewise taught those* pains *dwell onely in the* fancy, *nay in the* Wishes *and importunate* desires *of them that are tormented: as if the* flames *of the infernal* Tophet *had been the painted Fires of* Purgatory, *and every criminal were his own* Hell *and* pain *and* Devil *too.*

The *Socinians* opinion of the future state of Souls.

Mr. *Hobbs.*

Mr. *White.*

Lastly, we have been taught that the severity of the day of judgment *shall pass upon it self' when* death *shall learn to* die, damnation *be* condemn'd, *and* perdition *be* destroy'd, *Whilst men have brought again from the infernal pit that monstrous* Heresie, *which should have justifi'd its doctrine, by having been it self* consum'd *there, and lost unto Eternity.*

Resolution concerning *Origen.*

Alas! who will from henceforth be afraid of sin, *if it onely punish by inflicting* pleasure, *torment by hating us with keen* desire, *or end in painless* deperdition? *We* can dwell with consuming fire, *and peacefully* cohabit with everlasting burning, *if the flames be onely those of* lust, *or of* desire; *or be they* real *ones, if they utterly* consume, *and are so great as to be withall most friendly, and calcine us in a* moment.

Which severals being thus nakedly premis'd, *there will not need a farther* Preface *to manifest, how very seasonable the subjects of the ensuing discourses are: nor more to justifie the* Edition *of them, unless it may be usefull to declare, that these* considerations *were so weighty, as to perswade thereto the Right Reverend Father in* God, *the Lord* Bishop *of* London, *(who was entrusted with these Venerable* Remains) *though he otherwise is very jealous without much caution to commit (and will not suffer any other person to bring) the posthumous* labours *(especially the occasional private* Letters) *of his* friend *to publick light: lest, though every thing which fell from that excellent* Pen, *merits its* Readers *full reception, yet wanting the advantage of a* review, *it may not altogether merit and deserve its* Authour; *that is; be not so exactly absolute, as whatsoever past his second view was sure to be.*

May the Charity *of the one in* writing, *and the other in* publishing *these discourses be answered in the advantage of the* Reader; *who can onely, by being convinc'd there is a* Hell, *escape the* knowing *what it is, and will happily confute these* Papers *by being a* Proselyte *unto them.*

ἈΞΙΑ ΘΕΟΥ ΚΡΙΣΙΣ,

Judgment worthy of God:

Or, an ASSERTION of the EXISTENCE and DURATION OF HELL TORMENTS.

SIR,

AS ſoon as I had made my laſt diſpatch to you, it pleaſed God to faſten me to my Bed for ſome days, by the return of a fit, which hath been my frequent exerciſe; from whence being now after five days remov'd to my Chair, I have ſome liberty to review your queſtion; and think it beſt with my pen in my hand to offer to you (in the ſame order which you have us'd) my thoughts of every period.

And firſt for the *terms* of the *Queſtion*, they want ſomewhat of *Expreſneſs*: For ſuppoſing as you do, that the *Wicked riſe*, and are judged, and adding from hence that their ſentence ſhall be that they ſhall *utterly be deſtroyed*, yet it is uncertain, *whether that ſentence ſhall be immediately executed, or after ſome ſpace; or if immediately, whether by a ſwift or lingring deſtruction.* For he that ſhould affirm the wicked to be at the laſt judgment committed to a fire, which ſhould torment for many hundred or thouſand years, and at laſt conſume and annihilate them, would affirm the affirmative of this queſtion; and ſo he, that advanc'd from thouſands to millions of years and ages of ſufferings, concluded (at any the longeſt laſt) with abolition. And then the arguings that are after us'd from God's *Juſtice, &c.* would be of little force, if no more but this were deſign'd to be gain'd by them. For it were ſure as much Juſtice to puniſh *eternally*, as to puniſh *millions* of years, and then annihilate, when the ſuppoſed ground of Injuſtice is the lightneſs, or ſhortneſs of the Acts ſo puniſhed, which would in the Eye of Law, and Equity, bear as little, *i. e.* no proportion with many millions of Ages, as with duration abſolutely infinite. I ſhall therefore take it for granted by him that propoſeth the queſtion, that he means deſtruction immediately following the doomſday ſentence, and that no lingring but ſwift deſtruction.

Next then *p.* 1. for *Origen*'s opinion, granting it right ſtated (as I think it is) I demand for what reaſon that is mention'd? Is it not for this, becauſe *Origen*'s Doctrine was deem'd an *Hereſie* in the Church, and that of ſome ill and dangerous conſequence to be believ'd? If ſo, then it muſt be conſidered, whether they that deem'd *Origen*'s Heretical, can appear to have been more favourable to this, (which will not be found) or whether the ill conſequences of this be not as dangerous, as *Origen*'s, *i. e.* whether the belief of no future puniſhment to the wickedeſt Hypocrites in the world, ſave onely of ſwift annihilations, will not be as forcible a means of ſecuring wicked men (that have no taſte of ſpiritual joys) in the admitting of any gainfull evil, as the belief that after a long ſpace of horrible torments proportionably increas'd to their number of Sins, and the aggravations thereof, they ſhall one day, no body knows when, when the Devils have been puniſh'd enough for their higheſt rebellions and continued hating and oppoſing of God, be delivered out of their flames, and made partakers of viſion of God, and Society of Saints, and Angels, which they ever hated, and never deſire to ſee, or be in their company, and have ſuffer'd all thoſe torments, rather than they would entertain or admit Communion (of deſire and practices) with them. 'Tis poſſible it may be ſaid that the reaſon of the difference is, becauſe *Origen*'s opinion was contrary to *Scripture*, and that this other is not. To this I ſhall make no farther reply, than in the words of *Vincentius Lirin. Imo planè nemo unquam Magiſtrorum fuit, qui pluribus divinæ legis uteretur exemplis.* His onely fault then muſt be, that he urged divine Teſtimonies in uncatholick Interpretations: (And whether that have not place here alſo, I leave it to every one to conſider.) And ſo ſaith *Lirinenſis* again, *Dum parvipendit antiquam religionis Chriſtianæ ſimplicitatem, dum ſe plus cunctis ſapere præſumit, dum Eccleſiaſticas traditiones & veterum Magiſteria contemnens quædam ſcripturarum capitula novo more interpretatur, meruit ut de ſe quoque Eccleſiæ Dei diceretur, Si ſurrexit in medio Tui Propheta—*

Thirdly then, to come to your *Teſtimonies from Scripture*, of the N.T. eſpecially, for proof of the *affirmative*. And 1. for the uſe of θάνατος, ἀποθνήσκειν and ἀποθνήσκειν; It is acknowledged that theſe words properly ſignifie the ſame that in Engliſh *death or dying* doth. But that this ſhould be limited to *utter deſtruction* and *annihilation*, is moſt unreaſonable. For, in the uſing of this argument it is foreſeen and granted, that *death* is taken ſometimes for death in and unto *Sin*: Onely 'tis ſuggeſted that thoſe are *myſtical* and metaphorical ſenſes. Hereupon I infer, that if the words be taken ſometimes myſtically and metaphorically, and yet

no assurance that they are so, but because they are us'd in a matter whereto death, as it signifies a separation of Soul and Body, is unappliable; then may they by the same reason be taken so elsewhere, and not bound to that one which is thought to be the sole literal and proper signification. If *Death* appear to signifie in Scripture somewhat *beside* utter *destruction*, then how can the wickeds utter destruction be *concluded* from the mentions of their death, *&c.* Against this it avails not to say, that the one is the proper, but the other onely metaphorical notion of it: for it being granted that the Scripture useth Metaphors in one instance, why may it not in another *as* probably? This is sufficient to the force of that argument. But then *ex abundanti*, I add, that the *notion* of *Death* for utter destruction, *i. e. Annihilation*, being onely usefull to the disputer, it will be hard for him to produce any one place, either in Old or new Testament, (I might add, or in any other Author) where θάνατος, *&c.* signifies *Annihilation*. It signifies indeed the *separation* of *Soul* from *Body* very frequently; but that is not founded on supposition that in that separation either of the parts, much less both, utterly perish. Nay the doctrine, for which the proposer of the questions disputes, supposes him not to mean death in that notion; for then *eternal death*, the wickeds portion, must be *eternal separation of soul and body*, which is exclusive of all reunion or resurrection at the day of Judgment: *which* the Disputer averts as *heretical*. Nay 'tis to be observ'd that when our *Saviour* came neerest the expressing this matter of annihilation, he chuseth two other Phrases, (not this of death, or any thing that way inclining) *having never been born*, and *having a milstone hanged about the Neck and being cast into the midst of the Sea*, which by an imperfect resemblance seemeth meant on purpose to signifie annihilation: And yet it is also observable to the main question, that either of these states (and so annihilation) is better and more desirable, than the Lot which in God's decree awaits a betrayer of Christ, a wicked man, for that one fact. Thus far by way of evacuating all force in that Argument; To this I shall add somewhat *Positive* toward the laying foundation for the evincing the contrary, *viz.* That *death in Scripture use*, *is* (as 'tis granted in the objection) *oppos'd to Life*. Life then, ordinarily signifies that which results from the union of Soul and Body: but it also signifies the result of another union (*Unio Virtutis*) betwixt God and the Soul, or betwixt God and both. In the former of these it signifies spiritual life, both as that signifies living well, whereby the passages of spiritual vertue betwixt God and us, are kept open and free; and as it signifies pardon of sin, the contrary whereto is expressed by separating and hiding his face, and turning himself from us. In the latter (*viz.* betwixt God and the soul and body, *i. e.* Person of man) it signifies God's favour and protection, of which under the style of God's presence the *Psalmist* saith, that *in it is life*. And then as all felicity is the certain effect or consequent of this kind of union, so life oft signifies felicity, even that of the highest Magnitude. And all this not Mystically or Metaphorically, that I know of, (or if it did, that exception is of no force as hath already been shew'd) but as literally, and with as full propriety as the union of soul and body is call'd Life, *God* being (as the School saith out of Saint *Augustine*) *intimior cuicunque rei creatæ*, than the Soul is to the Body: and so the several parts of that union more necessary to the several sorts of life signified thereby. Mean while it is evident that ζωὴ life belongs not to being simply; for all Ents have not life: or to miserable being; *non est vivere sed valere vita*; but to greater or lesser degrees of happy and joyfull being, the utmost of which is so naturally expressed by ζωὴ, that it wants not the addition of αἰώνιος (oft times) to doe it: *If thou wilt enter into life*, *Mat.* 19. 17. and 7. 14. and 18. 8. *i. e.* the happy being in Heaven: Which is so properly that which is call'd life, that this we live here scarce deserves the appellation in comparison with it. Now in proportion to these acceptions of life must the Notion of θάνατος, *&c.* be calculated. Had life signified most properly [being] simply taken, there might have been some pretence, that the contrary θάνατος should denote the contrary to *being*, *viz. Annihilation*: But when it signifies those so many other things, and not simple entity, 'tis most rational that θάνατος should both technically, and properly signifie the opposites to those severals, *wicked life*, the *displeasure of God*, a *miserable being* here, *separation of Soul from Body*, of *both from God*, and above all, *endless torments in another world*, *Joh.* 8. 51, 52. (and that as somewhat to be *seen* and *tasted*, which were not so well appliable to annihilation) and in many other places; I instance in one or two more, first *Heb.* 2. 14. because there it seems to me to have a mark distinguishing it both from death, the separation of Soul and Body, and from annihilation. For of neither of those I suppose the Devil can be said κράτος ἔχειν, to *have power*, especially not of the latter; which is a work of the same Omnipotency that creation is: Whereas of eternal torments of the wicked 'tis certain that the inflicting of them is intrusted to the Devil; and so he *hath power* over them.

Secondly, 1 *Joh.* 3. 14. Where *he that loveth not his brother* is said μένειν ἐν θανάτῳ *to abide in* that which is there call'd *death*, which is some prejudice to the opinion of *redactio in nihilum*: for in that there is no *abiding*. So that I suppose it clear that there hath been little gain'd to the establishing the affirmative of the question, from this first objection, the use of θάνατος, *&c.* for the punishment of the Wicked.

Proceed we then to the second sort of words ἀπώλεια and ὄλεθρος and ἀπολέσαι there rendred destruction or perishing or perdition. For all these will be ruled by the former θάνατος, *&c.* none of them having any propriety to the sense of annihilation, but onely oppos'd to σώζεσθαι and σωτηρία in the notions wherein they are visibly us'd for rescues or deliverances; sometime from greater, sometime from lesser dangers; sometime for forsaking of Sin, repentance, *Act.* 2. 40. coincident with spiritual life: sometime for pardon of Sin, sometime for temporal cures; and sometime for that state of endless rest from pain, Sin, Frailties, Infirmities, together with addition of all positive bliss in the vision of God. And in proportion ἀπώλεια is fitly us'd not onely for the privations, but contraries to every one of those, the evils extremely opposite to these good things. And nothing hinders but that ἀπολέσαι be taken, *Mat.* 10. 28. not for annihilating but tormenting in Hell, that being the known place for the inflicting of torments, and to that end the fire eternal prepared for the Devil and his Angels, and Men also adjudged to have their parts of it, *Mat.* 25. 41. and the office of the Devils, there to be *Lictors*, and tormentours, and gaolors, which suppose space of detention and cruciating, but are irreconcileable with instant annihilation: see *Mat.* 5. 25, 26. And against this sense of ἀπολέσαι, nothing farther said hath force. For, first, thus 'tis certain, God both can and will punish, *i. e.* cruciate those that fear him not. Secondly, 'tis denied that ἀπώλεια most properly signifies the destruction of the being of the subject, or annihilation, and whereas 'tis affirm'd

so

ſo to ſignifie *Mat.*10.39. it is certain it doth not. For there as it is once oppos'd to the loſing this preſent life, (as our Saviour foretells the complying *Jews*, and *Gnoſticks* ſhould in event do by thoſe very means by which they intended to preſerve them) ſo it is a ſecond time appli'd to godly *Martyrs* who loſe their lives for Chriſt's ſake, of whom it will not be imagined that they are annihilated, when they ſo die. Thirdly, the *Conceſſion* that when applied to a perſon, it ſignifies generally *death* in the proper ſenſe, is a manifeſt prejudice to its ſignifying *annihilation*; for if the death of a perſon were the annihilating that perſon, all reſurrection were ſuperſeded. And this is farther evident by the ſeveral proofs farther produced, as *Mat.* 26. 52. where *they that take the Sword* againſt the lawfull Magiſtrate, *ſhall i. e.* are worthy to *periſh by the Sword* of the Magiſtrate, which yet I hope can annihilate no men, but *onely kill the body*, *Mat.* 10. 28. *And* beyond that *have no more that they can doe*: ſo *Mat.* 27. 20. I hope Jeſus was onely crucified, not annihilated. And ſo in all other places, ſave onely that of 1 *Cor.* 15. 18. where upon a falſe aſſumption it would follow that (not the wicked, which alone were pertinent, but) good Chriſtians ſhould utterly loſe all being, at leaſt of the body, or be never rais'd again, ſo that it is far from being by that *Cumulus* of Teſtimonies concluded that the deſtruction or periſhing of the wicked ſignifies utter deſtruction.

If theſe *teſtimonies* may be believed (ſome of which belong to Chriſt, ſome more to the godly, and no one to the annihilation of the wicked) the direct *contrary* will be *concluded.*

Fourthly, the places that are produced to prove this to be the expectation of the *Devils*, prove it not. Not *Mar.* 1. 24. for there *to deſtroy them*] is to retrench their great power over the men of the World, to deſtroy their *Dominion*, to caſt them out of the bodies *ver.* 25. yea and out of the Temples and minds of men, which they poſſeſt. The other of *Luke* 4. 34. is to the ſame purpoſe, and ſo concludes no more, than that concluded. And indeed it cannot be with any ſhew of reaſon imagined, that the *Devils* ſhould know ſo little of their own *doom*, as to think it poſſible they ſhould at *Chriſt*'s coming be *annihilated.* Nay if they had, their preſent condition being ſo far from the leaſt degree of happineſs, they could have no reaſon to deprecate it, or beg Chriſt to *let them alone*, and diſclaim having *any thing to doe with him.* Their annihilation (if that had been the ſignification of deſtroying them) the ſpeedier it were, it were certainly the more deſirable; eſpecially when it would alſo have ſecured them from the fear of a yet worſe condition, which we know was decreed them, and of which they cannot be doubted to have received preſages, by being finally ſentenc'd to it. If this argument be conſidered, it will certainly warrant my affirmation, that 'twas not annihilation that the devils with ſuch horrour expected from Chriſt, but as appears by comparing with *Mat.* 8. 29. amandation to torments.

Fifthly, the uſes of the word ὄλεθρος for *eternal deſtruction*, exemplified by the Objector by many texts, *Jo.* 3,15. *&c.* if prov'd as manifeſtly, as freely granted by me, are ſtill of no force to induce the deſired concluſion, becauſe it was ſaid ἀπώλεια ſignifies not *annihilation.* And yet it falls out, that ſeveral of the teſtimonies are impertinent to that to which they were deſign'd; as 1 *Cor.*1.18. 2 *Cor.* 2. 15. where they that *periſh* are impenitent *ſinners* (abſtracted from the *doom* that expects them) as oppos'd to σωζόμενοι in the notion of *penitents*, and the next 2 *Theſ.* 2. 10. is of the ſame importance.

Sixthly, the *uſes* of the *nouns* ἀπώλεια and ὄλεθρος muſt be concluded by what hath been already ſaid of the verbs and nouns together, and indeed infer as little toward the undertaken concluſion. For to that two premiſſes being requiſite, 1. That the *puniſhment* of the wicked is expreſt by ἀπώλεια and ὄλεθρος; That thoſe words ſignifie *annihilation*; onely the *former* of theſe is pretended to be *prov'd* from the uſe of the words in the quoted places: the *latter*, on which all the weight lies, being not pretended or endeavoured to be prov'd but rather *taken* for *granted*, which is the great *fallacy* of *petitio principii*, not to be tolerated in the preſſing any Argument.

Seventhly, For φθορὰ it avails nothing: for allowing it to be all one with ὄλεθρος (a word which by the way I muſt now add, having formerly omitted to inſert it, ſignifies bodily *ſmart* inflicted by the devil, 1 *Cor.* 5.5. all one with κολαφίζεσθαι 2 *Cor.* 12. 7. *buffeting*) yet ſtill it ſignifies not *annihilation*, but ſometimes an effect of *ſpiritual death*, or ſeparation of God from the ſoul: *viz.* abominable *uncleanneſs*, which in a Chriſtian is the *defiling* of God's *Temple* 1 *Cor.* 3. 1. and that is granted by the Objector to be uſeleſs to him (and is not rendred more ſerviceable by pretending 'tis Metaphorical, for though to call a man a Temple may be deem'd a Metaphor, yet to pollute, whether Temple or Man, is propriety of ſpeech, and that the onely importance of φθείρειν in all places of the New Teſtament, 1 *Cor.* 15. 33. 2 *Cor.* 7. 2. and 11. 3. *Eph.* 4. 22. *Jud.* 10. *Rev.* 19. 2. and ſo very often φθορὰ *Rom.* 8. 21. *vid. Annotat.* 2 *Pet.* 1. 4. and 2. 12. twice, and 19.) Sometimes the corruption of the body in the grave, 1 *Cor.* 15. 42. and 50. ſometimes for hurt to the man, *Col.* 2. 22. and ſometimes for the puniſhments that await the wicked, *Gal.* 6. 8. and oppoſed to an happy everlaſting ſtate called ζωὴν αἰώνιον, and by that oppoſition not prejudiced but rather concluded to be an everlaſting miſerable ſtate. For whereas the contrary is ſuggeſted without offer of proof, *viz.* that *deſtruction* being oppos'd to eternal life, doth therefore ſeem to ſignifie that which is moſt oppoſite thereto, *viz.* real and *eternal deſtruction*, this is indeed ſcarce ſo much as a ſeeming or probability, very far from a demonſtration. For ſure eternal miſerable being is moſt properly contrary and ſo oppoſite to eternal happy being. And though in *Metaphyſical* conſideration abſolute *no being* be moſt oppoſite to *being*, and ſo to eternal being; yet in *moral* ſpeaking it is not ſo; For ſure eternal ill being, eternal torments, are much worſe than no being at all: the bare *Bonitas Entis*, which Dr. *Twiſs*, and ſome Predeſtinarians fly to, being, when joyn'd with infinite miſeries, very far from being valuable to him that hath it; If we believe *Chriſt*, *having never been born*, is more deſirable than it. What is ſaid on this word φθορὰ to the interpreting of 2 *Pet.* 2. 12. is in my opinion not to be adhered to: Ἄλωσις and φθορὰ, are, I think, to be actively taken, and ſo γεγεννημένοι εἰς ἅλωσιν καὶ φθορὰν will ſignifie *thoſe that take*, and *corrupt others*, the filthy *Gnoſticks*; (ſee *Annot.*) and in that ſenſe, of which onely the words are capable, the phraſe hath no ſhew of uſefulneſs to the Objectour. For then ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν καταφθαρήσονται readily ſignifies in *their corrupting or debauching others*, they *ſhall be deſtroyed*, *i. e.* puniſhed ſeverely (I ſuppoſe eternally, though that word enforce it not.)

Eighthly,

Eighthly, For καταδαξαι, *Luke* 19.27. the full importance of it is to denote a ſignal *execution* of puniſhment on malefactors, brought forth and ſlain before the provoked King, but no more implies *annihilation* than any of the former. Nor is it at all diſcernable by that place whether the *puniſhment* executed were to be *ſwift* or *lingring*, it onely ſignifies *ſharp*, and not to be averted; and ſolemn, and *exemplary*, as for a great and provoking crime: and indeed the paſſage wherein we find that phraſe being a *Parable*, the Notion of it muſt be accorded thereunto; and ſo cannot be other than ſuch as a *Prince* executes on his rebel ſubjects, neither annihilation on one ſide, nor eternal puniſhments on the other; and ſo that phraſe will be argumentative on neither part.

Ninthly, For καταναλίσκειν, and the other words of the ſame nature with that, καταναλίσκειν and ἐσθίειν, the utmoſt that can be pretended of them is, that thoſe things that are thus *burnt*, *conſum'd*, and *devour'd*, are utterly *changed* from their former ſtate, not that they are *annihilated*. For what is utterly burnt is turn'd to *aſhes*, but then *aſhes* and not *nothing* are the term of that *corruption*. So likewiſe that which is *eaten* and maſticated never ſo ſmall and converted into Chyle, then bloud, then fleſh, the reſt going out into the draught, is ſtill but thus chang'd not annihilated. 'Tis not indeed what it was, but thereby it onely the more fitly repreſents thoſe infernal torments, and ſtate, which is as wide a moral mutation and departure from all good or deſirable to any appetite, as can be imagined. And certainly this is all that can pretend to be deduc'd from common interpretation (which is referr'd to) of thoſe Phraſes. For if the *wicked* were granted to be deſtroy'd exactly after the manner of *Chaff*, *&c.* yet as chaff is not annihilated, ſo would it not follow that the wicked are annihilated. But then withall it will be juſt to remember, that *Similitudes* and *Parables* muſt not be bound to ſuch accurate ἀναπόδοσις, as that every circumſtance in the parable be accounted for ſtrictly in the application, but onely the main lineaments, wherein the deſign'd reſemblance conſiſted, preſerv'd, *viz.* that as after the threſhing and winnowing the good corn, and laying it up carefully in the granary, the manner is to ſet fire to the chaff, which licks it all up, and never ceaſeth till it have conſum'd all, and in that reſpect is call'd ἄσβεστον πῦρ: (the wind conſpiring with the fire, as in their open threſhing floors on the tops of mountains the Jewiſh husbandry directed) ſo after the trying and purging and at length rewarding the godly with eternal Heaven, 'tis to be expected that God ſhall proceed to deal ſeverely with the wicked, and then that ſeverity be ſuch as they ſhall not poſſibly avert nor be able to undergo without the utmoſt moral damage to them. As for the uſe of καταιρω, *Heb.* 13. 11. of *ſacrifices* burnt to aſhes, *Act.* 19. 19. of *Books* burnt alſo, and *Rev.* 8.7. of *trees*, and green *graſs* burnt up, it is no more than hath been yielded to the force of the former places. For ſtill none of theſe were annihilated, they were burnt to aſhes, not to nothing. Nay when the very phraſe ἀσβέστῳ πυρὶ is ſometimes joyn'd with the *burning* of the *wicked*, as of chaff, it is not obvious to render any reaſon for the choice of this phraſe, but what will be founded in the *eternity* of their torments and being, for fire we know goes out it ſelf when the fewel is exhauſted, and ſo the *Unextinguiſhableneſs* of the one muſt be anſwered with the *durableneſs* of the other.

Tenthly, For the ſame and like *Phraſes* in the *Old Teſtament*, granting (according to the mind of the Objectour) that they include the *ſecond death* after the general judgment: yet ſtill this avails nothing to the deſir'd concluſion, unleſs it be farther prov'd that thoſe Words and Phraſes do ſignifie *abſolute* utter *deſtruction*, or annihilation, for upon that onely the affirmative of the queſtion depends, and for that there is no leaſt pretence of proof offer'd here.

Eleventhly, For the Phraſe θανάτῳ θανατοῦσθαι, it will never be uſefull to the diſputer: for if the firſt death be the Act of ſeparation of Soul and Body, and ᾅδης not the torments of *Hell*, but the ſtate or continuance of that *ſeparation* (as it will be found to ſignifie in all the places of the Bible, and in the moſt and beſt heathen Authours) then the ſecond death being the taking away them, muſt by conſequence be founded in the *reunion* of the Soul and Body, that reunion being in propriety the diſſolving of ſeparation, Act and State both.

Granting therefore that the caſting of *death* and *Hades* (I muſt ſet that word inſtead of Hell, which in uſe ſignifies another thing, even that whereinto it is ſaid there to be caſt) *into the Lake of fire*, *Rev.* 20. 14. is *the ſecond death*: and the converting thoſe (Act and State) into a State of ſenſitive and real miſery: what can follow thence to the diſputers advantage, That according to the *Rabbinical notion*, it ſignifies final and utter *deſtruction*? Why, let it do ſo; and the reſult is, that then death being finally and utterly deſtroy'd, a never ceaſing State of being (though that moſt miſerable) now takes place, and that is Eternity of torments, far remov'd from annihilation: for though utter deſtruction of *poſitive Entities* may be deem'd to ſignifie annihilation, yet when attributed onely to *privative* Entities, death and *Hades*, it can in no reaſon ſignifie *annihilation*, but the contrary *reſtauration* to being, *i.e.* to union of Soul and Body. But then ſecondly, that the *Rabbins* or *Chaldee Paraphraſt*, *Deut.* 33. 6. or *Iſ.* 22. 14. meant by ſecond death to denote abſolute negation of all being, muſt not be allowed: for *Deut.* 33. 6. the Hebrew reading *let Reuben live and not die*, and the Chaldee Paraphraſt uſing the Phraſe of the ſecond death, that can infer no more, than by that Phraſe they explain'd what they deem'd already meant by the Hebrew word duly rendred *dying*: and there is no reaſon or colour for ſaying that that ſignified *annihilation*; die he might, yet not be annihilated. And the like is apparent of the other place, *Iſ.* 22. 14. ſo much therefore for that.

To proceed then, will it be for the *Objectours* advantage that the *ſecond death* is expreſs'd by the *lake of Fire and Brimſtone*, and that evidently referring to the utter deſtruction of *Sodom* and *Gomorrah*? To this I reply firſt, that 'twas a tempeſtuous *Rain* of Fire and Brimſtone that conſumed *Sodom*, and not a *Lake*; and ſo the reference doth not farther hold than the Fire and Brimſtone, *i. e.* the terrible ſtinking, and furiouſly burning Fire, and that gains nothing to the *diſputer*; The Fire of *Hell* may be as ſearching, and *noiſome*, as is poſſible, without being *finite*, utterly *conſuming*, or *annihilating*. Nay, ſecondly, when the *Men* of *Sodom* and *Gomorrah*, the inhabitants as well as the *Walls*, were *burnt* to aſhes by that Fire and Brimſtone, to which that lake bears ſome reſemblance, what probability is there, that either thoſe Walls that were burnt to aſhes were *annihilated*, or elſe that all that people were then annihilated ſo as to be uncapable of being rais'd, and judged at the day of doom?

Or

Or if they were, wherein did their puniſhment appear to be greater than the portion of any other more moderate wicked man, which in the diſputer's ſenſe ſhall be ſo finally annihilated, and ſure reap no advantage by the ſtate that expects him in the interval? *Laſtly*, will his advantage be, that as *death* by being caſt into the *Lake* is ſuppos'd to be *utterly deſtroyed*, ſo *whoſoever elſe* is caſt into the Lake, ſhall be utterly *annihilated*? That I ſuppoſe the ſpecially deſign'd advantage: but as it was ſaid, it will prove none, becauſe *death* being a *privative* thing, the deſtroying of that neceſſarily infers, not onely poſitive *Reſurrection*, but conſequent to it, an *undying ſtate*, and that is contrary to the diſputer's pretenſions. And then though thoſe privations be deſtroy'd by being caſt into the Lake, yet it no way follows, that men by being caſt in thither, ſhall be deſtroyed alſo. The concluding thus were, as if, putting off the Prophetical expreſſion, one ſhould ſay in plain words, After the death of *Adam* and all his poſterity, and their continuing in the ſtate of *ſeparation* ſome thouſands of years, they ſhall be rais'd again, and their Souls eternally *united* to their Bodies, and of thoſe ſo rais'd, many ſhould be caſt into as eternal flames, (the former of theſe is parallel to the caſting of *Hell* and *Hades* into the *Lake*; the latter of the *perſons* into the ſame Lake) *Ergo* as there ſhall be no more *ſeparation* of Souls from Bodies, ſo there ſhall be no more *puniſhing* of wicked men; whereas indeed the very contrary follows: The deſtroying of death is the commencing of this endleſs miſerable life, therefore prov'd to be endleſs becauſe death is deſtroyed, and ſo life comes univerſally; and ſo to continue eternally inſtead of it: for elſe death and *Hades* (or that which is more than death, annihilation) ſhould return to have their being again, which it was decreed they ſhould not, and therefore they are ſaid to be caſt into the Lake. 'Tis true indeed, if *Hades* ſignified the place of *Hell* or ſtate of *torments*, then the caſting this into the Lake would be the finiſhing thoſe torments, whether after *Origen*'s way, or any other, it matters not; but this, as hath been ſaid, is not the importance of *Hades*, but the *State* of death, as θάνατος is the *Act* of it.

To what hath laſt been ſaid, that which follows in the bottom of *p.* 3. will be found no competent anſwer. The firſt *Anſwer* is, that the *deſtruction* of *death* and *Hades* is ſpoken properly in reference to them whoſe *Names* are in the *Book of Life*.

But firſt, if this were true, then one of my former concluſions muſt needs be granted, that *Hades* ſignifies not *Hell torments* (for that being deſtroyed to thoſe that were under it, the Godly were never under theſe) but the ſtate of the dead *in univerſum*. Yet *ſecondly*, it is not true; for *v.* 12. *I ſaw the dead, ſmall and great, ſtand before God, and the Books were opened*, The Books of Regiſter of all mens deeds (from which the Book of Life, following, is different) *and the Dead were judged*—the Dead indefinitely, *i. e.* ſure all the Dead, and yet more deictically by enumeration of all particulars concern'd in it: *The Sea gave up its Dead, and Death and Hades delivered up the Dead which were in them, and they were judged every Man according to their Works*. Here 'tis evident that Death and *Hades* are properly ſpoken in reference to all that were to be judged according to works, and not onely to them whoſe names were written in the Book of Life. And ſo that evacuates the firſt Anſwer. The *ſecond* Anſwer is, that they that are *not written* in that Book, ſhall never ſuffer ſuch a Death as brings to *Hades*, but ſhall fall into a worſe, the *ſecond Death*. But to this I reply, that this diſtinction hath no ground in the Text, but contrariwiſe both Death and *Hades* are equally there ſaid to be deſtroy'd to all that were under them, both whoſe names are, and are not written in the Book of Life. As therefore to the Godly, that Death that leads to *Hades* is deſtroy'd, ſo equally to the Wicked; and then they are both rendred eternal; and then the Wickeds being caſt into this Lake, is not, cannot be to be deſtroy'd there; but being a lake of fire, to be tormented there eternally, as is moſt apparent, *ver.* 10. where *the Devil was caſt into this lake, and the beaſt and the falſe prophet* ſaid to be there already, yet were not annihilated by being caſt thither, but as it follows, *ſhall be tormented day and night for ever and ever*. That they fall into a worſe death, I willingly grant, and think it uſefull to the cauſe I defend: for ſuppoſe a *Wicked Man*, whoſe impiety coſts him dear here, (one of the *Devil*'s ſaddeſt *Martyrs*) cruciated with the *Diſeaſes* his Sins have brought on him in an exquiſite manner many years, and at laſt either ſeiz'd on by the hand of *Juſtice*, and delivered to a wittily tormenting *Death*, or exerciſed many years with the rack of *Stone* and *Strangury*, or the like, and at laſt by theſe horrid miſeries his Soul rent from his Body, and he continue in *Hades* many Hundred years, and certainly partake of no good in that eſtate, at the utmoſt, but reſt from the labours of his former life. Can it in this caſe be ſaid that the *ſecond Death* is worſe than this, and yet this ſecond Death defin'd by a ſwift *Annihilation*? Certainly it cannot. Nothing but long continued if not *endleſs Torments* can be ſaid worſe than thoſe ſo long *continued Torments*. But whereas it is added that the *ſecond Death* is abſolute and *eternal deſtruction*, as the Scripture elſewhere ſpeaks, I reply, that the Scripture no where ſpeaks ſo; never uſes *ſecond Death* of any ſuch thing as *Annihilation*, nor ever ſeems in any other words to ſay of any wicked man, that he ſhall be annihilated. As for γέεννα, I grant it parallel to πῦρ τὸ αἰώνιον, but can ſee no Argument producible thence that either of them denotes *annihilation*, being both ſo much more proper to denote *Torments*, and thoſe eternal. For the valley of *Hinnom*, 'tis known that Children were not burnt to Aſhes there, but put into hollow brazen Veſſels, and there fryed and ſcorched (a moſt lingring pain,) and therefore call'd *Tophet* from the Timbrels that there us'd to ſound to drown the noiſe of their diſmal cries. And for the *lake* the Text is expreſs, they that be *tormented* (without intermiſſion) *day and night* (and without ceſſation) *for ever and ever*. And though the valley of *Hinnom* being on Earth was not a ſtate of Eternal but *temporary* puniſhments; yet that is no prejudice: for being to take a reſemblance from Earth and humane puniſhments where nothing was Eternal, the moſt that could be was to take the ſharpeſt and moſt *lingring* Torments thereby to expreſs thoſe which, being moſt ſharp, were *Eternal* alſo. Thus much for the Texts of Scripture and phraſes therein, which ſeem favourable to the affirmation, but duly weighed have not ſo prov'd.

Now for the Conſideration taken from *God's Attributes* of *Juſtice*, and eſpecially of *Mercy*, p. 4. There ſeem to me to be *three* weak parts in the arguing. *Firſt*, that to thoſe *ſins* which are committed under temptations and *infirmities* of ours, not generally reliev'd by a ſufficiency of auxiliary grace, God's *Eternal puniſhments* are ſuppos'd to be affix'd by them, that maintain ſuch puniſhments of Eternal torments. Certainly they that thus doe, doe amiſs; and by ſo doing give great occaſion to thoſe that believe them to find

to find other measures for justice in God than those which he hath prescribed to men: (whereas in matters of this nature *God* is content to be judg'd by *our Tribunal* and measures, *Judge I pray you betwixt me and my Vineyard*, and *Are not my ways equal?*) But they that maintain God's *requirings*, *Mic.* 6. to be proportion'd to his *shewings*, and the sufficiency of the Divine grace, ready for all that will make use of it, and therein found the justice of punishing those that do despise or neglect those means so liberally and abundantly provided for them by God, have given no cause for that exception. It is by them (on the contrary) marked out as an act of superabundant mercy, that God forsakes not upon the first refusals and not making use of his grace; he is long-suffering, and most willing, and most ardently labours *that all should come to repentance*, even such as have long resisted his Evangelical methods of rich grace. '2. That weight is laid upon the *temporalness* of the sins committed in this world, intimating I suppose the *unproportionableness* of *Temporal* to *Eternal*, and therein founding an objection against the Justice of those punishments. This I suppose is believ'd to have force against those that are wont to answer it by compensating the want of weight in the temporarineſs of the sin and sinner, partly by the *eternity of God* against whom the sin is committed, partly by the *preparedness* and inclination of the man *to sin eternally*, in case he should live eternally. And I shall confess that I have always look'd on those as σοφὰ φάρμακα, (such as the *Schools* have many) not able fully to satisfie humane understanding, and have therefore been carefull in several writings to offer surer grounds of satisfaction in this matter; by laying the weight on the *option*, which is by God given us, of *eternal bliss* on one side, as the reward of our Evangelical obedience, as on the other of *eternal woe* on our wilfull denying, and this finally and obstinately persever'd in: which makes it most just, that they that resolutely and inexorably make this choice of never so much ill to themselves, should have none but themselves to blame for the unhappiness of their portion. *Thirdly*, that *God* in inflicting punishment is compar'd with *Man* in respect of the *compassion* supposable in him to see any the worst man thus afflicted: Whereas I conceive God is to be look'd on here onely as *Rector* of the *Universe*, whose office it is to proceed in the work of Judicature without passion on either side. You may see it in a Judge on Earth, which if he be a well-natur'd man never willingly pronounces sentence, *dolet quoties cogitur esse ferox*: but yet must utterly disclaim his office, if he do not *secundum allegata & probata* pronounce that *sentence*, which the *Law* prescribes against such or such a fact, and resist all temptations of his compassion in so doing. Such a severity is that of God's, which the office which belongs to him in the World exacts of him, even when he swears *that he is far from delighting in the death of him that dies*, and most passionately exhorts *to repent and live*, and imputes it to absolute *wilfulness*, for which no reasonable account can be given by any man, that he will thus suffer.

Should he never make such *Laws* to repress Sin by assur'd expectation of *eternal punishment*, we might easily judge what a World or rather *Wilderness* of savage Creatures this Universe would be, by what it now is, even after all this severity of menace and interdict. 'Twas therefore most *just* and most *necessary*, that he should thus have ordain'd and enacted these *sad Laws*; And therefore in great Justice and Wisedom, and without any resistence from his infinite goodness and mercy, He thus enacted. And having done so, should he as oft as any one came to suffer according to those Laws, *retract* or *dispense* with; set his Compassion to evacuate the process, and frustrate all the wise designs of this his Justice? Certainly no man would ever expect this of an allwise *Lawgiver*; or (after he hath set his Seal to this grand *Indenture*, so solemnly as by his *Son*'s promulgating and signing it with his *bloud*) imagine that his *Compassion* should thus *tempore non suo* interpose, when there are so many more proper seasons, wherein he hath effectually demonstrated himself to have as much of that to every the wickedest man that perisheth, as any the tendrest *father*, even *David* ever own'd to the most desperate rebel Son *Absolon*, that finally refuseth all returning to mercy, till at length he perisheth in the midst of his Sin to the wounding his Father's heart. These are three competent exceptions to that part of the arguing taken from God's attributes. And therefore to the *additional considerations* for the strengthening thereof the reply will be easie, that if they are the *greatest part of the World* that falls under this *severity*: this is but necessarily consequent to that greatest part, being such as that sentence most justly and indispensably belongs to, and consequently not such whose guilts are truly suggested to be thus more *venial*, and of an ordinary degree; but onely such as proceed from *malice* and *obstinacy*, gross *negligence* or groundless *presumption*. For, for all other sins of *infirmity*, *ignorance*, and even *wilfull*, timely *retracted* by *repentance*, there is *remedy* prepar'd under the *Gospel*. Onely whereas to the two heads of *infirmity* and *ignorance*, as proofs of the more ordinary degree of guilt, the Objectour adds *negligence*, strength of *temptation*, corruption of *nature*, *affection*, evil *education* and *example*; and then in gross farther adds many other circumstances, both positive and privative, abating the hainousness of the guilt; This will deserve to be better consider'd, both because the most of these (as the case truly stands) yield no matter of just excuse to any, (for so 'tis sure of *examples* of *men*, when in evident opposition to the *commands* and intermination of *God*: so of *affection* or sensitive *passion*, when in contradiction to *reason* and humane *nature*, the upper soul which ought to exercise its dominion given it by God over those θεῖα ἢ ἀνθρώπων, the *bestial part of the man*, and not be corrupted and led captive and blindfold by it: so again evil *education*, when contrary to the light of natural *conscience*, corruption of *nature*, when repair'd by *grace*; temptations of the *flesh* or world or Devil, when infinitely out-weigh'd by contrary motives to *obedience* and good living) and because some of them have much of malignity in them, which may well enhance not lessen the guilt. Of this sort I chiefly instance in *negligence*, such as it may be supine and wretchless, which in a *creature* and *servant* contains all degrees of enhancing any sin: 'tis *wilfull*, for he might be more *carefull*: 'tis *obstinate*, for he is oft *warn'd* of it by the noxious effects (which he cannot but discern) of it, and the Master's continual precepts to the contrary: 'tis *presumptuous*, still imagining he shall find *mercy*, when God assures him he shall *not* in this way, and upon that groundless confidence still presuming to offend: 'tis most *ungratefull*, scorning and contemning to make any use of the greatest treasures of grace, all ready for him that would use tolerable diligence: 'tis an act of horrible *pride*, in despising God himself, his *precepts*, *threats*, *promises*; of *infidelity* both active and passive, not *believing* God, not being

faithfull

faithfull to his ſervice; And it ſelf being nothing in effect but height of *Idleneſs*, and that *doing* or admitting much more ill, *omitting* much more good (merely to gratifie that one ſwiniſh vile pleaſure of ſloth) than any covetous voluptuous man doth for his greateſt treaſures, or taſtfulleſt ſenſualities, it hath as it were all the aggravations of all other ſins collected into one ſink or kennel. In this place the *deſcription* aſſign'd the *worſt* of *men*, [*viz.* men of flagitious and contumacious lives] may perhaps deſerve ſome animadverſion. For if this be the one meaſure, to which eternal puniſhments are thought commenſurable, 'tis poſſible there may be great and dangerous miſtake in it.

For 1. There are many *principles* of godleſs living all meeting in the *effect*, caſting off the *yoke* of God's *obedience*, and ſo equally deſerving to fall under the ſeverity of thoſe *Laws* by which the world was created and manag'd. Θυμὸς and ἐπιθυμία are the two comprehenſive names of them, but there are ſeveral under each. Under the firſt *pride* and *rage* and *revenge*, &c. under the ſecond *voluptuouſneſs* of all ſorts, *Covetouſneſs*, deſire of *praiſe*, &c. And every of theſe have a foundation in our corrupt nature, and temptations from without alſo. And as one ſoil is more unhappily qualified for the one; ſo another is for another. And if all the reſtraints, commands, preventions, excitations, invitations, engagements, mercies, puniſhments of *God*; all his methods of armature and fortifying each man againſt theſe domeſtick enemies and traitours of his, may not be permitted to have any force toward his reſcue out of this ſlavery to any of theſe ſins, there is little reaſon of excuſe that will hold the pleading for any of theſe. The *contumacy* is in effect the ſame in each; in him that asks God forgiveneſs for his intemperance every day, and every night wallows in it; as to him that goes on ſullenly and demurely, and hath no regret to it. The *aggravations* are ſeveral; but the difference of the degrees of malignity hardly diſcernible: Or if the diſadvantage be on the ſide of the ſtout flagitious offender, this is no more than is neceſſary to be ſuppos'd to the defining ſeveral *degrees* of torments in Hell, that the *mighty ſinners might be mightily puniſhed*; it doth not at all concern the juſtice of that ſentence, that decrees every unreform'd impenitent to thoſe flames. For *repentance*, as it ſignifies ſome degree of ſincere renovation, being the *minimum quod ſic*, without which all ſhall periſh even under the Goſpel, (that utmoſt diſpenſation of ſtrict Law that God will permit any to hope for, that doth not give the lie to his meſſage in the mouth of his Son) they that come ſhort of this have no more to plead from any other circumſtance imaginable, becauſe that God which gave ſpace for repentance, hath alſo provided ſuch counterbalances either of aids or pardons to ſuch circumſtances, as ſhall utterly fruſtrate and prevent all plea that can from thence be drawn either againſt his juſtice or his mercy. 2. It muſt be remembred that there be other ſtates, to which thoſe titles of *flagitious* and *contumacious* lives are not competible, which yet have no leſs of malignity in them by that conſideration; ſuch are that of the intricate diſguis'd painted *hypocrite*, that hath *God* always in his *mouth*, and his glory the deſign of his fouleſt actions, and yet his *damnation* as *juſt* as any man's: that of the wicked *Chriſtian*, carnal *Goſpeller*, that under the vow of *baptiſm*, *i. e.* Chriſt's banner, equals the ſins of *Jew*, *Turk*, or *Heathen* Worſhipper: that of *recidivation* into forſaken ſins, *Apoſtaſie*, Temporary adherence to Chriſt, (but *in time of temptation* preſently *they are offended*, the δειλοὶ or cowardly *Gnoſticks*, that Chriſt in the *Revelation* ranks with ἄπιστοι, *unbelievers*) each of theſe upon other as juſt accounts, as thoſe under which the *flagitious* and *contumacious* is acknowledged to fall, and periſh, may as reaſonably be reſolv'd to have their portion: the richeſt *talents* being rather more than leſs accountable for, than the meaneſt; and the *utter darkneſs*, where there is weeping and gnaſhing of teeth, peculiarly aſſign'd to the *unprofitable ſervant*, that being apt to object ſeverity and auſterity againſt God, did not yet endeavour by improving his Talent to approve himſelf unto him. By the way, that *parable* forewarns us how poſſible it is for a man negligently to loſe all his opportunities of graces and advantages toward heaven, and engulf himſelf in endleſs woe, whilſt his heart is ſecretly objecting againſt the reconcileableneſs of God's judgments with thoſe Attributes which he thinks fit to be vindicated in all his inflictions. In this Section (after the middle of the fourth page) it is reſolv'd, that the opinion of *eternal torments*, properly ſo call'd, is not to be accepted upon leſs terms than of plain *demonſtration* from Scripture: But what that ſignifies, I cannot gueſs; *God's affirmation* when once reveal'd, as there is no juſt cauſe to doubt the teſtimony to be divine, will bear down all difficulties, which any improbability of the matter will ſuggeſt to us. *Reaſon* it ſelf thus judgeth, that *God* is to be believed rather than any humane *reaſoning*. If therefore *Chriſt* (who ſufficiently teſtify'd himſelf to come from God, and to have the ſignature of his Authority on all his affirmations) did teach *eternity of torments* properly ſo call'd, and expreſs that doctrine in ſuch plain words, as all that heard him and his Commiſſioners preach, were firmly reſolv'd to ſignifie the real everlaſtingneſs of thoſe torments, then I ſuppoſe here is as plain demonſtration, as the weightineſs of the matter or the *Objectour's* exceptions can exact. And that thus it is, it may not be amiſs briefly to ſhew in this place. Beſides thoſe teſtimonies which are by the Objectour produc'd (and as they are enervated by him, have and ſhall be vindicated and clear'd to have force in them, and ſo are not to be mention'd here) I inſiſt on theſe *three*. 1. The *parable* of *Dives* and *Lazarus*, which being yielded to be but a parable, hath yet from Chriſt's uſing it theſe grounds of aſſuring our faith, that there is as certainly after this life a *ſtate* of *torments* as of bliſs, and thoſe torments executed by *ſcorching*, but not devouring and conſuming, much leſs *annihilating* flames. He that is in them hath nothing to beg but a preſent *cooling of his tongue*, and that may not be had, becauſe *Dives* hath had all his portion of *good things in this life*, and ſo muſt have no more ſuch, though it be but the leaſt *allay* of his pains for one minute, which ſure excludes annihilation, which is the perfect *ſuperſeding* of them. Again, *there is a gulf fixed*, which interſcinds all intercourſe between Heaven and Hell, whereby any aid or relief ſhould come to them. Theſe circumſtances put together muſt conclude, that the fire being not ſuch as of it ſelf conſum'd thoſe that were tormented in it, and *Abraham*, that was now a *Comprehenſor*, knowing that there was now no place left for the leaſt degree of releaſe to the ſufferer, and no relief being to be hop'd for from Heaven, from whence onely it was poſſible to come, the fire and ſo the continuance in the torments muſt be eternal. I foreſee but one objection to this, *viz.* that this was *before* the day of *Judgment*, and then, this *non obſtante*, the fire after the

day of Doom may annihilate. To this I anſwer, that the Parable is not bound to refer to the *time* wherein it was *delivered*. Other Parables of the *King* and the *Bridegroom* referr'd to after times, and this here by the ſeeing *Dives* bodily in Hell, and the ſcorching of the tongue and the mention of dipping the finger, *&c.* muſt refer to the ſtate of conjunction of ſouls and bodies in *Heaven* and *Hell*, and that muſt be after the *Reſurrection*; and ſo that ſuperſedes that one objection, and I foreſee no other.

Secondly, I mention Chriſt's words of *Judas*, that it were *better for him never to have been born*, and of him that ſhould offend a tender diſciple, and avert him from Chriſt, that it were better *a milſtone were hanged about his neck, and he caſt into the midſt of the ſea*. Here I ſhall ſuppoſe *annihilation* as fully expreſs'd by theſe two phraſes, as by any it could be, and yet that ſomewhat worſe than that expects wicked men, which muſt needs be founded in eternal *miſerable being*: for eternal Being, if not miſerable, is much better; and miſerable Being, if not eternal, but immediately determin'd by a ſwift deſtruction, as Chriſt ſuppoſeth, is not certainly and unqueſtionably worſe than never having had a Being.

Thirdly, I reſume again (though I now perceive they are after mentioned) the expreſs words of Chriſt, *Revel.* 20. 10. that the *Beaſt and the falſe Prophets*, i. e. ſome wicked men βασανισθήσονται *ſhall be tormented in a lake of fire and brimſtone day and night for ever and ever*. Nothing could have been more expreſs: And to theſe I add, that there is no *one* ſeeming *diſſent* of contrary teſtimony producible from the whole *Scripture*, but *innumerable* that bear full *conſent* with theſe, which conſequently have eſtabliſht the faith of this *Article*, that it was by the Apoſtles of Chriſt entred into that *depoſitum* which they left in every Church where they preached, as appears by the laſt words of the Apoſtles Creed, *the life everlaſting*; which as it is expreſly contrary to *annihilation*, which is exciſion and determination of life in reſpect of duration or laſting, ſo being ſubjoyn'd to the *reſurrection of the body*, muſt be indefinitely coextended to that, and ſo belong to all bodies that are raiſed. And that it is thus comprehenſive, appears more manifeſtly by the *Athanaſian Creed*, which *to the riſing and coming again of all men with their bodies, and giving an account for their own works*, which is parallel to the Reſurrection of the body, ſubjoyns as the Explication of Everlaſting life this expreſs *Dogma*, *And they that have done good ſhall go into life everlaſting, and they that have done evil into everlaſting fire*. And this was no doubt the concordant ſenſe of the Churches, that had this *depoſitum* of Chriſtian faith, both from the *Scriptures* and the preaching of the *Apoſtles*, and their *Succeſſours*, committed to them. And ſo there remains no cauſe of doubt of the validity or plainneſs of *demonſtration*, as far as any matter of doctrine is capable of it from the teſtimony of Chriſt and of God. What follows of the *incredibility* of this doctrine, making ſome men deſperately doubt of the truth of the whole body of Religion, can have no force againſt the truth of it. All Chriſt's *duri ſermones* had that effect of his teaching them, *they were offended at him*; and the meaning of that is, They forſook the whole Religion.

Having gone thus far in particular Reply to all that have been propoſed in favour of the *Affirmative* of the queſtion, I need not accommodate any Anſwer to the remaining (fifth) page of the firſt part. The three *Poſtulata*'s, if all granted, (as they may in ſome limited ſenſe) will gain him nothing. Not the *firſt*, for the letter of Scripture favours not him, as hath been ſhew'd; death and deſtruction no way ſignifie or conclude annihilation. Not the *ſecond*, for there is no one Text clear in phraſe and ſignification yet produced for the affirmative, nor any that by any age or orthodox Father hath been ſo interpreted. Not the *third*, becauſe in our doctrine, ſet upon its due *baſis*, there is nothing ſo much as of a ſeeming diſagreeableneſs to piety, or the nature or Attributes of God, as hath been ſhew'd alſo. Then for the *ſcandal* of thoſe diſputes about *Predeſtination*, &c. which is thought to be allay'd by the opinion of *Annihilation*, I anſwer, that they which deny all reſpective decrees of *Reprobation* or *Preterition* againſt *Supralapſarians* and *Sublapſarians*, that affirm *univerſality* of *Redemption*, and of the gift of *ſufficient grace* (all which are maintained by Biſhop *Overal*, to whom the diſputer profeſſeth to incline, and are known to have been maintained by concordant votes of all the *Fathers* of the *Greek* and *Latin* Church before Saint *Auguſtine*, and ſince him by a conſiderable part of the Church through all Ages, and the contrary never univerſally received as a *Doctrine*, and ſo remains to have been but a diſputable *queſtion* at the moſt) cannot be imagined to be under any part of this ſcandal, or conſequently to receive benefit by the Allay that is ſpoken of. And if the Doctrine of *Reprobation*, &c. have need of this *Antidote*, to avert the ill and dangerous conſequences of it, and to reconcile their dictates with piety and reverence to God Almighty, then it is more than time that the favourers of that Doctrine ſhould rather change their *poiſons* for wholſome *diet*, than like the *Mountebank* on the Stage preſume to ſwallow the poiſon in confidence of this onely Antidote, which I have not yet heard that he believes to have any force in it. In a word, let us all renounce the *irreſpective decree* of Reprobation, as I profeſs to doe, and there is no more pretence for the denying of eternal torments of the Reprobates upon that account. As for the puniſhment of *perſonal ſins*, and their circumſtantial abatements, that hath been accounted for already.

The Second Part.

IN the Second Part the view of the places producible for Eternal Pains, begins with a *prejudice, viz.* that it is no where plainly and directly *denied* that the Reprobates ſhall be deſtroy'd. But that negative Argument as it is ſimply invalid, ſo it is moſt unſeaſonably prefixt to the ſetting down of Teſtimonies for the perpetuity of their Torments: For if one ſuch *Text* be produc'd that ſhall really conclude their torments perpetual, (as certainly do the words of Chriſt, *Revel.* 20. 10. of their being tormented *Day and Night for ever and ever*) it is then moſt certainly conſequent that the *Reprobate* ſhall not be *deſtroy'd* immediately after the day of judgment: and what is that but the plain and direct denial of it? And to add that it is no where ſaid that they ſhall *live* for ever, but that *incorruption* ſeems to be the privilege of the *Elect*, is ſure but another branch of the ſame *paralogiſm*; for they that are tormented for ever, have ſenſe and life for ever, but that being a life of miſery eternal, hath no ſemblance of the privilege of the Elect, whoſe Crown it is to live and reign, not to live and be puniſht for ever. And ſo this yields not the leaſt mite of advantage to the former opinion. Now for the phraſes πῦρ αἰώνιον, *Matt.* 18. 8. & 25. 41, 48. Κόλασις αἰώνιος, *Matth.* 25. 46. Ἁμαρτήματος κρίσις, *Mark* 3. 29. τὸ πῦρ τὸ ἄσβεστον, *Mark* 9. 43, 44. and ὅπου ὁ σκώληξ αὐτῶν ὁ τελευτᾷ, καὶ τὸ πῦρ οὐ σβέννυται, *ver.* 45, 46, 48. ὁ ζόφος τοῦ σκότους εἰς αἰῶνα, 2 *Pet.* 2. 17. *Jud.* 13. ὁ κρίνος τοῦ βαπτισμοῦ αὐτῶν εἰς αἰῶνα, *Revel.* 14. 11. and the *lake of fire and brimſtone, where the beaſt and the prophet ſhall be tormented day and night for ever and ever, Rev.* 20. 10. All theſe are endeavour'd to be evacuated firſt by a *general* Anſwer; then by *particulars* accommodated to each particular phraſe. The general is, that phraſes [αἰώνιος, εἰς αἰῶνα & εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων] do not always ſignifie an abſolute *eternity*, but either a long time, or an irreparable ſtate of things, or during unto the ceſſation of the ſubject. And without diſputing the truth of this anſwer, it will be ſufficient to my turn, if either ſome of theſe phraſes do ſometimes ſignifie an *abſolute eternity*; for then I ſhall have no reaſon to except againſt the Interpretation of the univerſal Church of God for ſo many Centuries, which thus underſtand all, unqueſtionably moſt, of theſe places, or if they here denote an *irreparable* ſtate of thoſe things that are ſpoken of; for then the wicked being *caſt into fire*, are in that ſtate *irreparably*, *Matth.* 18. 8. 25. 41. being in *eternal puniſhment*, *Matth.* 25. 41. are irreparably there, and ſo in the reſt; which notion of eternal would never mind any man of the annihilation of thoſe that are enter'd on ſuch eternal flames or puniſhments. As for the teſtimonies from *Deut.* 15. 17. *Pſal.* 37. 29. and 14. 6. they are all neceſſarily interpreted by the *matter* of them to refer to certain finite periods, either of the man's life, and capacity, either of ſerving, or enjoying the earthly *Canaan* in the two former places, or to the end of this World, as the laſt of them, but no way prejudices the proper uſe of the words for abſolute eternity, when the matter ſo requires, as I ſuppoſe it doth, whenſoever it ſpeaketh of a *duration* which is to commence at the end of this life or world of ours, as when *eternal life* is mentioned, the *diſputer* will acknowledge; and yet with no more reaſon than I can render for interpreting *eternal puniſhment* to this ſenſe. But becauſe the *Objectour* depends not on this his general Anſwer, let us deſcend to the particulars: And firſt that of everlaſting fire, *Matth.* 18. 8. and 25. 41. 48. *Jud.* 7. Here *Jud.* 7. is added over and above thoſe which were even now produced for this phraſe, and on purpoſe, it ſeems, as a *decoy* to draw all the reſt into the net. For herein is the anſwer founded, that the laſt of thoſe, *Jud.* 7. is by moſt Divines not underſtood to ſpeak of the fire of *Hell*, but of that fire whereby their *Cities* were deſtroy'd, which was onely a *deigma* of Hell-fire, and ſo αἰώνιον πῦρ ſhall not ſignifie *eternal* burning, but *utter* deſtruction, to which is added the conſideration of a queſtion, which may be made from *Matth.* 8. 29. whether the *Devils* themſelves, for whom eternal fire was *prepar'd*, be yet caſt into it, who are ſaid, *Jude* 6. and 2 *Pet.* 2. 4. to be but *priſoners*, and ſo not yet under the *execution* of their doom.

To all this I anſwer, *Firſt*, that if the ſuggeſtion be true, that ſuch is the judgment of *moſt Divines* (which I acknowledge to have been mine own formerly, but have changed it ſince) concerning that place, *Jude* 7. and their authority deem'd by him that urgeth it worth the heeding, then is the more united conſent of *all Catholick interpreters*, none excepted, for the notion of the ſame phraſe in all other places, of far greater authority for the admitting the eternity of that fire which is aſſerted in them: and if by thoſe other places the *Article* be eſtabliſh'd, I ſhall not need contend for (nor ſhould ever have produc'd) that one place of *Jude*, becauſe ſome Interpreters, and even mine own former doubting of that one, can be no prejudice to their conſent with me for the many other, any *one* of which if it truly conclude the eternity of Hell fire, is as good as a thouſand. But then, *Secondly*, as I do not conſent this to have been the judgment of moſt Divines, which is ſaid to be; ſo I now upon better conſideration of the Context, ſee no reaſon that could induce me or any to make that, ſo as to reject the more literal interpretation. That *Sodom* and *Gomorrah*, and the Cities about them ſignifie the *inhabitants* of thoſe Cities, is apparent there by their being affirm'd to have *given themſelves over to fornication*, which ſure not the *walls* but the inhabitants did: and then ſure thoſe that *ſuffer'd the vengeance of eternal fire*, and therein *are ſet forth for an example* or eſſay, what we Chriſtians following the like ſins are to expect, are not the Walls, but the *Inhabitants* alſo. By the way, it is not the *pretertenſe* or ſenſe, or in the *aoriſt*, (as when of the *Angels ver.* 6. it is ſaid, *they kept* not but left, and of theſe ἐκπορνεύσασαι *having given themſelves over to fornication*) but in the preſent ὑπέχουσαι *ſuffering*, either as not at all looking back in this part of the period to their deſtruction on earth by fire and brimſtone, or elſe as to a laſting judgment then begun, but ſtill continuing upon them without any releaſe; *they ſtill ſuffer that vengeance of fire* which withall is αἰωνίου alſo, never likely to have an end. So no good firm ground is there in this Interpretation, which I remember I had long ſince out of *Socinus*, but is not, that I know of, the reſolution of moſt Divines. As for the queſtion whether the *Devils* are yet caſt into eternal Hell, there will be no need of diſcuſſing it here, becauſe if for God's

wiſe and juſt ends they are not ſo confin'd thither, as after the judgment, when there is no farther place for thoſe ends, they ſhall be; yet ſtill the ſouls of the men of *Sodom* may now ſuffer in that fire, and the *Devils* that are tied to their dark *priſon* (which appears not to be any other place but that Hell, where the ſpirits of wicked men are) be ready at hand to torment them. Having clear'd this place, it follows, that as yet no leaſt probability is produc'd how αἰώνιον πῦρ in other places ſhould ſignifie any thing elſe but *eternal torments* of them that are caſt into it, and the Section that follows at the top of *p.* 8. hath nothing in it that exacts return, for if the fire of Hell be αἰώνιον, then it burns everlaſtingly, and if they that are in it ſuffer the *judgment of eternal fire*, then they muſt be eternal alſo, and that is here affirm'd and *Rev.* 20. 10. As for the four *conſiderations* that next follow to evacuate the belief of eternal torments being ſignifi'd by eternal Fire, 'tis certain they have no ſhew of force in them ſeverally; and then jointly they will have as little. For, 1. If the word *Fire* (in that *phraſe* αἰώνιον πῦρ) be a *Metaphor*, as indeed it is not deem'd to be the ſame with our *culinary fire*, and it differs from it in that it enlightens not, but leaves the place *dark* where 'tis, yet ſtill it may be really fire to all other the punitive effects, and no doubt it is ſo in reſpect of burning and ſcorching and tormenting, or elſe the Scripture would not ſo oft affirm it of it. 2. If the word αἰώνιος do not primarily or perpetually ſignifie everlaſting, yet tis not once found in the *New Teſtament* to ſignifie otherwiſe: the place *Jude* 7. is the onely place pretended, and that hath been competently vindicated. 3. Though fire be a *deſtructive* thing, yet it is not able to *annihilate* by any its natural force, and beſides it is a *cruciating* thing, and thus was it in the valley of *Hinnom*, from which the Fire of Hell takes its denomination, and thus *the beaſt and the falſe prophet are ſaid to be tormented day and night for ever and ever* in it, and then ſure 'tis neither Expreſſion nor Inſtrument of annihilating deſtruction. 4. If everlaſting *fire* be oppos'd to *life*, *Matth.* 18. 8. yet this engages it not, no nor inclines it to ſignifie *utter deſtruction* but the moſt *unhappy cruciating ſtate* which is more contrary to happy life than abſolute annihilation would be, as hath formerly been ſhew'd; And therefore though everlaſting Fire ſhould be granted to ſignifie everlaſting deſtruction, (as with any propriety it cannot, Fire being the Inſtrument of deſtruction, not deſtruction it ſelf) yet in that caſe everlaſting deſtruction would reaſonably ſignifie as ὄλεθρος αἰώνιος *eternal perdition* doth, 2 *Theſ.* 1. 9. and of that we have already given account, that it ſignifies notorious judgments here concluding in the flames of Hell, and that it no way ſignifies or infers annihilation, but the contrary to the joys of a bliſsfull life, *i. e.* the pains of Hell.

For the rendring this *phraſe* more applicable to the deſir'd notion, 'tis thought fit to compare it with another like phraſe πῦρ ἄσβεστον, *Mark* 9. 43, 44, 45. as that is rendred, *that ſhall not* nor *never ſhall be quenched*; of which 'tis ſuggeſted, that it neceſſarily ſignifies no more, than that that Fire ſhall not go out, till the matter or fewel of it be conſumed or deſtroyed, and thus 'tis uſed, *Iſay.* 66. 24. and that this appears to be the importance of our Saviour's meaning, from other places, *Matth.* 3. 12. *Luke* 3. 17. where 'tis applied to the *chaff* and *Tares* which admit no everlaſting duration in the Fire, but are very capable of utter deſtruction. To all this I anſwer. 1. That there is no ſuch affinity between ἄσβεστον & αἰώνιον, that one ſhould regulate the notion of the other; when they are applied to divers matters, one to the burning of *chaff*, tother to the puniſhing of *wicked men*. Or if there be, it may as reaſonably hold, that ἄσβεστον ſhould be interpreted by αἰώνιον; and in order to that, the chaff and tares interpreted of wicked men, which are known to be figuratively expreſſed by them, as that αἰώνιον ſhould be regulated by ἄσβεστον, and ſo wicked men thought in the ſame manner to be conſumed by the fire, as the chaff and tares are. 2. That for πῦρ ἄσβεστον if it be granted that it neceſſarily ſignifies no more than that the Fire ſhall not go out, till the fewel of it be deſtroyed, yet 1. it as fairly follows, then it may (when the context requires) very conveniently ſignifie more; and that 2. There will be no ground of doubt, whether when 'tis applied to thoſe who are affirm'd to be tormented *in a Lake of Fire day and night for ever and ever*, *i. e.* to wicked men, it ſhall not ſignifie this *more*, *viz.* eternal burning. 3. For the place of *Iſaiah*, I ſhall appeal to ancient interpreters; not onely whether it may, but whether it do not, ſignifie *eternal fire*, or that which is not extinguiſhed for ever. *Procopius*, I ſuppoſe, hath on this prophecy as great a reputation among learned men as any, I ſhall give you his ſenſe, that the Prophet in the concluſion of the Prophecy ſpeaks of the Saints of God διαβαίνοντας ὅτι τὴν ἐξαίρετον οὐρανόπολιν, τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ βασιλείᾳ ἀφορισθεῖσαν μόνην, *&c. ſhall paſs into the moſt eminent heavenly City, the manſion ſet apart for the kingdom of God, where they ſhall be for ever ſerving God, placed under the great high Prieſt, and they ſhall all ſee the deſtruction of the wicked, and think what good things they have loſt by deſpiſing God. Is* 1. *Whom they ſhall behold,* μακρὰν ἑαυτῶν ὄντας *placed far off from them,* σκώληκα δὲ φησιν ἀτελεύτητον τὸν ἐν τῇ μετανοεῖν τῶν ἰδίων ἁμαρτημάτων συνειδήσιν, ἐν τῷ τυφθῆναι ἀγαθῶν ἐστερῆσθαι διαπαντὸς ἀεὶ τὸν ψυχὴν, καὶ κατηρεφῆ ἑαυτῶν ὄντα τῇ ἐδαπάσῃ κακίᾳ, πῦρ δὲ ἄσβεστον τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ σωτῆρος αἰώνιον, ὑπομασθόρον τοῦ διαβόλου. You ſee his ſenſe of the words, which undoubtedly they will bear, as the deſcription of the final reward of the *pious* believing *Jews* and *Heathens* on one ſide, and of the *impious* obdurate on the other. And if, as he tells us, ſome will have it underſtood as a prediction of the *Jews* deſtruction by the *Romans*, which were διαπαὶ ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ, καὶ μόνον ἀλλὰ δίκην ἀτελεύτητον πάσχοντι, yet ſtill this interpretation is founded in the ſuppoſition, that the *worm that dieth not, and the fire that is not quenched*, ſignified an undying puniſhment, and as ſuch is us'd to ſignifie in prophetick ſtyle that which is next degree to abſolute eternal; purſuing the *Jews* whereſoever they are to be met with, without any the leaſt mitigation, or mercy. 4. For the uſe of the ſame words, *Matth.* 3. and *Luke* 3. of the *chaff* and *tares*, 'tis ſufficient to ſay, that, thoſe parabolical expreſſions being undoubtedly ſet to denote the wicked, the word ἄσβεστον, which properly ſignifies that which never is or ſhall be *quenched*, being applied to the *tares* in the *parable*, but to the *wicked* in the *application* of the parable, muſt be allotted ſuch a notion in either, as the *matter* requires; and ſo though ſpoken of Tares, it be not taken in its full amplitude of ſignification, but in that inferiour degree which is competible to the burning of Tares or chaff to aſhes, yet being applied to the *wicked*, the thing ſignified by thoſe tares, it may ſtill abide in its full amplitude, and ſignifie the *tormenting* and not conſuming, and ſo the *everlaſtingneſs* of that Fire. And indeed if it be argumentative in the *diſputer*, the chaff admits no everlaſting duration in the Fire, from which it may be deem'd concluſible that πῦρ ἄσβεστον applied to that, is not *unquenchable fire*, then it will be as well worth obſerving that *wicked*

men

men are capable of *everlasting* duration in Fire, and therefore πῦρ ἄσβεστον applied to them (as it is, *Mark* 9. 43, 44, 45.) signifies everlasting Fire.

Next for αἰώνιος κόλασις, that that may be reconciled with the *Objectour's* notion. He notes first, The *opposition* of it to *everlasting life*, *Matth.* 25. 45. which may incline it to signifie everlasting death. 2. That αἰώνιος doth not by absolute necessity signifie *everlasting*. 3. That κόλασις doth not necessarily signifie *tormenting punishment* but may be understood of a privative punishment, and then death being a punishment, everlasting death may be truly call'd everlasting punishment. To these I answer, to the first, that the *opposition* to everlasting avails nothing, everlasting life being undoubtedly everlasting bliss, and then everlasting misery is most directly opposite to that. To the Second, That αἰώνιος spoken of that which begins after the day of judgment must denote such a duration as is proportionable to the αἰών following that, as αἰώνιος spoken in relation to any other age, whether to the year of *Jubilee*, or the age of the Jewish *state*, or the age of this *world* simply or the Christian *age*, must be commensurate to that age to which it refers, and therefore αἰώνιος κόλασις there, being consequent to the judgment of the *great day* described in that Chapter, must in all reason be of the same duration as αἰώνιος ζωὴ in the same place. To the *third* that κόλασις generally signifies positive punishment, not *mulct*, as ζημία and perhaps τιμωρία doth; however the reason cannot hold, that if *death* be a punishment then *eternal death* may be truly call'd *everlasting punishment*, because though *death* should infer annihilation wherein there is *nothing*, *ergò no punishment*, yet Death it self is *something*, and is joyned with real pains as well as privations: but of those or any other reality the state of *annihilation* is not capable; and then to say everlasting punishment, though that were supposed to signifie no more than everlasting *pœna damni*, yet must it be founded in *everlasting being*, for no man can be punished everlastingly by deprivation of bliss that hath not a being at all, to be thus capable of devesting or deprivation: for *non entis nulla est affectio*, But to this it is *replied*, that the Text saith not the wicked shall be everlastingly punished, but they *shall go into a punishment*, and that punishment shall be *everlasting*; and such is everlasting death. To this I *answer*; that there is no ground of this distinction in the Text, which saith together, *they shall depart into everlasting punishment*, which is certainly the very form that would be used, if the κόλασις were designed to be never so positively punitive, if it were into the *furnace of fire*, *where there is weeping and gnashing of teeth*, *Secondly*, 'tis *replied*, that a man may *suffer* or be punished by that which he doth not actually *feel*, and many attempts are made for the proof of this. But it is sufficient in a word to say, that none of the proofs come home to the state of *annihilation*, whereof onely our question is. A *mad man* or *fool* may suffer though they discern it not; a *dead* man, who is not annihilated but lives in his better part, may suffer in his *memory*, *children*, *friends* here, much more while he lives may he without folly desire to avert such sufferings; but he that is not, is not capable of any of these: and if I were sure, that *to morrow* I should be *nothing*, no real consideration of my self (but either present care of *others* good, or perhaps irrational *fancy*) would incite me to make any provision for after that morrow. So again *privation* of possible felicity is to any one that hath being a real punishment, because he is a loser, though not sensible of what he hath lost; but to him that is *not*, 'tis an absolute *nullity*, and were a man sure to be annihilate, the fear of this were unreasonable, for that time when he should be nothing, and the onely thing that renders it reasonable *now* is because he hath a *being*, and hopes to continue it, or (whatsoever he is seduced to *believe* to the contrary) yet still he *desires* it, and as long as he hath life, may well desire, and cannot chuse but wish all the accomplishments and even images of it: and at once fear the loss of life, and all felicities which either do or may accompany life. But still this man's being *subject* to this *fear*, because capable of the causes of it, is no proof of his being punished, who is supposed *not to be* he that hath a *being*, and desires the continuance of it, suffers when he loseth it; but he that hath no being, is not to be esteemed by these measures, any more than he that hath never yet been, is this day punished by not being created, or conceived till to morrow. Nor to this is it any way consequent, as is objected, that the *desire* of *everlasting* life should not be a *reasonable* desire. For though it be reasonable to *fear* the *privation* of a reasonable desire, yet this fear is onely incident to him that hath a being, and he that hath no being cannot have desire, how reasonable soever it is for him, that hath a being, to have it.

The *Sadducees* had a being when they desired *praise*, and though they believed no *immortality* of *Souls*, yet they believed *durability* of *memory*, and memory was a kind of *image* of *life*, and they that despaired of the *body* might take some content in the *shadow*; but even that a mere shadow and fancy too, which also would be at an end, whensoever their being were supposed to be so. So again the same *Sadducee* whilst he *lived* might fear *death*, because he enjoyed somewhat which he was unwilling to lose, and because death it self though it were thought to enter him on a state of *nothingness*, yet was it self *something*, both *respectu sensus & damni*. And beside the *Sadducee* could hardly be *Sadducee* enough in the point, so as not to have some *fear* of the *contrary*: however he still had a being, and was to be unwilling to lose it. But that having *no being* should be real *punishment* to him that is *not*, is above my comprehension. As to what is said in the *Objectour's* person *p.* 10. at the beginning, that if he believed *annihilation*, he would yet as much fear the *punishment*, as he desires *everlasting life*, I shall grant it on this presumption; that he now believes he shall *enjoy* everlasting life: but then he that thus *desires* and *fears*, is supposed to *exist*, and to him 'tis granted that *deprivations* are *penal*; and again, though he would fear that, yet sure he would never fear κόλασιν αἰώνιον in the notion of *eternal sensible punishments* and scorchings of fire. I know not whether all that I have said of the nature of the privative punishments be maturely said or no, as *non entis non est affectio*, so I have always found it hard to satisfie my self concerning any *thing* of that which *is not*. Onely I rest my self in this, that my mistake, if it be such, is sure of so nice a making, that I cannot my self discern it, and therefore it is not to be imagined that the truth of *Christ's* speech should hang on so weak a string as it must, if by κόλασις αἰώνιος *Christ* meant no more than *eternal deprivation* of being. For if that which *is not*, cannot be eternally *punished*, how can the *wicked* be said to *depart to eternal punishment* when they are *annihilated*?

For *everlasting judgment* I acknowledge it signifies no more than the *former* imported; and so is to be concluded by the discourse on that. 'Tis the adjudging to a state which shall last to all *eternity*, or a sentence, wherein the eternity of him that is judged, is concerned.

Next

Next for their *worm never dying*, I have *three* things to add, *Firſt*, that the *worm* in dead bodies devoureth very *ſlowly* and leaſurely, and ſo is as fit as any thing could have been to expreſs *lingring* torments. *Secondly*, that the *worm* devoureth not the *whole body*, the bones and firmer parts are not liable to her malice; and ſo 'tis moſt unfit to expreſs utter *annihilation* of the whole. *Thirdly*, that the *worm* being peculiar to *dead* and putrified bodies, is a moſt lively repreſentation of gnawing and miſeries *after death*; and then when inſtead of mortal worms, which are the onely inſtruments of gnawing on dead bodies, there is ſomewhat elſe threatned by *Chriſt*, which is fit to be expreſſed by the ſtyle of an *immortal worm*, nothing could have been more adequate for the expreſſing the *eternity* of torments in *hell*; thoſe eſpecially of a gnawing tormenting *conſcience*, which, if it be but the conjecture of *Divines*, is, as appears, a very probable conjecture. Of the meaning of the place in the Prophet, *Iſa.* 66. 24. I have formerly ſpoken, and acknowledged it the fountain from which our *Saviour*, *Mark* 9. derived it, but have ſhewed how little is gain'd from thence toward proving it a *preſent*, becauſe a viſible, *deſtruction*. *Abraham* is ſuppoſed to behold *Dives* in hell, but that proves not that *Dives* his puniſhments were preſent of this World. *Procopius* hath ſhewed, how the pious in heaven might behold the puniſhments of the wicked in another World, and in what ſenſe to be ſaid to *come forth to worſhip before the Lord, and go forth, and look*, &c. And indeed if it be unqueſtionable, that in *Chriſt*'s ſpeech the future miſeries of the wicked are thus expreſs'd (as the diſputer himſelf yields) there can be no difficulty to underſtand the words ſo in *Iſaiah* alſo. If therefore the place in *Iſaiah*, ſo referred to the future *torments* of the *wicked* after the day of *judgment*; if the expreſſion of future puniſhment by *fire* and *worms*, proportionable to the ſeveral cuſtomes of diſpoſing dead bodies by *interring* and *burning*, was frequent among the *Jews* (as the *diſputer* grants to the force of the other Texts which *Grotius* quotes) if the addition of the never *quench'd fire* take away all ambiguities imaginable in the *worm*, and incline it more ſtrongly to thoſe puniſhments which are elſewhere expreſs'd by *eternal fire*; and if they, to whom *Chriſt* ſpake, the *Jews* which generally agreed to the *Phariſees* opinion of the *eternity* of another life, ſo underſtood the *phraſe*, and *Chriſt* ſpeaking agreeable to their opinion and interpretations of *Iſaiah*, gave no leaſt cauſe of conjecture or imagination, that he meant the words in any *other ſenſe*, than it was ſure they would *underſtand* him; what cauſe of doubting can remain in this matter? None certainly from the ſubſequent words, *ver.* 49. for adhering to that interpretation of πυρὶ ἀλισθήσεται for *conſumption* of the *ſacrifice*, as in the *Holocauſts*, to which the wicked are fitly compared, there follows no more, than that the *whole* of the wicked, *bodies* and *ſouls* ſhall like the Holocauſts be caſt into the *Fire*, and burnt, or deſtroyed there; but in what ſenſe of deſtruction, whether in that of *annihilation*, (which is not competible to the *holocauſts*, and wherein 'tis never found to be taken in the Sacred *dialect* when the *Heavens* are ſaid to vaniſh or *melt*, as Salt, *Iſa.* 51. 6. this is not for the Heavens to be annihilated, and the מלח׳ם uſed for *veſtimenta detrita ſeu evanida*, *Jer.* 38. 11. were not *annihilated*) or in the *other*, having loſt all the advantageous *parts* and *effects* of *life*, and being engaged in a moſt ſad eſtate far worſe than *not being*, is not ſo much as intimated in the phraſe, any farther than by the conjunction thereof with the Eternal never dying *Worms* and *Fire*, it is reaſonably to be interpreted; and that is quite contrary to the *diſputer*'s intereſts.

Next then for ὁ ζόφος τοῦ σκότους εἰς αἰῶνα, *Jud.* 13. 2 *Pet.* 2. 17. there is no pretence that it ſhould in theſe places be meant for *death* any more than ζόφος is, 2 *Pet.* 4. It ſignifies the ſad *uncomfortableneſs* of that ſtate, which, being in reſpect of the torments expreſs'd by Fire in other places, hath not yet the one comfort of ordinary Fire belonging to it, *viz. lightſomeneſs*, but contrariwiſe ζόφος τοῦ σκότους, as durable as the flames. The Texts produced, *Job* 10. 21, 22. 1 *Sam.* 2. 9. *Eccl.* 11. 8. *Pſal.* 88. 7, 11, 12. *Job* 17. 13. *Eccl.* 6. 14. are pertinent to prove what they deſigned, that *darkneſs* denotes the *ſtate after* this *life*: but that no way prejudices the uſe of it for a *poſitive ſtate* and not that of *annihilation*: for that 'tis not uſed in any of thoſe places. Yet that it ſhall not here be taken in that ſenſe which in thoſe places belongs to it, there are theſe reaſons, 1. Becauſe the *New Teſtament* moſt explicitely affirming a *reſurrection* from that *Old Teſtament*'s *darkneſs*, doth yet threaten this ζόφος τοῦ σκότους εἰς αἰῶνα, which therefore muſt commence *after* the *reſurrection*, and ſo cannot be that death from whence men riſe *in the reſurrection*, of which thoſe *Old Teſtament* places were underſtood. Secondly, becauſe in the ſame Chapter, 2 *Pet.* 2. 4. 'tis ſaid of *Angels* σειραῖς ζόφου ταρταρώσας, where ζόφος being applied to *Angels*, it cannot ſignifie that *death*, as if 'twere applied to living *men*, it might. 2. Being joyn'd with *chains*, it thereby ſeems to ſignifie ſome poſitive ſtate; but eſpecially, 3. Being joyn'd with ταρταρώσας it muſt denote that ſtate, which all ſorts of men, Heathens, as well as Jews and Chriſtians, underſtood by *Tartarus*, that ſure is a place of ſuffering after death. Thirdly, Becauſe though there be no farther mention than of the *privative* part of *Hell*, in the ζόφος τοῦ σκότους, yet in the other places of the *New Teſtament*, where the ſame is mentioned under the name of ἐξώτερον σκότος, the *utter* or *utmoſt darkneſs*, the fartheſt receſſion from lightſome or bliſsfull life imaginable, there is joyned with it *weeping and gnaſhing of Teeth*, *Matth.* 8. 12. and 22. 13. and 25. 30. which ſufficiently differenceth it from the notion for death.

As for the places in the *Revelation*, it is granted to be reaſonable to interpret them according to *prophetick ſtyle*, and not exact them to ſtrict *literal* interpretation; accordingly as *Jer.* 7. 20. and *Iſa.* 34. 4, 10. ſignifie *utter* final *vaſtations*, (as appears by their *ſmoke going up for ever and ever*, lying waſte and *none paſſing through* it, from *generation to generation*, *for ever and ever*, and *the not quenching of God's wrath*, but burning *upon man and upon beaſt*) ſo where the like circumſtances either inforce, or but incline, the interpretation of paſſages in the *Revelation*, I ſhall make no ſcruple to yield, as *Revel.* 18. 18. ſpeaking there of the ruine of *Babylon* 'tis moſt reaſonable to interpret to that ſenſe the ſmoke *of her burning*, by *her* meaning that great *City* in the end of the verſe, and ſo again *chap.* 19. 3. her *ſmoke roſe up for ever and ever*, Heathen *Rome* was deſtroyed, ſo as never to be rebuilt again; there is nothing in the contexts that inclines to any more than this. But then for *Revel.* 14. 9, 10, 11. I cannot thus yield. There, to deterr all from yielding to Idolatry in the leaſt degree, *worſhipping the beaſt and his image*, &c. the intermination goes out thus, *if any man ſhall doe thus*, verſ. 9. the *ſame ſhall drink*, &c. verſ. 10. where the *bitter wine of God mixt*, *unmixt in the cup of his wrath*, is properly ſuch a vengeance as hath, 1. No mixture or allay of *mercy*, 2. All the embittering *ſpices* added to it, and ſo fitly ſignifies *deprivation* of life and all that

that is pretious here, and very much more of *bitterneſs* after it. And this is farther inforced by their being (not conſumed, but) tormented with *Fire* and *Brimſtone* (not here as *Sodom* was in the preſence of men, but) in the preſence of the *Holy Angels*, and in the preſence of the *Lamb*, i. e. by the ſentence of *Chriſt* with his aſſembly of Angels in judgment, and ſo *verſ.* 11. *the ſmoke* (not ſimply as *Rev.* 19. 3. nor of their *burning* or conſuming, as in *Iſay* it was, but) *of their torment aſcendeth up for ever and ever; and they have no reſt day nor night* (quite contrary to *death* whereby men reſt from their labours, and to *annihilation* much more, which is a perfect ceſſation and that eternal, as oppoſite as was poſſible to having no reſt day nor night) ſo *chap.* 19. 20. where 'tis ſaid of the *beaſt* and the *falſe prophet*, the *Roman Idolatry* and *Magick*, &c. (*i. e.*) the eminent ſupporters of the former by *Magick* and *Auguries*, the principal factours for the holding up the Heathen Worſhip, *Apollonius Tyanæus*, &c. (See note on *Rev.* 13. g. h. i. k.) that *they were caſt alive into a Lake burning with Fire and Brimſtone*, the meaning in all reaſon muſt be, that they were from this life ſentenced to be caſt into exquiſite torments, not that they were utterly deſtroy'd or conſumed, but as infallibly removed to that place of torments, as if they had gone down quick Bodies and Souls together into *Hell*.

Here indeed is nothing ſaid of the *perpetuity* of thoſe torments but that is expreſly ſet down, *chap.* 20. 10. not onely as far as concerns the *Devil* that was to bear them company, and was *caſt into the Lake* where they are, which by the way muſt either infer that the *Devils* who are not deemed to enter on their full puniſhment till the day of *Doom*, ſhall then alſo be *annihilated*, or that the wicked who are then in the ſame condition with the *Devils* ſhall not be conſumed or annihilated) but particularly as to them βασανισθήσονται *the Beaſt and the Prophet ſhall be tormented for ever and ever.* And if you ſhall demand, why I ſaid not this thus particularly in the *Paraphraſe* and *Annotations* on the places of the *Revelation*? I anſwer, that it was not agreeable to my *deſign* on that Book, which was onely to ſet down the *grand lines* and branches of that obſcure Prophetick Writing, and not more nicely to deſcend to every *minute* expreſſion in it.

Where it is ſaid, *page* 12. *l.* 8. That to apply any paſſages in the *Revelation* to that which is to follow after the laſt judgment, is not ſo *Prophetical* and therefore not ſo *probable* a ſenſe; I anſwer that all that is *future* (as ſurely all that follows the laſt judgment is) may well be ingredient in a *Prophecy*; and ſo in this probably enough, if either ſpeaking of vengeance on wicked men this be added over and above their viſible portion (for that ſure is very fit in a *Chriſtian* Prophecy, when *wicked* men oft thrive very proſperouſly here, till the day of full iniquity and their accounts comes, and then they *die* oft but *as other* men, and would not deterr any man from following their ſteps, if we were not admoniſht that after *death* they muſt meet with a diſmal Portion) or ſpeaking of the end of the World and the day of *doom*, the ſeveral allotments of men be there ſeaſonably mention'd alſo, as we ſee it is in *Revel.* 20. 12, 13, 14, 15.

As for the laſt *reſerve*, that if the *puniſhment* here deſcribed be to be underſtood of that which follows the *laſt Judgment*, yet no expreſſion uſed in any of thoſe Texts doth neceſſarily ſignifie an abſolute *eternity* of poſitive Torments; I anſwer that undoubtedly ſome do. I inſtance in *Revel.* 20. 10. as it hath been formerly inlarged on, (*day and night for ever and ever* expreſſeth an abſolute eternity, as much as any words of man can do) βασανισθήσονται doth plainly denote *poſitive torments*, and referring peculiarly to a *rack*, doth thereby denote the kind of poſitive torments to be ſuch, as are not deſigned to *ending* the life, but to *continuing* it in great pains, for ſo we know the Rack is among men.

Now for the *exceptions* to *Revel.* 20. 10. I muſt add ſomewhat. 1. 'Tis ſuggeſted that that ſeems not to be ſpoken of the *laſt* final *judgment*. I grant it is not, but of the hour of *death*, whereon I ſuppoſe thoſe wicked mens Souls caſt into the fire of Hell, and never reſcued from thence, till Body and Soul together at the day of *doom* being joyned in thoſe torments, they are ſhut up thither to all eternity. *Secondly*, 'tis ſuggeſted that it ſeems not to be meant of Hell (*i. e.*) *Gehenna*, into which none were ever caſt alive, *i. e.* before the firſt death. To this I anſwer, that to be *caſt alive into Hell* is a phraſe like to that of *going down quick into* Hell, uſed of them whom the earth ſwallowed up. Wherein 'tis more than poſſible that ſuch notorious ſinners might go, bodies and ſouls together, to Hell, without any previous ſeparation by death; by the ſame *analogy* whereby we believe that *Enoch* and *Elias* went up, bodies and ſouls, into Heaven, without ſeeing death; and whereby we believe the ſame of thoſe that ſhall be found alive at *Chriſt*'s coming, both wicked and Godly. But then, *ſecondly*, if this be not certain enough to be adhered to, then the phraſe will ſignifie as *ſuddenly* and *really* to be caſt into thoſe Flames, and there to be tormented, as they could be imagin'd to be, if bodies and ſouls together they ſhould be caſt *alive* thither; and ſo this is a direct prejudice to the *ſleeping* of their *ſouls*, or receiving any interval of reſt from their paſſing out of this *life*, and their entring into the torments of *Hell*.

Of the places in the *Apocalypſe* ſome things are added, to the taking off from their force, *Firſt*, a *deſperation* of any certain *underſtanding* of that book. To which I *anſwer*, that 'tis but a *panick* and popular *fear*, which is the authour of that deſperation, and keeping men from the ſtudy of it, makes it neceſſarily unintelligible; whereas *Firſt*, there be many repeated paſſages of Chriſt in it, deſigned on purpoſe to excite men to the ſtudying of it. *Secondly*, there are evident *characters*, which ſerve as *keys* to the underſtanding of it, and nothing but the ſeeking and fanſying depths and myſteries in it, hath made it ſo myſterious: the meaning neareſt to literal, and ſuch, as by comparing it with other prophecies, appears to be the one prophetical ſignification of each paſſage, will be found to be the trueſt; and they that ſtrain higher, and ſeek farther off, to find what was never intended by the *Inſpirer*, or the *Amanuenſis*, are the men that have made this Prophecy *obſcure*, which would otherwiſe be as perſpicuous as any one of the greater Prophets of the *Old Teſtament*. *Secondly*, when 'tis ſuggeſted, that the places for *interminable* pains are but *two* or *three*, and thoſe oppoſed to as many *hundreds*, which are to be alledged againſt this ſenſe. I anſwer, that as few or as many as they are, (it matters not for number, one *affirmation* of *God*'s will eſtabliſh a truth) *Firſt*, they accord with many others in writings not obſcure or prophetick. *Secondly*, there is no one (much leſs many hundreds) producible to the contrary ſenſe, as hath hitherto appeared by examining all ſuch as were pretended to be oppoſite, but were found very reconcilable with the ſenſe. *Thirdly*, when the obſcurity of the Writer is again mentioned, that hath been already ſpoken to on the firſt place.

Concerning

Concerning the reaſons which are uſed to ſecure the places for eternal life for to ſignifie that, though eternal torments be not allowed to be properly eternal, I have little to ſay, becauſe I fully acknowledge that importance of the word *eternal*, whether to bliſs or woe. And I think it hath already appeared, that there are not theſe reaſons of difference between them as now are mentioned. For, *firſt*, as there are no texts in the Goſpel which ſeem to oppoſe the abſolute ſenſe of eternity in the promiſes, ſo thoſe that were thought to ſeem to oppoſe the abſolute eternity of the threats, having been brought to trial have been found very light; and, *ſecondly*, the doctrine of eternal torments truly ſtated and vindicated from the miſtakes by men introduced into the doctrine, hath appeared moſt credible alſo to thoſe that believe the Goſpel; and as neceſſary to God's juſtice as he is Rector of the Univerſe, and as agreeable to his goodneſs, who earneſtly averts their dying that will needs die, as the eternal promiſes are reconcilable to all the Attributes of God. *Thirdly*, that as there are negatives that irrefragably confirm the truth of the article concerning Eternal life, ſo there are affirmatives and negatives both (each is therefore not quenched) that as irrefragably eſtabliſh the truth of the doctrine of eternal torments. As for the *Philoſophical* doctrine of the *immortality* of the *ſoul*, I yield it can import no more, than either its not being corruptible from any outward principles, nor deſtructible from any created power; I yield it (for all that) deſtructible by God, but have formerly anſwered how that place, *Mat.* 10. 28. hath nothing to doe with his will or purpoſe to *annihilate* it.

Laſtly, As for *tradition*, as that ſignifies the *ſuffrages* of all the men in the World. *Heathens* of all ſorts, *Jews* of all ſects, *Mahometans*, *Chriſtians* heretical as well as orthodox, it matters not though this doctrine be not deduced by ſuch abſolutely univerſal tradition. I yield that many *Heathens* there were that *believed* it, that the *Sadducees* denied it, that the *Jews* now adays care for none but *themſelves*, and ſo make no proviſion for *other* men, that there have been *Origeniſt* Hereticks, and ſome ſuch as *Auguſtine* mentions, *Enchir. c.* 122. *de civit. Dei l.* 21. *cap.* 17, 18. ('tis no news that there ſhould have been falſe teachers and believers in the World:) But that *Auguſtine*, who is confeſt frequently to *aſſert* the doctrine and frequently to *defend* it againſt adverſaries, ſhould yet be believed to *doubt*, *lib. de ſerm. Dom. in mont. tom.* 4. *ſuper Matth.* 5. 25, 26. I am not apt to give heed to it. Becauſe, *firſt*, if the ſame *Auguſtine* ſhould be ſo *uncertain* and unconſtant, he were little worth heeding on either ſide. *Secondly*, there would be reaſon to reſolve, that the *place*, where the *doubting* is found, was either not written by *him*, who wrote elſewhere ſo *contrarily*, or were written by him before he had competently conſidered the grounds, whereon afterwards he eſtabliſheth his acknowledgements of the truth. But the truth is, I diſcern not how thoſe words [*neque ita hoc dixerim, ut diligentiorem tractationem videar ademiſſe, de pœnis peccatorum quomodo in Sacris dicantur æternæ*] ſhould be interpreted, ſo as to expreſs him a *doubter* in this matter. In other circumſtances he might well give men liberty of expreſſion, yet himſelf never have the leaſt ſuſpicion or doubt of the truth of the *main* Article. It remains therefore that the Scripture, as that hath been found conſonant and agreeable to all other places of it ſelf, and as it hath been interpreted by all learned Orthodox men of all ages, and as from the *Apoſtles* time to this day their doctrine hath been delivered down in the *Creed* of the *Apoſtles*, and other occaſional *explications* thereof, doth as evidently affirm the *eternity* of the torments of the wicked on the one ſide, as the eternity of the *joys* and bliſs of the godly on the other ſide; and that as far as the *Catholick* Church in all ages hath extended, in oppoſition to the *heterodox* and *heretical*, ſo far the tradition of this Article for eternal pains is *univerſal*, and therefore in no reaſon to be doubted of by a meek Son of this perſecuted Church, which profeſſeth *readily* and *uniformly* to receive all Catholick Tradition, truly ſo called, as that includes the writings and preachings of the *Apoſtles*. Having gone thus far, and at laſt arrived to the concluſion, in the ſame poſture (with ſome intermiſſions) of the Chair, wherein the *Gout* had faſtned me; I now find the uſe of my foot return'd again, and ſo take my leave of this *paper* and my *chair* together, and by the length of it ſuppoſe I have your full leave ſo to do. When you have ſurvey'd it as deliberately as you deſire, I deſire that you will return mine *own* to me, not weighing too ſeverely what was written thus haſtily. But remember, if any one text of *Scripture*, or teſtification of the *Churches* ſenſe of all times (including the *Apoſtles*) be producible, it is ſufficient for the eſtabliſhing this *truth*, though many paſſages produced, or defences made for the farther confirming of it, ſhould not be found *rigorouſly* Concludent or Demonſtrative. The God of Heaven, Authour of all Grace and Truth be now and ever with you.

SIR,

IN your account of the *eternity* of *infernal puniſhments* you make them conſiſt in the *perſevering appetition* and *averſation* of thoſe things (then *impoſſible* to be *obtained* or *avoided*) which formerly *in via* men have *deſired* and *averted*. To this ſtating of this matter muchwhat the like with Sir *Ken. Digby*'s and Mr. *White*'s, I have more to object than is fit for a Letter. Some few heads of Exceptions I ſhall briefly note to you. *Firſt*, I ſee not how this agrees with the *nature* of the *judgment to come*; the giving and executing a ſentence upon wicked men. This we are every where taught in *Scripture* and our *Creed*. But your ſtating, which onely leaves men with thoſe *deſires* and *averſions* wherein they lived here, and ſo die, without *ſentencing* them to any other puniſhment but what they thus bring with them, and ſo is already inflicted on them, and needs no *Devils* to execute it, ſeems not reconcilable herewith. *Secondly*, the *Matter* of this ſentence is expreſſed in *Scripture* to be a *lake of Fire and Brimſtone*, into which they are caſt, which muſt be a very ſtrange figurative expreſſion, if it ſignifie no more than their own *voluntary acts*, appetitions and averſations. *Thirdly*, it is manifeſt, that thoſe *diſeaſes* which precede many Mens *deaths*, do change their *appetitions* and *averſations*. The luxurious Man on his ſick Bed hath not thoſe vehement deſires of Women, delicate meats, *&c.* which he had in his health: Why then ſhould I think

think that after Death his appetites of what he desired *in via*, viz. in his life and health, should continue to him? Nay, 4. When *Souls* are devested of those *Bodies* which were the necessary Instruments, and also the fomenters of those carnal sins, and again when the *body* before its reunion is so changed as not to be sustained, as *in via* it is, by eating and drinking, 'tis not imaginable it should retain those natural desires which *in via* it had: And when they no more marry in *Hell* than *Heaven*, and are as *equal to* evil *Angels*, as the Saints in Heaven are to good ones, and the natural end of all carnal desires ceasing, it is not imaginable God should continue those desires to them for ever. Or if any should so conceive, many strange wild consequences unfit to name, would be equally probable and equally unimaginable. 5. By this stating, the *loss* of *Heaven* will from hence onely be *penal*, that Men desired Heaven *in via*, or judged it fit to be desired. And if so, it will be no punishment to them that never thought of it at all, as *infidels*, or despised it (as they did all spiritual joys, and thought it not worth desiring) as they that placed all their *appetites* on carnal and material *pleasures*; which are the worst sort of men, who in consequence hereunto must be least punisht in Hell *pœna damni*.

Having said thus much against your Scheme, I owe my self the pains of adding a word or two for the defence of the way that I have used in the *Practical Catechism*, *viz.* by considering the *option* given to us by God, wherein you seem to me not to have observed that, on which the chief weight of my account was designed to lie.

That *God* propos'd to Men *life* and *death*, blessing and cursing, eternal joys and eternal pains, as the *Rector* of the Universe, I take for granted; and so do you, as an Article of our Faith: So that of the *an sit* the question is not, but considering the transitory short pleasures of sin, the onely question is, How eternal pains are with any justice *proportion'd* to them: and to that the answer is, Not that they *are proportion'd* to them, but that there is *no need* they should be, because *God* having propos'd the joys of *Heaven*, and (much more) immunity from these pains upon terms put absolutely in our *power*, it is merely our own *fault*, not imputable to the decree of *God*, if we fall under those hardest *pains*. The extremity of which was primarily design'd, as by all prudent *Lawgivers* punishments are, to deter men from those sins which are fenced with so thorny an hedge; not that they may be inflicted on any, but that all may be kept innocent: and in this sense 'tis ordinarily observ'd, that the everlasting Fire which is threatned men, was prepar'd for the *Devil* and his *Angels*. Yet when such *threats* are entred into those *Laws*, whereby the Universe is governed; it is just and reasonable that they should be also actually perform'd on the disobedient: else it were as good, nay better to all political ends, that they had never been made or promulgate. And if still, when they come to be *inflicted*, they appear to be *hard*, or above the proportion of the offence, there are yet other ways of superseding that exception beside the evacuating the decree: *viz.* The several branches of the ἐπείκεια all which the Gospel hath provided in this matter.

First, That those which we could not (either by *Physical* or *moral possibility*) avoid, should not be charg'd upon us to this condemnation, as *Original* sin; sins of *Weakness*, *Ignorance*, sudden *surprise*, *Indeliberation*, &c.

Secondly, That known deliberate voluntary sins, if timely retracted by *repentance*, humiliation, confession, change of mind, shall not fall under it.

Thirdly, That God gives sufficient grace to *avoid* all wilfull sin, and again sufficient grace to *repent*, when it hath been committed; and inflicts it not till he sees men go on obstinately, and that they will not repent.

Fourthly, That he *calls*, and *warns* and *importunes* them to consult their own safety, to make use of his *grace* timely, and not obstinately to harden their hearts against their own *mercy*, and so to perish in despight of mercy.

Fifthly, That he *offers* not onely *deliverance* from these *torments*, but over and above, *eternal joys* upon so easie terms of so moderate nay desirable performances, that they which will neglect so great Salvation propos'd to them, with so many advantages and concurrence of all rational motives; and finally make so mad a choice as to take *Hell* as it were by *violence*, cannot but be thought *worthy to take their portion in that Lake* be it never so punitive and endless: Because though in respect of that one sin (the short pleasure that comes in to them by *sin* compar'd with intensive endless flames) there is no proportion, yet 1. In respect of their *obstinacy* and unexcusableness; 2. In respect of *God's tenderness*, using all wise means of moderating the rigour of his Law by the Gospel (though not by utter abrogating his Laws, which becomes not either a just or wise Lawgiver, or Rectour of the Universe) all shew of Injustice is remov'd: particularly by the second taken alone, (much more in union with the first and third) the rule being owned by all rational men *volenti non fit injuria*, be the evil never so great, 'tis just they should have it, that finally make it their choice, (so doth the persevering Impenitent) and that not onely an hasty passionate choice as *Nero's* Mother's, *Occidat modò imperet*, (which yet Historians observe to have brought her death justly upon her) but a *deliberate*, stanch, obstinate, constant *choice*, when their Creatour, and Redeemer, and Sanctifier have us'd all prudent probable means to gain them to better counsels and choices, but all in vain, they die because they will die: When yet they are oft warn'd (and expostulated with) of the irrationalness of that will or choice. 'Tis true, when they come to suffer their own choices, they are far from liking them (as *Xiphilin* observ'd of *Nero's* Mother in the forementiond case) and then 'tis likely would fly from them, call to the *mountains to cover them from the wrath of the Lamb*: But their choices being primarily terminated in the pleasant sins, but consequentially in the pains annexed to them by God's Law, 'twill be as unreasonable that they which have chosen the former should be freed from the latter, as that he that hath *bought* a *Commodity* at a price, and bound himself to a day of payment, should, after he hath enjoy'd and *spent* the Commodity, be excus'd from paying the *price* of it by pretending it was not really worth so much, when it appears by his *bargain* that he himself thus valued it, and willingly took it at this price, and hath now chang'd his mind on no other consideration, but because the enjoyment, for which alone he valued it, is past, and none but the *payment* behind, which consider'd by it self, every man acknowledges to be the ungratefull part; and so he did when yet on intuition of the more pleasant he made choice of it.

I have thus far enlarged to give you a clearer view of the force of the *opion* in this matter, than I can discern you to have had of it; and consequently to shew you the insufficiency of the reason on which you reject it; when you say, that upon this *Hypothesis* it should seem to be concluded, that *eternal life* is owing to Piety *ex justitia*. But to this I reply: 1. That it were no news from S. *Paul*'s words [*That God the righteous Judge shall give the Crown of righteousness* to all that keep the *Faith*, &c.] to conclude that that *Crown* is some way due to Piety *ex justitia*. But then *secondly*, My Argument from the *opion* hath no least need of so affirming, but becomes much the *stronger* the less that be affirm'd; For the *less rewardable* in it self our *Piety* is, the more *mercy* and superabundant goodness it is in God thus to decree the rewarding it; and the more *undeserv'd* that *Mercy*, and the easier the condition of it, the more *Criminous* is the guilt of those that *despise* and *contemn* it, and prefer sin, and impenitence, and eternal death before it.

A N

AN ACCORDANCE OF Saint PAUL with Saint JAMES, In the great Point of FAITH and WORKS.

HE that ſaith with Saint *Paul*, a man *is juſtified by Faith and not by Works*, and to reconcile Saint *James* with Saint *Paul*, affirms, that *good Works are the effect of true Faith*, means either that true faith where e'er it is, is *able* to *produce* good works, though it do not always actually produce them; or elſe, that it *actually* and neceſſarily *produceth* them. If the *former* be his meaning, then I conceive it true in ſome degree, but not pertinent to his purpoſe of reconciling Saint *James* with Saint *Paul*, becauſe faith may be able to produce them, and yet never actually produce them; and ſo the man that is ſuppoſed to be juſtified by faith never be able to *ſhew* his *works*, which Saint *James* requires of him, and conſequently his faith be a *dead* faith, *i. e.* not able to juſtifie. But if the *latter* be his meaning; that true faith, whereſoever it is, actually and neceſſarily produceth good works, I conceive it falſe; yet can I not diſpute againſt him in thoſe terms, by inſtancing in any particular to the contrary. Becauſe he hath a guard or hold for himſelf to fortifie him againſt any aſſault, by affirming to any ſuch inſtance of mine, where good works were not produced, that that faith was not true faith; which yet if he ſhould be put to prove, he would have no other reaſon to confirm it, but onely becauſe it produceth not good works; being ready, if it did produce good works to acknowledge it true faith; which how guilty it is of thoſe two faults in diſputing, *circulus* and *petitio principii*, I think is manifeſt to any. Yet being by this *Sophiſm* of his interdicted this way of proceeding, I have but one way of arguing left me; *firſt*, to demand his *definition* of true *faith*, and whatſoever definition he gives, to prove that faith, in that notion of his, is the cauſe of good works at the moſt, but as a man is the cauſe of a child, a true perfect, univocal cauſe of the effect, when the effect is produced; but yet ſuch a one, as might have ſuſpended that action, by which it was produced, and ſo might have been as truly a man without the actual producing of that effect, as he is now, he hath produced it: that is, that *faith* is a *rational* or moral, not *natural* agent, working *freely*, not *neceſſarily*.

To bring this operation to practice, I will ſuppoſe this *definition* of faith to be given me (which by them that affirm good works to be an effect of *faith* is ordinarily given) that it *is a fiducial aſſent to the promiſes of Chriſt*. Where that I may not miſtake him, I muſt firſt demand, whether he conceives theſe *promiſes*, which are the object of his faith, to be *abſolute*, or *conditional*. If he affirm them abſolute, made to mens *perſons*, or individual *Entities*, without reſpect of their *qualifications* or demeanours, then ſurely that faith, which ſuppoſeth all kind of qualifications of the ſubject ſo *unneceſſary*, will never ſo much as move me to produce *good works*, becauſe I may as well be ſaved without them, the promiſes being ſuppoſed without condition; and therefore he that affirms good works to avail nothing in the buſineſs of attaining to ſalvation, cannot, without contradicting himſelf, ſay, that his *faith* muſt *neceſſarily* produce good *works*, if it be a ſaving faith: for ſure all that neceſſity proceeds from a *believing*, that without good *works* there is no *ſalvation* to be had; which if it be not believed, that neceſſity ceaſeth. But if he affirm the *promiſes*, which are the object of his faith, to be *conditional*, then I muſt ask, what he takes this condition to be, either *faith* alone, or good *works* alone, or *faith and good works* together: if *faith* alone, then (beſide the ridiculouſneſs of that, in making the *believing* that I ſhall be *ſaved*, the onely *ground* of my *believing* I ſhall be *ſaved*) the former inconvenience recurs again, that that *faith* which ſuppoſeth faith onely to be a *condition* of the promiſes, will find good works as *unneceſſary*, as that faith which ſuppos'd the promiſes to be *abſolute*, and ſo will never incline me to them neither. If he affirm the *condition* of the promiſes to be good *works* alone (I mean by good *works* all other graces beſides faith, *contrition*, *amendment* of life, *charity*, *holineſs*, &c.) then he acknowledgeth, that theſe good works are of themſelves ſimply *requir'd* of a man that is, or will be a believer; and ſo that they are no neceſſary *effect* of *faith*, for if they were, it would be enough to require *faith alone*, and they would undoubtedly follow without requiring. For I conceive it ridiculous to make the *condition* of an *Indenture* ſomething that is neceſſarily annext to the poſſeſſion of the *demiſe*. If he affirm *faith and good works* neither ſingle, but both together

to be the adequate condition of the promiſes, which Saint *Paul* calls *faith conſummate by charity*, Saint *James*, *faith made perfect by works*, Saint *Paul* again νόμῳ & νόμου (which certainly is the *truth*) then firſt I muſt admoniſh him, that his *fiducial aſſent*, by which he defines faith, muſt not ſignifie a believing with *reliance*, that he is one of them that ſhall be partakers of what is promiſed, which they are wont to call ſpecial faith, or particular *application*; for that muſt either ſuppoſe them to have *performed* the *condition*, and ſo good works in them (yea and faith) muſt be before faith; or elſe it is the *believing* confidently of a *lye*, it being abſolutely *falſe*, that the thing *promiſed* belongs to any that hath not performed the *condition*.

But his fiducial *aſſent*, if it be a tolerable *definition* of faith, muſt be (anſwerable to the *promiſes*) onely this, a believing and *relying conditional*; that he ſhall be partaker of what is *promiſed*, that is, a *believing* (and depending on it) that *God* will not *fail* him, if he *fail* not *God*: that God will give him *heaven*, if he perform ſincere *obedience*, and rely upon the gift of *Chriſt*, not on any merit of his *obedience* for the attaining of it. Now to ſay the truth, this *fiducial aſſent* thus expreſs'd (and none but this) may truly be affirm'd to be a moſt powerfull motive to me to produce *good works*; but then it is as true, that it is as powerfull a motive to me to rely on the gift of *Chriſt*, and ſo in that reſpect *faith* may be ſaid to *produce* good *works*, faith may alſo be ſaid to produce that which they call *faith*, *i. e.* the believing, that if I obey and rely, I ſhall be ſaved, is a motive thus to produce actual relying; and in this ſenſe I will acknowledge both (if he, with whom I diſpute, will thank me for it.) But then, *ſecondly*, it follows not that that which is a powerfull *motive*, is a *cauſe* neceſſarily producing, becauſe that motive is but a *moral motive*, perſwading not enforcing, and man by corruption, or by ſome prevailing temptation may reſiſt that motive, and I think 'twould be no *Paradox* to ſay, that ſome men have made no doubt of the truth of God's conditional promiſes, *i. e.* have verily perſwaded themſelves, that if they *ſerved God* ſincerely, they ſhall be *ſaved*, and yet quite *neglected* God's *ſervice*: and if it be objected, that they want the *fiducial*, though they have the *aſſent*, and that if they had the *affiance*, they would aſſuredly produce *good works*; I anſwer, that by that *affiance* they mean either abſolute *aſſurance* that they ſhall be ſaved, (and that, if it be not an errour, ſuppoſeth *good works*; if it be, produceth them not) or elſe a conditional *affiance*, and then again I affirm of that, that it is no more than what I expreſt by making no manner of *doubt*, but if they *ſerve God* ſincerely, they ſhall be *ſaved*; which though I believe to be a moſt *powerfull motive* to obedience, yet I conceive not a *neceſſary* irreſiſtible *cauſe*, (becauſe 'tis onely a moral motive) nay nor that that always produceth the effect. *Firſt*, becauſe the *fooliſh Virgins* had as much of this as the wiſe, for ought we ſee; and after the door is ſhut come as confidently, *Lord, Lord, open to us*, and yet it ſeems did not watch and make ready their *Lamps*, which was the act of obedience requir'd of them; and the want of it forfeited their hopes. 2. Becauſe the *unprofitable ſervant* that profeſſeth he knew that *God reaped where he ſowed not*, yet *hid the Talent in a Napkin*, put it not out to the exchangers. 3. Becauſe the *exhortations* of *Chriſt* and the *Apoſtles* are generally to *good works*, as well as to *faith*, nay much more frequently, which argues to me that faith doth not neceſſarily produce good works, and they that are ſuppoſed to have faith are exhorted *to add to their faith vertue*, 2 *Pet.* 1. 5. which (if Faith were a neceſſary cauſe of Works) were all one as to exhort the *Fire* to *burn*, the *Water* to *moiſten*, &c. 4. Becauſe there is a difference obſerved in Scripture between a *working* and a *non-working Faith*, and the privileges are beſtowed onely on the firſt, by which it is plain, that it is poſſible for it not to work. 5. Becauſe *faith is* ſaid to be *made perfect by works*, *Jam.* 2. 22. which ſure an agent cannot be ſaid to be by producing an effect, which it cannot but produce; as the act of *Humectation* adds no degree of perfection to the *water*. Nay 'tis a general rule, that the *producing* of what *effect* ſoever adds no perfection to the *cauſe*, ſave onely *relative*; as the begetting of a *Son* adds onely the relation of a *Father*, but nothing elſe more than he was before; it rather ſuppoſeth him perfect before, which is the importance of the *Logick* axiome, *effectus eſt extra naturam cauſæ*. All that can truly and in propriety of ſpeech be ſaid of Faith in this matter, is this; that *Faith* is ſo ſtrong a *motive* to *obedience*, that if it be drawn as a Weapon to the purpoſe, and uſed as it ſhould, it would in reaſon *out-balance* all the contrary *temptations* to diſobedience: and if the *will*, which hath the caſting voice, give its ſuffrage, as in *reaſon* it ought, it ſhall then infallibly produce *obedience*; but yet not *irreſiſtibly*, becauſe that *will* being ſtill a *free faculty* at leaſt to evil, may after all the propoſal of motives either *ſuſpend* its Action, or elſe doe that which it ſhould not. For ſure it is an errour of *Socinus* to affirm *cognitionem rerum pulchrarum aut turpium, quales præter alias ſunt res honeſtæ & vitioſæ; harum odium, illarum amorem neceſſariò gignere*; and that *Socrates*'s ſpeech (*præſente ſcientia fieri non poſſe ut quis incontinens ſit*) was true with this Caution, *ut quis ſciat res honeſtas, eas facienti magnum commodum allaturas*, def. diſp. de loco c. 7. ad *Rom.* and in 1 *Joh.* 4. 8. If by *amor* and *odium* he mean *proſecutio* and *averſatio*, as 'tis plain he doth by that which follows. For ſure *Medea* was not deceived in her ſelf when ſhe ſaid, *video meliora probóque, deteriora ſequor*. And ſo many, who make no doubt of an *Heaven* to belong to all penitent reformed *Servants* of *Chriſt*, and that that *Heaven* contains *joys* above all that the World can afford, do yet chuſe the *pleaſures of ſin for the preſent ſeaſon*; like *Ephraim* that is likened to an *Heifer that loved to tread out the corn*, betook her ſelf to that courſe which for the preſent yielded ſome profit (as the Heifer being by the Law then unmuſled, might eat as ſhe trod it out) that had its reward at that minute, that ſhe did the work. Whence is all this? but from hence, that the carnal pleaſures of ſin for the *preſent* obtain the conſent of the will againſt all the *future* pleaſures and joys of Heaven, joyn'd with the ſowreneſs of preſent obedience; which could never be, if believing the promiſes always either neceſſarily, or infallibly produced good works.

THE

THE LAST WORDS Of the Reverend, Pious and Learned Dr. HAMMOND.

BEING

Two PRAYERS for the Peacefull re-ſettlement of this CHURCH and STATE.

Prayer I.

O Bleſſed Lord, who in thine infinite mercy didſt vouchſafe to plant a glorious Church among us, and now in thy juſt judgment haſt permitted our ſins and follies to root it up, be pleaſed at laſt to reſume thoughts of peace towards us, that we may do the like to one another. Lord, look down from heaven, the habitation of thy holineſs, and behold the ruines of a deſolated Church, and compaſſionate to ſee her in the duſt. Behold her, O Lord, not onely broken, but crumbled, divided into ſo many ſects and factions, that ſhe no longer repreſents the Ark of the God of *Iſrael*, where the Covenant and the Manna were conſerved, but the Ark of *Noah*, filled with all various ſorts of unclean beaſts; and to complete our miſery and guilt, the ſpirit of diviſion hath inſinuated it ſelf as well into our affections as our judgments; that badge of Diſcipleſhip which thou recommendedſt to us, is caſt off, and all the contrary wrath and bitterneſs, anger and clamour, called in to maintain and widen our breaches. O Lord, how long ſhall we thus violate and defame that Goſpel of peace that we profeſs? how long ſhall we thus madly defeat our ſelves, loſe that Chriſtianity which we pretend to ſtrive for? O thou which makeſt men to be of one mind in an houſe, be pleaſed ſo to unite us, that we may be perfectly joyned together in the ſame mind, and in the ſame judgment. And now that in Civil affairs there ſeems ſome aptneſs to a compoſure, O let not our Spiritual differences be more unreconcilable. Lord, let not the rougheſt winds blow out of the Sanctuary; let not thoſe which ſhould be thy Embaſſadours for peace ſtill ſound a Trumpet for War: but do thou reveal thy ſelf to all our *Elijah*'s in that ſtill ſmall voice, which may teach them to echo thee in the like meek treating with others. Lord, let no unſeaſonable ſtiffneſs of thoſe that are in the right, no perverſe obſtinacy of thoſe that are in the wrong, hinder the cloſing of our wounds; but let the one inſtruct in meekneſs, and be thou pleaſed to give the other repentance to the acknowledgment of the truth. To this end do thou, O Lord, mollifie all exaſperated minds, take off all animoſities and prejudices, contempt and heart-burnings, and by uniting their hearts prepare for the reconciling their opinions: and that nothing may intercept the clear ſight of thy truth, Lord, let all private and ſecular deſigns be totally depoſited, that gain may no longer be the meaſure of our Godlineſs, but that the one great and common concernment of truth and peace may be unanimouſly and vigorouſly purſued. Lord, the hearts of all men are in thy hands, O be thou pleaſed to let thy Spirit of peace overſhadow the minds of all contending parties; and, if it be thy will, reſtore this Church to her priſtine ſtate, renew her days as of old; let her eſcape out of *Egypt* be ſo entire, that not an hoof may be left behind: But if thy wiſedom ſee it not yet a ſeaſon for ſo full a deliverance, Lord, defer not, we beſeech thee, ſuch a degree of it, as may at leaſt ſecure her a being; if ſhe cannot recover her beauty, yet, O Lord, grant her health, ſuch a ſoundneſs of conſtitution as may preſerve her from diſſolution. Let thy providence find out ſome good Samaritans to cure her preſent wounds: and to whomſoever thou ſhalt commit that important work, Lord, give them skilfull hands and compaſſionate hearts; direct them to ſuch applications as may moſt ſpeedily, and yet moſt ſoundly, heal the hurt of the daughter of *Sion*; and make them ſo advert to the intereſts both of truth and peace, that no lawfull condeſcenſion may be omitted, nor any unlawfull made. And do thou, who art both the wonderfull Counſellour and Prince of peace, ſo guide and proſper all pacifick endeavours, that all our diſtractions may be compoſed, and our *Jeruſalem* may again become a City at unity in it ſelf; that thoſe happy primitive days may at length revert, wherein Vice was the onely hereſie; that all our inteſtine contentions may be converted into a vigorous oppoſition of our common enemy, our unbrotherly feuds into a Chriſtian zeal againſt all that exalts it ſelf againſt the obedience of Chriſt. Lord, hear us, and ordain peace for us, even for his ſake whom thou haſt ordained our Peace-maker, Jeſus Chriſt our Lord.

Prayer

Prayer II.

O Moſt gracious Lord, who doſt not afflict willingly, nor grieve the children of men, who ſmiteſt not till the importunity of our ſins enforce thee, and then correcteſt in meaſure, we thy unworthy creatures humbly acknowledge that we have abundantly taſted of this patience and lenity of thine. To what an enormous height were our ſins arrived e'er thou beganſt to viſit them! and when thou couldſt no longer forbear, yet maſtering thy power, thou haſt not proportioned thy vengeance to our crimes, but to thy own gracious deſign of reducing and reclaiming us. Lord, had the firſt ſtroke of thy hand been exterminating, our guilts had juſtified the method; but thou haſt proceeded by ſuch eaſie and gentle degrees, as witneſs how much thou deſiredſt to be interrupted, and ſhew us, that all that ſad weight we have long groaned under, hath been accumulated onely by our own incorrigibleneſs. 'Tis now, O Lord, theſe many years that this Nation hath been in the furnace, and yet our droſs waſtes not but increaſes; and it is owing onely to thy unſpeakable mercy, that we, who would not be purified, are not conſumed; that we remain a Nation, who ceaſe not to be a moſt ſinfull, and provoking nation. O Lord, let not this long-ſuffering of thine ſerve onely to upbraid our obſtinacy, and enhanſe our guilt; but let it at laſt have the proper effect on us, melt our hearts, and lead us to repentance. And oh, that this may be the day for us thus to diſcern the things that belong to our peace! that all who are (yea, and all who are not) caſt down this day in an external humiliation, may by the operation of thy mighty Spirit have their ſouls laid proſtrate before thee in a ſincere contrition! O thou who canſt out of the very ſtones raiſe up children unto *Abraham*, work our ſtony flinty hearts into ſuch a temper as may be malleable to the impreſſions of thy grace, that all the ſinners in *Sion* may tremble; that we may not by a perſevering obſtinacy ſeal to our ſelves both temporal and eternal ruine; but inſtead of our mutinous complaining at the puniſhments of our ſins, ſearch and try our ways, and turn again to the Lord. O be thou pleas'd to grant us this one grand fundamental mercy, that we who ſo impatiently thirſt after a change without us, may render that poſſible and ſafe by this better and more neceſſary change within us; that our ſins may not as they have ſo often done, interpoſe and eclipſe that light which now begins to break out upon us. Lord, thy dove ſeems to approach us with an olive-branch in her mouth, O let not our filth and noiſomneſs chaſe her away; but grant us that true repentance which may atone thee, and that Chriſtian charity which may reconcile us with one another. Lord, let not our breach either with thee or among our ſelves be incurable, but by making up the firſt prepare us for the healing of the latter. And becauſe, O Lord, the way to make us one fold is to have one ſhepherd, be pleaſed to put us all under the conduct of Him to whom that charge belongs; bow the hearts of this people as of one man, that the onely contention may be who ſhall be moſt forward in bringing back our *David*. O let none reflect on their paſt guilts as an argument to perſevere, but repent, and to make their return ſo ſincere as may qualifie them not onely for his but thy Mercy. And, Lord, be pleas'd ſo to guide the hearts of all who ſhall be intruſted with that great concernment of ſetling this nation, that they may weigh all their deliberations in the balance of the Sanctuary, that conſcience, not intereſt, may be the ruling principle, and that they may render to Cæſar the things that are Cæſar's, and to God the things that are God's; that they may become healers of our breaches, and happy repairers of the ſad ruines both in Church and State: and grant, O Lord, that as thoſe ſins which made them are become National, ſo the repentance may be National alſo, and that evidenc'd by the proper fruits of it, by zeal of reſtoring the rights both of thee and thine Anointed. And do thou, O Lord, ſo diſpoſe all hearts, and remove all obſtacles, that none may have the will, much leſs the power, to hinder his peaceable reſtitution. And, Lord, let him bring with him an heart ſo intirely devoted to thee, that he may wiſh his own honour onely as a means to advance thine. O let the precepts and example of his Bleſſed Father never depart from his mind; and as thou wert pleas'd to perfect the one by ſuffering, ſo perfect the other by acting thy will; that He may be a bleſſed inſtrument of replanting the power inſtead of the form of Godlineſs among us, of reſtoring Chriſtian vertue in a profane and almoſt barbarous Nation. And if any wiſh him for any diſtant ends, if any deſire his ſhadow as a ſhelter for their riots and licentiouſneſs, O let him come a great but happy defeat to all ſuch, not bring fewel, but cure, to their inordinate appetites; and by his example as a Chriſtian, and his Authority as a King, ſo invite to good, and reſtrain from evil, that he may not onely releaſe our temporal, but our ſpiritual bondage, ſuppreſs thoſe foul and ſcandalous vices which have ſo long captivated us, and by ſecuring our inward, provide for the perpetuating our outward peace. Lord, eſtabliſh thou his throne in righteouſneſs, make him a ſignal inſtrument of thy glory and our happineſs, and let him reap the fruits of it in comfort here, and in bliſs hereafter; that ſo his earthly Crown may ſerve to enhanſe and enrich his heavenly. Grant this, O King of Kings, for the ſake and interceſſion of our Bleſſed Mediatour, Jeſus Chriſt.

The

The Contents of the ſeveral Books in this Volume.

A Practical Catechiſm. Page 1.
(*The Contents of which ſee at the beginning of the Book.*)
A Copy of ſome Papers paſt at *Oxford* (*Concerning the Practical Catechiſm*) 155.
A View of ſome Exceptions to the Practical Catechiſm p. 199.

Of Conſcience p. 207.
Of Scandal p. 222.
Of Will-worſhip p. 232.
Of Superſtition p. 242.
Of Idolatry p. 250.

Of Sins of Weakneſs and Wilfulneſs p. 265.
Of a late or death-bed Repentance p. 277.
Of Fraternal Admonition or Correption p. 289.

Of Reſiſting the lawfull Magiſtrate under colour of Religion p. 301.
Of the word Κείμαι p. 314.
Of the Zealots among the Jews p. 316.
Of taking up the Croſs p. 320.
A Vindication of Chriſt's reprehending St. *Peter* p. 324.

Addreſs to the Lord *Fairfax* p. 330
A Vindication of the Addreſs p. 336.

A View of the New Directory; and Vindication of the Ancient Liturgy p. 358.
The particulars p. 361.
1. *The Preſcribing of ſet Forms* ibid.
2. *Outward or bodily Worſhip* p. 367.
3. *Uniformity in God's Service* p. 368.
4. *The peoples bearing ſome part* ibid.
5. *The dividing the Prayers into ſeveral Collects.* p. 369.
6. *The Ceremonies of Kneeling, Croſs, Ring,* &c. 370.
1. *The Abſolution* ibid.
2. *The Hymns,* &c. ibid.
3. *The uſe of the Doxology* p. 371.
4. *The Confeſſion of Faith in the Creeds* p. 372.
5. *The frequent repeating of the Lord's Prayer,* &c. ibid.
6. *The obſervation of Feaſts* p. 373.
7. *The reading the Commandments* p. 374.
8. *The order of the Offertory* ibid.
9. *Private Baptiſm* p. 375.
10. *A preſcript form of Catechiſm* p. 376.
11. *Confirmation* ibid.
12. *The ſolemnities of Burying* p. 377.
13. *Thanksgiving after Child-birth* ibid.
14. *Communion of the Sick* p. 378.
15. *Commination* ibid.
16. *Lent,* &c. ibid.

Conſiderations concerning the change of ~~Church Government~~ p. 397.
Of the Power of the Keys p. 406.
(*The ſtate of the point* chap. 1. ibid.
1. *On whom this Power was beſtowed?* c. 2. p. 407.
Who are the Apoſtles Succeſſors? c. 3. p. 412.
2. *In what this Power conſiſts?* c. 4. p. 420.
3. *The end and uſe of it* c. 5. p. 450.
4. *The effect of it.* c. 6. p. 454.
The utility of it c. 7. p. 457.

Of the Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtian Religion.
(*This is miſplaced next to the Practical Catechiſm* p. 133.
Chap. 1. The grounds of Chriſtianity, or the reaſons upon which men embrace Chriſtian Religion in the groſs, all of it together p. 134.
2. A Digreſſion concerning the uſe of Reaſon in deciding Controverſies in Religion p. 140.
3. Of the power of the Affections and Intereſts in matters of Faith p. 143.
4. Of the advantages of Chriſtian Religion in the groſs p. 144.
5. The Exceptions againſt ſome particulars in Chriſtian Religion; and 1 God's Diſpoſitions of Providence p. 148.
6. The Exceptions againſt Chriſt's Commands p. 150.

Of Fundamentals. p. 461.
Chap. 1. The Notation of the word Fundamental. ibid.
2. The Diviſion of the Diſcourſe into four parts; What are Fundamentals in General p. 463.
3. A particular view of Fundamentals: Jeſus Chriſt indefinitely p. 464.
4. Jeſus Chriſt Crucified p. 466.
5. Jeſus Chriſt raiſed, &c. p. 467.
6. Other Articles of Belief in Chriſt ibid.
7. The Faith in Baptiſm p. 470.
8. Of the Creeds in General; and firſt, of the Apoſtles Creed ibid.
9. Of the Nicene and Athanaſian Creeds together; and ſeverally of the Nicene p. 474.
10. Of the Athanaſian Creed p. 476.
11. Of the ſuperſtructure, and the particular branches thereof ibid.
12. Of the Doctrines, that hinder the ſuperſtructing of good life on the Chriſtian belief; firſt, among the Romaniſts, a catalogue of them, eſpecially that of the infallibility of the Church; 2. Among others. 1. That of the Solifidian 478.
13. Of the Fiduciary p. 480.
14. Of Chriſt's dying for none but the Elect p. 482.
15 Of the irreſpective Decrees of Election and Reprobation p. 484.
16. Of the Predetermination of all things p. 486.
17. Of the Spirits acting all things within the man p. 492.
18. Of the miſtakes concerning Repentance 493.
19. Of the neceſſaries to the ſuperſtructing of good life on this Foundation p. 495.
A Prayer p. 500.

Of Schiſm. p. 503.
Chap. 1. An Introduction, The danger, and ſin of Schiſm ibid.
2. What Schiſm is, together with ſome general conſiderations thereon p. 505.
3. The ſeveral ſorts of Schiſm p. 508.
4. The pretended evidences of the Romaniſt againſt the Church of *England* examined; and firſt, that from the Biſhop of *Rome*'s Supremacy by Chriſt's donation to St. *Peter* p. 513.
5. The

5. The Evidences from the Biſhop of *Rome* ſucceeding St. *Peter* examined p. 517.
6. Their ſecond Plea, from the Biſhop of *Rome* having planted Chriſtianity among us p. 519.
7. Their third evidence from our caſting off obedience to the Biſhop of *Rome* at the Reformation p. 523.
8. Of the ſecond ſort of Schiſm, as it is an offence againſt mutual charity; This divided into three ſpecies, and the firſt here examined p. 526.
9. The ſecond ſpecies of this Schiſm examined, as it is an offence againſt external peace, or Communion Eccleſiaſtical p. 528.
10. The third ſpecies of this Schiſm, as an offence againſt that charity due from every Chriſtian to every Chriſtian examined p. 529.
11. Concerning the preſent perſecution of the Church of *England*, and the advantages ſought from thence p. 530.

A Parænesis, wherein is inſerted a Diſcourſe of Hereſie p. 535.
Chap. 1. An introductive reflexion on our preſent condition ibid.
2. A firſt objection, or argument of our guilt drawn from our preſent condition; anſwered in the former branch of it: The judgment apportion'd to our ſins p. 536.
A Prayer fitted for a day of Humiliation p. 539.
Another p. 540.
3. A view of the ſecond part of the Objection: The periſhing of the Righteous p. 541.
4. A ſecond Objection anſwered, Where is now the Proteſtant Engliſh Church? p. 542.
5. Of the nature of Hereſie. Our Church ſecured from the guilt of it p. 543.
Sect. 1. The uſe of the word in Scripture ibid.
2. Of matter of Faith p. 544.
3. The two ways of conveying Faith to us p. 545.
4. The teſtimony from which we receive the Faith ibid.
5. The qualifications of ſuch Teſtimonies p. 546.
6. Where theſe qualifications may be found. Of the conſent of ancient Doctours, and definitions of Councils truly General p. 547.
7. The benefit from General Councils. Reverence due to them. To the firſt four eſpecially p. 549.
8. Of the ſubſequent General Councils. The Romaniſts deference to them p. 550.
9. Our reverence to all General Councils. The Fifth and the Sixth p. 551.
10. Of the ſeventh General Council p. 552.
11. Of the eighth General Council p. 554.
12. Of the reſt of the Councils which the Romaniſts call General; particularly that of *Trent* p. 556.
13. Of the inerrability of a General Council. That it is no matter of Faith p. 557.
14. That it is one of the *Piè credibilia*, that a General Council ſhall not err p. 559.
15. A Recapitulation and Concluſion of this matter concerning Hereſie ibid.
Chap. 6. A third difficulty raiſed from *Act.* 4. 19. and 1 *Cor.* 9. 16. ſatisfied p. 560.
Chap. 7. The beneficial uſes of our preſent condition p. 564.
Sect. 1 Contempt of the World ibid.
2. Secondly, Univerſal Reformation p. 565.
3. Thirdly, Fruits of Repentance. Among them Firſt, perfect contentment, diſcernable by two trials p. 566.
4. Secondly, Peace with all men p. 567.
5. Thirdly, Frequency of Synaxes p. 569.

A Letter of Reſolution to Six Quæres p. 573.
1. Of the way of reſolving Controverſies, which are not clearly ſtated and reſolved in the Scriptures p. 575.
2. Of Marrying the Wives Siſter p. 581.
3. Concerning Polygamy and Divorces p. 591.
4. Of the Baptizing of Infants p. 607.
5. Of Impoſition of Hands for Ordination p. 632.
6. Of the obſervation of Chriſtmas day, and other Feſtivals of the Church p. 650.

A Pacifick Diſcourſe of God's Grace and Decrees p. 667.
Concerning Preſcience p. 695.

Of Hell Torments p. 709.

Of Faith and Works p. 725.

Two Prayers p. 727.

FINIS.